

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2019**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Chairman, Springfield District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large  
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District  
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District  
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District  
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District  
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District  
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District  
Donté Tanner, Sully District  
Mary D. Cortina, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 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

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you pointed out, this is the third meeting and it's time to elect officers for the current calendar year. I PROPOSE THE ELECTION OF THE FOLLOWING SLATE OF OFFICERS FOR THE 2019 CALENDAR YEAR:

- FOR CHAIRMAN, PETER MURPHY FROM THE SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT;
- FOR VICE CHAIRMAN, JAMES HART, AT-LARGE;
- FOR SECRETARY, JAMES MIGLIACCIO, LEE DISTRICT; AND
- FOR PARLIAMENTARIAN, TIMOTHY SARGEANT, AT-LARGE.

Chairman Murphy: Is there a second to the motion?

Commissioner Cortina: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Cortina. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to elect the officers, as articulated by Mr. Ulfelder, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

Chairman Murphy announced the passing of Melissa Mayland. Ms. Mayland was the spouse of William Mayland, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning. Chairman Murphy offered condolences to Mr. Mayland and his three children, Gillian Mayland, Samara Mayland, Atticus Mayland, and other family, friends, and relatives.

//

Chairman Murphy announced the passing of the spouse of Mitra Amirhakimi, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning. Chairman Murphy offered condolences to Mrs. Amirhakimi and her family.

//

Commissioner Murphy announced the appointment of Jill G. Cooper as the Executive Director of the Planning Commission and Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, as a result of the merger of the Planning Commission's office and the Clerk to the Board's office.

//

Chairman Murphy announced the Environment Committee would meet on Thursday, January 24, 2019, at 7:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman Murphy announced the Telecommunications Committee would meet on Thursday, January 24, 2019, at 8:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced the Schools Committee would meet on Saturday, January 26, 2019 from 9:00 a.m. to noon, in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035 to hold a work session.

//

Commissioner Hart announced the Environment Committee would meet Thursday, January 24, 2019, at 7:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035 to continue discussions on the amendment to the Green Building Policy. An introductory presentation would be presented by

staff regarding the Natural Landscaping and County Facilities and Coastal Shoreline Erosion amendments. Commissioner Hart announced the Environment Committee would meet on February 21, 2019, at 7:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035 regarding salt management strategy for Northern Virginia.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Murphy established the following order of the agenda:

1. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT– ARTICLE 6 – DENSITY PROVISIONS FOR THE RESTON PRC DISTRICT

The order was accepted without objection.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – ARTICLE 6 – DENSITY PROVISIONS FOR THE RESTON PRC DISTRICT – NOTICE is hereby given that the Fairfax County Planning Commission will hold a PUBLIC HEARING on January 23, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.

in the Board Auditorium, Lobby Level, Government Center Building, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia, on the matter of an amendment to Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: Modify the maximum density provisions in Sect. 6-308 of the Planned Residential Community (PRC) District specifically for the Reston PRC District as follows:

- 1) Increasing the maximum overall density permitted in the Reston PRC District from 13 persons (the current maximum) up to 15 persons per acre of gross residential and associated commercial areas. The amendment, which would apply to both paragraphs 1 and 4 of Sect. 6 308, is being advertised to allow consideration of any number from 13 to 15 persons per acre.
- 2) Allowing the Board to approve residential development at a density of up to 70 dwelling units per acre (the current maximum is 50 dwelling units per acre) for properties designated for high density on an approved development plan and located in a transit station area planned for mixed use within the Reston PRC District, if a proposal is implementing the site-specific density and other recommendations in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The amendment is being advertised to allow consideration of any number from 50 to 70 dwelling units per acre.

- 3) Updating language throughout Sect. 6-308 to modernize terms such as “shall” and “shall not” for clarity. All persons wishing to speak to this subject may call the Office of the Clerk to the Planning Commission, (703) 324-2865, to be placed on the Speakers' List or may appear and be heard. Copies of the full text are on file and may be reviewed at the Office of the Clerk to the Planning Commission, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035. For the convenience of the public, access to the full text will also be available for review at the County's website, [www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz) under the Zoning heading by clicking on Pending Zoning Ordinance Amendments. ADA: Reasonable accommodation is available upon 48 hours advance notice; please call 703-324 1334 (TTY 711 Virginia Relay Center).

Commissioner Hart made preliminary comments and provided the Commission with his personal prospective on the proposed amendment.

Cathy Belgin, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 6, Density Provisions for the Reston PRC District.

There was a discussion between Ms. Belgin and multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- Potential language for redevelopment of the existing golf courses and a proposed increase in persons per acre;
- The current Master Plan's projection for possible planned residential growth within the PRC District; and
- Consideration for residential development above 50 dwelling units per acre with a maximum of 70 dwelling units per acre within the transit station areas (TSAs).

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

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

Margaret Parker, 1908 Reston Metro Plaza, Reston, spoke in support of the subject amendment because of the ongoing transportation infrastructure to support the Reston Master Plan. (A copy of Ms. Parker's statement is in the date file).

Mike Jennings, 11315 Handlebar Road, Reston, spoke in support of the subject amendment because of extensive review conducted by staff, numerous meetings held by the task force, and several community meetings held, which solicited feedback from members of the community. (A copy of Mr. Jennings' statement is in the date file).

Mark Ingrao, 2993 Aspen Lane, Falls Church, representing Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the amendment because the Reston Master Plan process was well thought out, Robert Simon's participation and support for the plan, Reston's stable residential neighborhoods, protection of a diverse housing stock under the plan, and the addition of new residential development that ensured balanced growth. Mr. Ingrao addressed traffic issues and suggested traffic impacts could be mitigated by balancing the jobs to household ratios. He also recommended phasing infrastructure with development. (A copy of Mr. Ingrao's statement is in the date file).

There was a discussion between Mr. Ingrao and multiple Commissioners regarding the separation of the density capacity calculation from the previously adopted plan amendment, carryover and recoupling of the village centers from the previous amendment, revisiting the capacity calculation, and balancing residential and non-residential development within a quarter mile to support the transit station area.

Dennis Hays, 1398 Old Quincy Lane, Reston, spoke in opposition of the amendment because of the changes made to Reston's framework, the lack of community outreach, and possibly lower standards of living as a result of the amendment. (A copy of Mr. Hays' statement is in the date file).

Sherri Hebert, 1607 Park Overlook Drive, Reston, spoke in opposition to the amendment because of the County's failure to convince the community of the need for the proposed amendment, the plans increased density, and recommended zoning of the PRC be aligned with the review of the Master Plan. (A copy of Ms. Hebert's statement is in the date file).

There was a discussion between Ms. Hebert and Commissioner Hart regarding applications coming into the Reston PRC District and the maximum density capacity of 13 persons per acre.

Bob Petrine, 2503 Fox Croft Way, Reston, representing Reclaim Reston, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment because of concerns regarding the proposed increase in the PRC's overall density cap and calculations for both present and future. (A copy of Mr. Petrine's statement is in the date file).

Larry Butler, 12001 Sunrise Valley Road, Reston, representing Reston Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment because of the need and timing of the PRC and the overall density capacity. (A copy of Mr. Butler's statement is in the date file).

There was a discussion with Mr. Butler, Leslie Johnson, Zoning Administrator, ZAD, DPZ, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Maximum density capacity, migration of Planned Residential Mixed Use (PRM) and Planned Commercial District (PDC) buildings to the PRC, and the possibility of those properties remaining in the originally zoned district;
- Complications that may arise with density capacity as a result of opting-out of the PRC and how acreage would be affected; and

- Allowed rezonings and were in conformance with the Master Plan.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

Tammi Petrine, 2503 Foxcroft Way, Reston, representing Reston 20/20, opposed the proposed amendment because of impacts it would have on the homeless shelter, Reston Regional Library, the fire department, police department, and schools. (A copy of Ms. Petrine's statement is in the date file).

John Mooney, 1400 Church Hill Place, Reston, representing Hampton Point Condo Association, opposed the proposed amendment because of the impacts it would have on infrastructure, density increase, and transportation congestion in the TSAs. (A copy of Mr. Mooney's statement is in the date file).

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:07 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 9:28 p.m.

//

Lynne Mulston, 11472 Links Drive, Reston, representing Coalition for a Planned Reston, opposed the proposed amendment because of the County's discussions regarding the need, timing, and increase in the PRC's overall density capacity. Ms. Mulston discussed Reston's parks and recreation services, planned open space, and contributions made by the area's two golf courses. (A copy of Ms. Mulston's statement is in the date file).

Bruce Ramo, 11562 Hemingway Drive, Reston, representing Hemingway Cluster Homeowners Association, opposed the amendment because the cluster was located near North Point Village Center and the St. Johns Wood development. Those two areas were identified as areas for potential re-development and would be directly impacted by the proposed zoning amendment. (A copy of Mr. Ramo's statement is in the date file).

Laurie Dodd, 12024 Lake Newport Road, Reston, opposed the amendment because of the proposed plans to increased density without having a solid plan for schools, roads, transportation, parks, public safety facilities, and other services required by the residents of Reston. Ms. Dodd concurred with the previous speakers concerns regarding the density calculations, funding, and identifying land to accommodate the increase in population.

Carole Fenn, 1958 Winterport Cluster, Reston, opposed the amendment because of the potential increase in density. Ms. Fenn stated Reston required quality over quantity and there should be smarter and smaller-scale development around the Metro station areas and commercial villages. (A copy of Ms. Fenn's statement is in the date file).

John Pinkman, 2188 Golf Course Drive, Reston, representing Rescue Reston, opposed the amendment because of the excess development and population density increase would destroy the design Reston had created and built over the past 50 years. Mr. Pinkman called on the Planning Commission to acknowledge the community's opposition to the proposed amendment.

John Burns, 2402 Brentwood Place, Alexandria, representing Fairfax County Architectural Review Board (ARB), opposed the proposed amendment because of concerns regarding the proposed density increase, impacts on the Lake Anne Village Historic Overlay District, and the surrounding areas. Mr. Burns discussed ARB's recommendation to add a buffer that would transition to the overall proposed density increase. Mr. Burns also addressed the Heritage Resources located in the Reston area which included the Upper Potomac Planning District Overview section. He suggested that, prior to any zoning actions, both Heritage Resource and DPZ staff be consulted regarding architectural surveys necessary to document onsite cultural resources. (A copy of Mr. Burn and ARB's statement is in the date file).

There was a discussion with Mr. Burnes, Ms. Johnson, and multiple Commissioners regarding the status Reston's survey of historic architectural resources and ARB's correspondence to the Commission dated January 18, 2019.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment. However, staff indicated that they would provide the Commission with an update of the referenced survey.

Josh Veverka, 8407 Pennell Street, Fairfax, representing Northern Virginia Association of Realtors, supported the proposed amendment because of numerous debates by the real estate members, approval received by the Public Policy Committee and Executive Committee of the association's board members. The association understood the balance between quality and quantity of development and the impact on home values and quality of life. The association welcomed additional density to meet the future needs of the community and housing market. (A copy of the Associations' statement is in the date file).

Shane Murphy, 12010 Rosiers Branch Drive, Herndon, supported the proposed amendment because of Robert Simon's vision for Reston, in particular the Lake Anne Village Center, which supported a true mixed-use environment. Mr. Murphy stated the current village centers in today's market would be developed as mixed-use environments. In keeping with Robert Simon's vision, North Pointe, Hunters Woods, and South Lakes Village Centers could be reconstructed as mixed-use development. The TSAs should support the density necessary to develop within those environments. The history of the population capacity was based on the average number of people who lived in those types of dwelling units. Those numbers were capped at 13 persons per acre. Should the village centers be redeveloped in the future, the existing population cap would be problematic. Mr. Murphy suggested an increase in the population capacity in order to support Reston's future development.

There was a discussion with Mr. Murphy and Commissioner Hart regarding a population capacity number that would suffice and could be implemented. Mr. Murphy stated that, based on the PRC advertising, the existing limit of persons/acre should be 15. However, Mr. Murphy was in favor of eliminating the cap.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

Richard Kennedy, 11441 Waterview Cluster, Reston, who did not support the change in the zoning requirement regarding the change to the existing limit of person/acre. The method of calculation for the current population and the tools implemented did not accomplish what was needed for Reston. The Reston Master Plan addressed density with floor area ratios. Mr. Kennedy supported eliminating the cap and recommended that focus be placed on the Master Plan.

Mark Looney, 11965 Freedom Drive, Reston, who supported the amendment because time spent on development projects and zoning issues in the Reston area. He supported Robert Simon's vision of 1962, the goals for Reston, and the history of how the math calculations resultant. The construct of the PRC was developed based on Fairfax County's zoning regulations during that timeframe and did not allow for mixed uses. A zoning district was created in order to implement Mr. Simon's vision for a mixed-use community. The population capacity was set forth in the Zoning Ordinance based on the average persons per household and average lot size. Mr. Looney stated that existing limit of 13 persons per acre translated into one house per 12,500 square feet per lot. In 2001 the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted updates to the Master Plan of Fairfax County, which included updates to the Reston Master Plan to create the TSAs. As a result, additional density was created around the future TSAs. The updates approved in 2014 updated those planning efforts, added more specificity, requirements, expectations, and visionary elements into the plan. Mr. Looney support the amendment for the TSAs and non-TSAs.

There was a discussion between Mr. Looney and Commissioner Carter regarding 12,500 square feet lot calculations and impacts of moving density in the current environment.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

Yavuz Inanli, 2236 Hunters Run Drive, Reston, supported the amendment because of certain changes made regarding the future of Reston. Mr. Inanli and his spouse purchased a home two years ago and concurred with the other speakers regarding Mr. Simon's vision for a place to live, work, and play.

Robert Whitfield, 1587 Inlet Court, Reston, representing Fairfax County Tax Payers Alliance, addressed concerns regarding the focus on the PRC amendment on a portion rather than the overall complex puzzle. Mr. Whitfield addressed three major developments in Reston in July 2018, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors. He stated no comprehensive analysis was conducted. A comprehensive transportation plan was suggested for the one-mile area around Reston Town Center. Mr. Whitfield asked whether there was an approved density cap for the remainder of the Reston Town Center. Mr. Whitfield attended and was involved in many Comprehensive Plan meetings to include the Reston Network Analysis that was conducted. He stated many of his questions regarding the amounts proffered by previously-approved developments in Reston and the amount of review received from the Corporate Network Income

Tax districts were earmarked for Reston went unanswered. Mr. Whitfield called for fiscal prudence in the planning and implementation process.

There was a discussion with Mr. Whitfield and multiple Commissioners regarding whether Mr. Whitfield's views were on behalf of the Fairfax County Tax Payers Alliance. There was also a discussion about the overall purpose of One Fairfax in the land use process.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

Frank Peterson, 1107 North Wind Drive, Reston, opposed the amendment because of the increase to the existing limit of persons/acre and the increase to the number of dwelling units at Urban Core South and North areas. The quality of services, transportation, schools, and infrastructure would be impacted by the population and density increase.

Parker Messick, 11420 Esplanade Drive, Reston, opposed the proposed amendment because of the unwanted changes it would incur on the Reston community regarding increased density, population, and infrastructure. Mr. Messick stated the overwhelming majority of Restonians opposed the proposed amendment and asked that people of Reston be allowed to determine the future of their community.

There was a discussion with Mr. Messick and Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner regarding his position on further growth and development in Reston.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject amendment.

Mark Malcom, 12824 Tournament Drive, Reston, opposed the proposed amendment because it was not linked to other tools in the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan and did not address portions of developments in a comprehensive way. Mr. Malcom addressed how the plan process looked at individual parcels and not the comprehensive pieces of the plan that addressed public infrastructure not being planned for the land acquisition in advance. He added there should be a change of processes that addressed future needs of open and public spaces that coincided with private developments. Mr. Malcom also addressed impacts as a result of developments outside the TSAs.

Marrilee Miller, 11561 Hemingway Drive, Reston, opposed the proposed amendment and concurred with the other speakers' opposition. Ms. Miller lived in close proximity to the North Village Town Center and recommended site visits to determine density based on the scale of properties and zoning limits. Ms. Miller stated the two Master Plans, one for Fairfax County and the other for Reston were confusing. She addressed her concerns regarding impacts of zoning out of the PRC. Ms. Miller also addressed the possibilities of referendums on Reston open spaces and land use impacts from mirroring other districts or localities.

There was a discussion with Ms. Miller and Chairman Murphy regarding impacts of having a referendum and voting against mixed-use developments, as well as commercial and residential developments that would benefit the job market.

Hank Schonzeit, 11990 Mark Street, Reston, supported additional density, but not without infrastructure. He added that most of Reston's 50 years of development was done with less planned infrastructure. Referenced was made to an underdeveloped library in the Reston area. Mr. Schonzeit added that the quality of life for any planned community should also be measured and factored into any planned development.

Commissioner Ulfelder made comments regarding the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the program's needs, the CIP's priority projects and bond referendum for those libraries, and the opportunity for the citizens to debate any deficiencies.

Walter Alcorn, 11716 Green Owl Circle, Reston, supported the review of the proposed plan. Mr. Alcorn suggested the Commission wait until the submission of a PRC application to determine the calculations to the possible change to the overall residential density limit and conduct additional population density analysis because raising the capacity might not be required, based on a small number of cases. Mr. Alcorn stated the plan should not be rushed and encouraged the Planning Commission to take the necessary time needed during the deferral to arrive at the best possible recommendation.

There was a discussion with Mr. Alcorn and Commissioner Hart regarding the possibility of capacity increase and reviews of the previously adopted plan.

Moira Callaghan, 11213 Longwood Grove Drive, Reston, opposed the proposed amendment because the overall residential density in the PRC District should remain at 13 persons per acre. Ms. Callaghan stated Reston was a historic place and that history, open space, and land should be preserved for its current and future residents. There was a lack of funding and schools and public facilities would be impacted as a result of the proposed amendment.

John Farrell, 11545 Under Oak Court, Reston, representing Colonial Oaks Homeowners Association, opposed the proposed amendment of the already established multi-family residents within all the village centers. Mr. Farrell opposed residential development with a limit up to 70 dwelling units per acre because the increased density would impact the established garden and townhome communities. Mr. Farrell referred to Commission Hart's unanswered question regarding the choice between the PRC, PRM, or PDC Districts. He asked whether a PRC plan was an administrative, ministerial, legislative act, or could guarantee the citizens of Reston that it included a legislative review, subject to the debatable rule.

There was a discussion with Mr. Farrell and Commissioner Hart regarding changes to the language in the advertised proposed amendment and the overall scope of the advertising. The Board of Zoning Appeals' decision regarding the Comprehensive Plan requirement for the development of Reston National Golf Course was also discussed.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hart for actions on this amendment.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Hart: I wanna thank everyone that came out tonight and stuck it out to the end. We're gonna finish, I think. Are we gonna finish before midnight?

Chairman Murphy: We could.

Commissioner Hart: Okay. So, we won't need to come back. It saves us two more nights. It saves the County some...

Chairman Murphy: I know you all looking forward to that.

Commissioner Hart: Unless, I – I don't know if– we will probably have other things to say and staff will have other things to tell us. Four years ago, whenever it was, we – we left this topic in a general sense and we didn't have unanimity. But we had, I thought, a consensus on the big picture. And we had – whether you agree with how many times the task force met, who was on it, we had a recommendation from the task force that had staff's support. At the time, it had Reston Association's support, which I thought was important. It had Mr. Simons participation and support, which was also I think, given a great deal of deference. It ultimately had the Commission's support, although we made some edits to it. And I think that consensus involved a number of shared conclusions that are probably still valid today. And that in a – in a very oversimplified way, that the – the changes to Reston with the toll road and the Silver Line, the changes to human behavior with the internet and – and the way people shop and the way people communicate, would require some changes to the Land Use Plan. And that there was a consensus that the future development of Reston would largely be concentrated around the Transit Station Areas. And that it would be vertical rather than horizontal. That it would be designed in such a way to be compatible with Mr. Simons principles, which were going to be reiterated and incorporated again, and that we would leave the rest of Reston, basically, the way it was. We were not increasing anything other than the Transit Station Areas. The village centers were kind of a leftover. It was carry over from what Mr. Simon wanted at the beginning and didn't quite happen, except sort of Lake Anne, and even then, not really fully. It wasn't something that was bumped up in this process. It was just something that just wasn't torn down in that process. We left it the way it was. Again, I think with the expectation that we would come back to that topic and that the village centers probably needed to redevelop or some of them would. It would – there had to be some incentive to do that and we would leave things alone which is – which is basically what we did. And, there's a lot of details and it's almost two hundred pages of it. But, I think I'm over simplifying. But that's basically where we ended up. And we didn't, at that time, do the Zoning Ordinance Amendment. And no matter what else, and I am gonna put this in a motion or a follow-on motion or something, if this ever happens again. If we ever do and we've got, you know, 20 years of stuff stacked up in the work program, all these other areas we're looking at. If we do a Plan Amendment that requires a Zoning Ordinance Amendment for implementation, they got to be together or one closely on the heels of the other. We did it in Tysons and I think it worked. And we didn't here and we – we left ourselves a real mess. We – we had that consensus and I think it's – it's faded away and I'd – I'd still like to hope that there's a way to get things back together. I have great faith in the resilience of this process. And that, in general, if reasonable people try, we're gonna get a consensus. We may not get unanimity. We

didn't have unanimity four or five years ago, but we were close. And I - I think if we'd approach this the right way, being mindful of Mr. Simon's principals and the one I talked about at the beginning about the - the continued involvement of the community in it, I think we can get there. We are closer than we are right now. The deferral will give us some more time to think about it and so, and I'm sure there's other things I could say, but I still want to finish before midnight. The - the - therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would - I WOULD MOVE THAT WE DEFER THE DECISION ON THIS TO A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 13, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

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 the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 6, Density Provisions for the Reston PRC District, to a date certain of February 13th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 p.m.

Peter F. Murphy, Chairman

James T. Migliaccio, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, VA 22035.

Minutes by: Samantha Lawrence

Approved on: July 31, 2019



---

Jacob L. Caporaletti, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission