

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 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 7:36 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

PA 2018-III-DS1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER, LAND UNIT J)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Tanner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tonight, we were supposed to have the public hearing for Plan Amendment 2018-III-DS1, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Dulles Suburban Center. We're gonna go ahead and defer the public hearing for a couple of weeks. So, with that Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PLAN AMENDMENT 2018-III-DS1, WHICH CONCERNS LAND UNIT J OF THE DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER SCHEDULED FOR TONIGHT, BE DEFERRED TO FEBRUARY 27TH, 2019. THE TWO EXTRA WEEKS WILL ALLOW FOR TIME FOR ADDITIONAL REVIEW.

Commissioners Migliaccio and Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the Plan Amendment on the Dulles Suburban Center, the public hearing, to a date certain of February 27th, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.
The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced the Schools Committee met on Tuesday, February 12, 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 consider language for inclusion in the County's Comprehensive Plan regarding future educational facilities. The Committee also discussed non-land use recommendations for future education facilities. Representatives from Fairfax County Public Schools, Sandy Evans, and Dalia Palchik also attended the meeting.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced the Schools Committee would meet on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 7:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced the Capital Improvement Program Committee would meet on Wednesday, February 20, 2019, at 6:30 p.m., in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035. County staff would present an outline of the Fairfax County Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2020 – 2024 (with future Fiscal Years to 2029).

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced the Planning Commission would conduct its annual Capital Improvement Program Committee workshop and public hearing on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035. Nine agencies were slated to participate in the workshop.

//

SE 2018-MA-005 – CHRISTOPHER LAND, LLC

(Decision Only) (Public Hearing on this application was held on January 9, 2019; Decision Only from January 30, 2019; Decision Only from February 6, 2019)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: And with that, I do have a matter tonight. It's a matter of Christopher Land, LLC. We were scheduled for a decision only tonight and in conversations, and in careful consideration, this is a very complicated application. There are some good things, such as stormwater abatement, but there is a very difficult thing such as the traffic. And I will tell you when I was trying to figure out how to get to INOVA Hospital, I knew not to go down Gallows Road. So, it is very congested there and as Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and I agreed when we did the walkthrough, regardless of whether or not this property – this application is approved, there needs to be traffic abatement at that location. The applicant, in the discussion with the challenge of this site is going to be continuing to work with VDOT along with the Supervisors office on traffic study at that location. So, because of that and because of where everyone was coming out on this, I – they have requested an indefinite deferral. So, we greatly appreciate the community input. Your voices were heard. I know some people think that they weren't. We got a letter about that the other day. But we seek and need community involvement. And I will tell you that there were several things that struck my – got my attention that and it wasn't complex legal argument, it was how this applies to the – the factual situation. So, with that I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO INDEFINITELY DEFER SE 2018-MA-005, CHRISTOPHER LAND, LLC, TO INDEFINITELY.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion to the motion?

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I – I came prepared tonight to speak in opposition to this – this development. And I would like to go ahead and provide my rationale because I have mixed – very mixed feelings about supporting a motion to further defer action on this application, particularly since this isn't a – it's been a two-year process for the neighborhoods to deal with the potential for the development of this site. And I think sometimes we just need to let things happen appropriately. But let me – so let me state clearly, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this application. It is the right idea, an independent living facility in the wrong location. It seeks a special exception under our ILF Policies to essentially shoehorn density into a flawed consolidated site. I also note that the Mason Land Use Committee and Mason District Council both oppose the development. Furthermore, I believe that the staff's assessment that the application is in harmony with the Comp Plan does not account for the cumulative impact of independent living facilities in close proximity to each other, as is the case with wide used distance from this site. Using the SE capability for one ILF, on this stretch of Gallows Road is responsive to a need. Two within hundreds of feet of each other establishes a precedent for using special exceptions to introduce even greater density into this heavily-trafficked residential corridor. Further, Mr. Chairman, the bulk of the proposed multi-family building alone, much less the combined density of all the proposed units is simply not in character with the area neighborhoods. A particular concern to me is the impact this development could have on the stability of the historic Homes Run Acres neighborhood, directly across Gallows Road from this site. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the matter of traffic must be considered as Ms. Strandlie referenced – not the matter of volume, as this is an issue throughout the County,

but safety. The ILF Special Exception Standard Number 4, specifies and I quote, “the proposed use shall be such, that pedestrian and vehicular traffic associated with such use will not be hazardous or conflict with the existing and anticipated traffic in the neighborhood.” In this regard and even if a stop light at the Hemlock – Hemlock intersection were to be approved by VDOT, in my mind a doubtful proposition – but even if VDOT were to approve a stop light at this intersection, the access and egress issues remain of great concern. There is simply not enough right-of-way available for proper and safe turn lanes without having to proceed with the property condemnation. And securing the need – needed right-of-way would require eliminating the row of townhomes proposed by the developer to run parallel to Gallows, and pedestrian use by the residents of this over 35 – over 35 independent living facility of the sidewalks along Gallows or crossing Gallows to access public transportation to the Merrifield area. I have walked along this part of Gallows with cars whizzing by at 40 or more miles per hour. It’s just had for me to imaging elderly folks feeling safe doing so. I will support this indefinite deferral of this application, not to give the applicant the time needed to conduct a traffic light warrant study, because frankly and I say this with all – all respect to the applicant, staff, our colleague, Commissioner Strandlie, but as my grandmother use to say, you can’t make yourself a purse out of a sow’s ear. Now – now I will support this motion for indefinite definite deferral because I am not confident that the proffer law will be changed so that the County and developer can have a free and open conversation on impact mitigation, and because Mason District will be part of the upcoming Site-Specific Plan Amendment process. A more appropriate venue, in my mind, for contemplating such a dramatic change to this site’s future use. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Is there further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner. I just wanted to make clear, that regardless of whether a light is approved, and I made clear to the applicant that there would have to be a light actually installed and operating before they broke ground. I made it clear that even if there were a light, that does not guarantee that there would be a motion to approve because of other complexities. And that was made very clear and they know that. And with that they requested a indefinite deferral and, as Commissioner Ulfelder – Ulfelder knows, sorry, sometimes motions to indefinitely defer, indefinitely defer.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Indefinite is a long time.

Commissioner Strandlie: Yes. So, I appreciate your support.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Cortina.

Commissioner Cortina: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Furthermore, on that same vein I – I was glad to see that some of the stormwater issues were addressed very thoroughly on this application. But they continue to reference the 55-plus plan. When you go back and actually read the 55-plus plan and match it up with the Ordinance, it appears the ordinance is match it up with the Ordinance it appears to the Ordinance is much broader then the 55-plus plan, which called for walkability

everywhere that it said to insert these facilities into residential. Walkability was a key function and that is really absent from the Ordinance. And I think that we – if this is going to be used for 55-plus that we really need to take another look at that Ordinance and make sure that this is what we want going forward. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to...

Commissioner Hart: [Inaudible]

Chairman Murphy: Yes. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Carter: A couple things. I just wonder about the 55-plus and whether it shouldn't be higher, 62-plus. A minor point, I guess, but that gets it into a little bit different realm and a little bit outside. People at 55 work and once you raise age a little bit, you get rid of that problem or help it along. The other aspect, which has been quiet in this, is the facing of the units. How do these units face the neighborhood? And I believe it's on the southeastern side. So that you have setbacks that are that are less than the adjacent. You have more units than are adjacent, and also the units in the way they're facing Gallows Road. Gallows Road is a very – you can see it and a lot of people travel on it. And so, one side of the street we have houses facing, looks pretty good. On this side we have the backs of units facing and I wonder in this case and some other cases coming up we ought not pay a little bit more attention to how units are facing. So, enough – enough of me.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: As long as we are piling on. I – I hadn't planned on – on saying anything but I too was one of the people concerned about the absence of a stop light and that you really, you can't turn left out of the only way in and out, and you can't cross the street. But if there's going to be an indefinite deferral, the – the one piece of that – that no one had mentioned yet. I came back to the consolidation problem and that the triangle wasn't complete. There was a piano key taken out of the thing. And if the piano key had been consolidated, I wondered if the entrance could have been shifted away from that little cluster of driveways and streets at that funny angle. If the piano key were consolidated, the entrance were moved closer to the beltway, it seems to me that there might be enough room to have the turn lane, which staff said was warranted but was geometrically impossible because it was too close to the other intersection. If you could separate the two – if the piano key is holding that up, maybe during the deferral they could redouble the efforts to get that missing piano key, and that might help with the configuration. Triangles are always difficult and this one in a very difficult spot with the traffic. So, hopefully that's one more item for folks to think about. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: I'm afraid to ask. Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision indefinitely, with the record remaining open on SE 2018-MA-005, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed. Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Hart announced the Environment Committee would present a motion for recommendation on Wednesday, February 20, 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 endorsement of the Green Building Energy Policy Plan language.

//

Commissioner Hart announced the Environment Committee would meet on Thursday, 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. The Committee would receive a briefing from Sarah Sivers, Water Quality Planning Team Lead, Virginia Department of Environment Quality on the Salt Management Strategy Development. Staff would also present an introduction to a Policy Plan amendment addressing the coastal resource management guidance (tidal shoreline erosion control).

//

Commissioner Hart announced the Environment Committee would meet on Thursday, March 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 to discuss a Policy Plan amendment on natural landscaping.

//

APPROVAL OF THE LIST OF APPOINTMENTS TO THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEES

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Everyone should have received under cover of a memo from Chairman Murphy the list of committee appointments for 2019. And I think we tried to, I think with – with a couple tiny exceptions, pretty much what everyone asked is what they got. And we haven't gotten any comments in response to the draft but what I would propose – I WILL MOVE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AS SUMMARIZED IN THE ATTACHMENT TO MR. MURPHY'S MEMO OF FEBRUARY 21ST, INCLUDING THE – NOT JUST THE COMMITTEES BUT MR. TANNER TO AIRPORT ADVISORY AND MR. MIGLIACCIO TO THE ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Commissioner Ulfelder: February 11th is the date.

Commissioner Hart: Yeah. If that's – if I didn't say that I messed up. It's February 11th.

Commissioner Sargeant: Still second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there are discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to adopt the recommendations of the Vice Chairman for committee assignments for 2019, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Strandlie announced the Housing Committee would meet on Thursday, February 21, 2019, at 8:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT– ARTICLE 6 – DENSITY PROVISIONS FOR THE RESTON PRC DISTRICT (Countywide)

(Decision Only) (Public Hearing on this application was held on January 23, 2019)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On January 10th, the Commission held a workshop and on January 23rd, we had a public hearing on a proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding the PRC District, and deferred decision to tonight. I'm going to have a series of motions, but first wanted to review my personal conclusions maybe more – more – some more candid than they should be. But the rational for the – for the recommendation. I largely agree that something has to be done with PRC Ordinance. And I've tried to combine a number of suggestions that we've received and come up with a road map how we will get there. While everyone may not be happy with the outcome, I believe that the – the package that I'm going to suggest is appropriate recommendation we should make to the Board now. This recommendation also, in my view, is an opportunity for fresh start on citizen engagement in continued positive discussions about future of Reston. I hope that the citizens will remain constructive participants in the land use process, including future Zoning Ordinance Amendments, future land use applications, and other hearings before us, whatever happens on this Zoning Ordinance Amendment. Communication and education are very important. They also can help keep a land use process grounded in reality. The land use process does not always result in a unanimous conclusion and we don't all always get there simultaneously, but I have faith in

Fairfax County's ability to develop a reasonable consensus on land use issues with a transparent and collaborative process. I also want to thank very much Fairfax County staff and I'm gonna name a number of people, who – over the past, I won't say how long, it's been many months, have participated in this. Several of them are here tonight. Leslie Johnson, the Zoning Administrator, Fred Selden, the Director of Planning, Cathy Belgin, Tom Biesiadny, Anna Bentley, Bill Mayland, Regina Coyle, Andy Dorlester, and many other folks. Also, particularly, David Stoner in the County Attorney's office, for their hard work under very difficult conditions. Zoning Ordinance Amendments sometimes are controversial and this one was, I think, difficult in a number of ways. We were working with very complicated numbers, sometimes in the face of a barrage of misinformation. I have not always agreed with staff over the last few months, but I've always appreciated their patience with me, and their guidance. I also wanna thank the many citizens and groups who participated in the public hearing, sent us letters and emails or came to public meetings over the last year. I haven't agreed with everything that's been said to us by everybody, but I think it's true that we listened, and that we genuinely welcome continued citizen involvement in this process. I also want to thank Goldie Harrison in Supervisor Hudgins office. Clayton Medford and Lindsey Martin in Chairman's office for their guidance and support. And finally, I want to express my appreciation to Hunter Mill Supervisor Cathy Hudgins for her thoughts through this process and her outreach efforts. We haven't always seen eye to eye on this project, but I admire and respect very much her dedication and her commitment to maintaining Robert Simon's principles and vision for the Reston community. Turning to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, under the statute our role to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors after a public hearing. That responsibility is always a great one, but heightened in this case I think because Reston is recognized around the world as a premier example of urban planning. It's perhaps the best realized new town in United States. We have an obligation to preserve and continue that legacy. I want our recommendation to meet that challenge. The controversy over this amendment was driven, I believe, by unusual amount of misinformation and confusion and a sense of alarm over things that were not happening. There's a wide spectrum of development-related issues which give rise to citizen frustration with development overall. Many of those issues are a result of the Dillon Rule or other legal limitations. Many of the complaints we have heard are not directly germane to the topic before us, are not necessarily within our control. But somehow, on this particular amendment, all of that anti-development frustration was focused on this particular – particular amendment. There were, in my view, several widespread misconceptions about PRC density cap and what it does. Some of those were created or fueled by freelance experts posting misinformation on internet. I've tried to address some of those previously, but I wanna clear that whatever this was about, the Zoning Ordinance Amendment was not proposing a density increase for Reston overall. The density cap is not a ceiling on level of development in Reston. It is a technical complication on use of PRC as a zoning category for applications. Reston will have the same level of future development with or without this cap on PRC. After we hit cap, we will receive the same applications for the same types of uses. The applications will just have to be filled under PRM or PDC or some other permissible category. Similarly, the density cap on PRC have zero impact on infrastructure. The zoning category of a new building is irrelevant and changing this would not be an existential threat to the future of Reston. The uses and densities for Reston going forward, are laid out in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is a guide to future development, a general or approximate location of features and components. There is flexibility built into the Plan and throughout the County, there are often options. Sometimes there are multiple Zoning Ordinance categories permissible to achieve a result. The Plan is also looking, perhaps 30 to 40 years ahead.

Leaving the PRC density cap in place probably means that the acreage of the PRC district shrinks over time and gives rise to other consequences we may not want. The area that is currently zoned PRC is also not permanent. I personally believe that in flexibility as to the PRC cap may be highly problematic. Some future development within this area may be very much wanted by the community and I don't believe we want to automatically preclude good land use applications because of an arbitrary or outdated formula. The Commission recognizes that Reston has evolved since the 1960s and will continue to evolve. Reston went through a major planning study several years ago with a citizen task force that met 200 times. They've reached a number of conclusions which I believe are still essentially valid. The Toll Road and Silver Line were transformational. Also, I believe principles of smarter growth as they have evolved and become better understood and incorporated into our planning. Consistent with Countywide and regionable - regional planning objectives, we concluded that the future growth should largely be vertical, focused at transit stops, and the rest of Reston would remain essentially stable. The creation of the Transit Station Areas, or TSAs, was absolutely essential to this approach and I would not change that. Those conclusions had the task force support and staff support and also, at that time, the support of Reston Association, the largest homeowners association in the County. I think that was important. The task force and these recommendations also had the support of Robert Simon and I - I found that also personally influential. The Planning Commission made some edits to the recommendations. The Board of Supervisors adopted them and we had begun implementation. But the introduction of the Transit Station Areas into the Reston Plan complicated the application of the density cap on the PRC District. We recognized for a number of years that we would need a Zoning Ordinance Amendment, but we never finished it up and that has led to our current dilemma. Tysons Corner went through a parallel planning process very similar to Reston a few years earlier. Tyson was largely re-planned because of the Silver Line, which was a similar change. Tysons went through years of citizen meetings, we completed plan amendments, we had follow-on motions, we did an implementation Zoning Ordinance Amendment, which was also necessary for the Tysons Plan, in short order following the completion of the Tysons amendments. That process, which involved many of the same staff personnel and a very similar template for how the task force would be and how that would be handled by the Commission, was very successful. It won a National Planning Award. Unfortunately, with the same ingredients, for whatever reason, we never got to the implementation Zoning Ordinance Amendment for the Reston Plan. We didn't do it 2015. In my view, the consensus had at that time has faded. Commissioner de la Fe has passed away. Mr. Simon has passed away. There's been extensive turnover on the Reston Association Board. There's been extensive turnover on the Commission. The reasons for those recommendations have largely been forgotten. My conclusion is that now in 2019, partly because of the four-year delay, the important consensus we had is gone and there is little or no visible citizen support for doing the Zoning Ordinance Amendment standing alone. There is a lot of visible opposition, even if that has been fueled by misinformation. I don't believe we can do the two pieces separately. And ultimately, I don't believe it's right for Board of Supervisors to go forward, absent citizen involvement in a completion of the process. We waited too long and disingenuous to pretend otherwise. Some of that loss of support, I believe also, can be minimized over time with education and an open process. While I agree that we probably will need to do something with density cap and that probably we will want to hold the PRC District intact if there's a way to do that, we can't force the Zoning Ordinance Amendment through now. Importantly, I think we don't need to and I think, based the information we've received from staff, and the guidance they've given us, the development and the implementation of the adopted Comprehensive Plan

can continue in the meantime. We have at least two options related to future development. One will be, if we hit the PRC density cap and an application wants to come using the PRC category, which I think staff has encouraged, the Board can authorize a concurrent Zoning Ordinance Amendment for an incremental increase, with case-by-case review. That, at least, allows for a process with a specific analysis of the specific impacts or implications of a given application, rather than a hypothetical across-the-board density cap increase. The second option, which I think is less desirable, but maybe more likely under certain circumstances, is that those applications will zone out of PRC and they will just come in as PRM or perhaps PDC. Which are similar categories or allow similar types of development in some ways. You don't need 750 acres, you need 5 acres or perhaps less if the – if the – if the acreage is waived. And we have also been dealing with PRM nearby. We've been doing it in Dulles Suburban Center and other places. I don't know that the result ends up all that different, certainly in terms of infrastructure or commitments or any anything else. There is an additional procedural layer in PRC with the review of a PRC Plan, which I think we would like to retain. I think it allows additional locality control over an application and additional opportunity for citizen input. But either way, those applications can continue. I think it is reasonable for us to recommend to the Board that they resume the process to look at select issues, which I will itemize, recoupling a review of the PRC density cap with tune-up on several discrete aspects of the adopted Plan, which we'll discuss. I think that request, also is consistent with one of the suggestions from Reston Association as well as some individuals. I think it's also consistent with Fairfax County's long tradition of making important land use decisions after a citizen task force has weighed in. We don't always reach the same conclusions as the task force, but that process is important. I believe also the Village Centers are the key to that solution. In some respect, that singling out the Village Centers may be heresy. I – I certainly know Mr. Simon wanted – initially, he wanted half a dozen intense Village Centers. Lake Anne on steroids perhaps and that didn't really happen. We got Lake Anne mostly and then we got some shopping centers. And that – I think Lake Anne was the closest to what he wanted, but we had some residual flexibility in the Plan that allowed for a much more robust development of those Village Centers, which never materialized. I think Mr. Simon, even his parting shot to us he – he had hoped we would get there. The intensity from 1960s was simply carried forward in the Plan. And I – I know we did it, I know we went along with it, but in light of everything that's happened, I think it's appropriate to revisit that. Whether the cap should be – or whether the maximum in the Village Centers should be as high as it is. I also don't think that process can be done in isolation. I think it's appropriate to discuss dialing back the residential aspects of the Village Centers and clarification of what those Village Centers should be, interlocked with a revisiting of the PRC density cap. This also may end up only being three of the Village Centers ultimately. Lake Anne, I think, is a special case. We thought we had a package for redevelopment of Lake Anne. We thought we had a deal. It fell apart and I think the conventional wisdom is we may have asked for too much, and the development did not make economic sense. I think we still want redevelopment of Lake Anne and that's in still another reason why we may want to look at the density cap. Tall Oaks, we just finished. I don't think Tall Oaks is coming in any time soon. That leaves three other Village Centers. I don't think any of them is really teed up for anything, so we may have time of all that. It is more logical to revisit the density cap in conjunction with scrutiny of Village Centers. I think reasonable people, participating in a reasonable process, assisted by County staff, can arrive at a reasonable consensus about where all those numbers lead us. That's something for us and the Board to evaluate. I wanna say a few things about infrastructure and some other comments that we received in this process – not necessarily affecting what these motions are going to be, but

nevertheless I think responding to many of the comments that we've heard. There was a lot of citizen interest in the issue of infrastructure and I hope this is an opportunity for folks to get involved in the land use process, whether in infrastructure or some other aspect of it. Infrastructure is a very complicated issue in Virginia, partly because of the Dillon Rule. There were a number of, I thought, unfortunate or careless comments that we have received, which I wanted to call out and I wanted to respond to and I hope will help put some of this in perspective. Some people have said there are no plans for infrastructure and that nothing being done. And I found that very frustrating. It reflects a certain level of ignorance and it's also a slap in the face to many hard-working County staff who are doing a great deal for infrastructure. Fairfax County approves a Capital Improvement Program every year. It's as thick as a phone book. There is some coordination between the Comprehensive Plan, which is looking at 30 to 40 years and the implementation of infrastructure on an annual basis. We receive presentations from approximately 15 departments – schools, parks, transportation, libraries, police, fire, stormwater, housing, and others. Those projections are adjusted each year based on many changing variables. I think it is naïve and simplistic simply to state infrastructure must be in prior to development. That kind of pronouncement is unrealistic, given the limitations we face under state law. It's not going to happen in Virginia. It would have happened already. The process of securing infrastructure in a Dillon Rule jurisdiction requires much more of an ongoing effort. There may be great things happening in Seattle and Portland and Amsterdam, but we live in real world. We live in Virginia. We live in a Dillon Rule state. Mr. Biesiadny addressed, I thought, eloquently in workshop, the issue of transportation. Fairfax County, in fact, has detailed and aggressive plan for funding transportation infrastructure in Reston. It's the second plan that the Board has adopted. Tysons was the first. I think that the Commission recognizes transportation funding comes from many different sources. It comes at different times. It's not easily controlled. It's not always known in advance. Some money comes from development. We don't always know when that's going to happen the applications market driven. It's important to recognize, also, that transportation infrastructure needs also are impacted by development in Loudoun and elsewhere – things that we don't control. If we abandon the TSAs, if we say, okay we'll go back we'll have sprawl, put your townhouse in Ashburn. Put time in Leesburg. Put them in Harpers Ferry. Many of those people still end up driving down Route 7 or the Toll Road and there's nothing we can do about those impacts. Major amounts for transportation also come from Richmond. The General Assembly meets once a year. They're meeting right now. We hope there's a budget. We hope there's transportation money in the budget. We hope some of that money is for us. We hope there's a Governor. We don't always know. We hope the Governor signs the budget. We find out once a year what's going to happen, and we make adjustments. We're starting CIP. Commissioner Sargeant announced we're starting CIP next week. We don't always know what's going to happen with that. Some infrastructure, including for transportation also, is local money and that depends on a number of things. It depends on Board of Supervisors authorization for bond referenda. That may happen once a year. We don't know the dollar amounts or which departments. There's usually a schools referendum. There's often parks. Then, we decide are we gonna do this year transportation or libraries? What are we gonna do? Maybe public safety. We try and work with what we have. The Board puts a package together, within the limits of the bonding capacity, and then that decision is ultimately up to the voters. We hope the bond referendum pass. The hope that that money materializes. There are many moving parts. I think that I've explained that, to the infrastructure equation. We make a recommendation based on those – the data that we receive, the information that we get from the agencies. Committee meetings, the workshop, public hearings, mark-up, and a recommendation. Citizen participation

in that process is usually very limited, but it's welcome. In the interest of transparency, some people find the CIP details complicated and boring. I think it is reasonable to disagree constructively with County recommendations on infrastructure priorities, but it is – it is ignorant and unnecessarily rude to claim that there are no plans for infrastructure or that nothing is being done. Specifically, with respect to parks and school sites, that also was called out a little bit. Some folks have complained that specific sites were not yet identified, despite the need for them from the Comprehensive Plan. But approach is typical throughout Fairfax County and I think it's logical. First, we want the Board of Supervisors to have flexibility in implementation. We want them to be able to take options as opportunities may arise. Secondly, and we have some School Board and Park Authority alumni sitting at the horseshoe here. They may correct me. But staff is also almost always looking at property, but we do not disclose necessarily those plans in detail. It would be irresponsible to announce the plans in advance, particularly where an assemblage of multiple parcels is sought, in multiple ownership and there may be a holdout for one of those parcels. If we announced that those are sites that we are looking at, the price goes up. The School Board and the Park Authority are going to be responsible for spending public money. The Schools Committee also is currently looking at some other options – flexibility, which would include for urban schools retrofitting of existing building – buildings or other creative ways to find school sites within a mixed-use project or – or other options. Affordable housing and this – this was another issue mentioned in some of the correspondence. It's a Countywide issue and it's very difficult to resolve. It's not unique to Reston. Supervisor Hudgins and the Board of Supervisors have both made affordable housing a priority. The economic realities and feasibility of affordable housing have been analyzed and negotiated many times. I think we've concluded that localized distinction impractical and the implementation is often very difficult financially. An important objective of Mr. Simon was to make sure that housing would be available to all age groups and all income levels throughout Reston. Those principles have been reiterated and adopted once again in the Comprehensive Plan. But the realization of that housing is even more difficult than it was 50 years ago. I think we recognize that it is to expect that the market alone will is gonna generate affordable housing. Some of the existing affordable housing we have is obsolete and vulnerable to redevelopment. It's difficult to maintain the current level. In order to continue to provide affordable housing, whether it's in Reston or elsewhere, I think we have a consensus there probably has to be some ongoing development activity, a percentage of which will come in as affordable dwelling units or workforce housing and that's gotta happen. Let me come back to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment and where this leaves us with the density cap. I think staff is right that we are very close to cap now. We probably have to do something to keep it, but level of pushback we've received, confirms for me that this is the wrong way to do the amendment and we shouldn't force it. I – I think over time, the misinformation can be challenged, and mistakes of perception can be fixed. We – we owe it to the citizens also, I think to try. One of Mr. Simon's seven goals, this was a relatively simple one, the importance and dignity of each individual – that the importance and dignity of individual be the focal point for all planning and take precedence for large-scale concepts. I tried to think what would he have done in this sort of situation? I think we have to recognize the importance and dignity of each individual. And to me, we have to respect the input of individual citizens. I think a renewed process looking at the Village Centers again follows that guidance. I also don't think there's any harm for the Commission recommend to the Board that the amendment be denied at this time. That they withdraw the authorization, if it's possible to do that, and authorize a plan amendment of limited scope with a citizen process to recouple the density cap determination with that plan amendment to do a simultaneous adjustment of the plan numbers of the Village Centers and the

density cap for PRC. We can look at some other selected edits later. When we do a task force, sometimes it starts out kind of rough, but we usually reach a consensus. I think we will be no worse off than we are right now after that process. And I think, consistent with Simon's objectives, he would want citizen involvement. Can there be development in the meantime? Yes, that's very important. Ultimately, I think reasonable people may conclude, that it is preferable to raise the density cap slightly – try to keep the PRC acreage intact, rather than leave cap in place and create checkerboard of PRC and PRM and other categories. Reasonable people might agree on an increase. Ultimately, once the misinformation dissipates, but I think it's also better to have that discussion in the context of an adjustment to the Village Centers. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will have several motions. First, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DENIAL OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TITLED ARTICLE 6, DENSITY PROVISIONS FOR THE RESTON PRC DISTRICT, WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE TOPIC OF THE PRC DENSITY CAP BEING LATER REVISITED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PLAN AMENDMENT SUGGESTED BELOW, WHICH IS IN LATER MOTIONS. AND, IF POSSIBLE, THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSIDER WITHDRAWING ITS AUTHORIZATION FOR THIS ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, PRIOR TO THE ADVERTISED PUBLIC HEARING SO THAT A BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING NEED NOT BE HELD AT THIS TIME.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it deny the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Article 6, Density Provisions for the Reston PRC District, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Carter: Well, I...

Commissioner Hart: I got a couple more...

Commissioner Carter: I meant to say something before we got into the – to the motion. So – so if we could go off verbatim for a second? Is that appropriate?

Chairman Murphy: No.

Commissioner Carter: No.

Chairman Murphy: Right. We're on now.

Commissioner Carter: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah.

Commissioner Hart: It's alright. I messed everything up with the long speech. So, you're not – she's gonna be here until 4:00 a.m., typing anyway.

Samantha Lawrence: [Inaudible]

Chairman Murphy: No, I'm not...

Commissioner Sargeant: That's that.

Commissioner Carter: Sam used to be my good friend. But I'm not sure now. I think we off on the wrong foot on this and I want to reiterate what you said about that. You cannot wait a substantial amount of time do to the zoning case. The – the proper way, in my view, is at the same time, not after – at the same time, you either I – I would prefer, and I know there's – there's a lot of reasons not to do this. I would prefer a implementation chapter in the Plan. If you can't do that, a separate document that does the implementation at the same time that you're – you're doing the plan because there's a back-and-forth that has to occur between implementation and plan making. And if you don't do that, we end up in – in cases like this. What we're really doing when you're four years late, is we're planning and you can't plan through a text amendment. That they – we get into the numbers and I've got lots of questions about the numbers and you – you've heard me talk about this before. It – nobody's gonna come to – to Reston to see what a wonderful job we did on the caps. That's not a world-renowned feature that the people are thrusting to look at. And let me go back even further a little bit. In the beginning, when this was created, there was a bundle of units or people that were given to the developer. And we heard reasons why that was set up like that. But the choice was – well, we could have all quarter-acre lots or we could do this more sophisticated planning. But however, we got there, we ended up with approximately, I believe 81,000 people coming – coming to Reston. And that was the first step. The next step was a land use plan. And on that land use plan, we want to provide this flexibility where we could move land uses around. Unfortunately, well – part of that flexibility was you would designate low, medium, and high areas. So, you would have a town center, high density Village Centers – maybe a little less – lakes and streams and golf courses, a lot less density – maybe no density. We're kind of losing that. And the essence behind that is you wouldn't be able to just do this by numbers. So, we go to those spots on the Plan and you add it all up, that was gonna be above the cap. So, you couldn't just do that. So, you have to come back and do the planning part of it. This is – and then after all of that was done, then the PRC zone was created. Put the caps into the law and setup a process. It takes a little while to get there, I think, but with this rezoning Development Plan, Subdivision Plan, Site Plan, the whole permitting process. And that was all very straightforward. Now here we are 55 years later and the mistake in the Plan was there's no flexibility. So – so when – and I'm not criticizing the staff about this because I probably would do the same thing and it would good thing we have staff that try to be equitable and fair among all the properties. But when you take those spots on the land use plan and you go to the maximum and, instead of doing what Robert Simon and Golf Reston and Mobile did, they – they could trade properties because it was one person. What do I care, as long as I get my maximum? You can't do that when we're 55 years later and the land has all been parceled out to different people. And so, it's difficulty to take from one person and give it to another for the planning reason. And that's where we got off on the wrong foot. So, when you start calculating the numbers explode. If you really want to know the numbers, it's like 18 or 20,000 people that we would have to lift the cap to, to meet all of those – the map that's in the

Plan. But the map – and that's how a zoning person does it. And I understand that and that's this fairness issue. But the rest of the Plan goes into the delicacies of each individual site. For example, North Reston – the Town Center. The very large set of numbers in the land use plan – when you read the text, it says, the – what the units you get have to be significantly lower than the adjacent high-density areas. In addition, we put a library, homeless shelter, government center, the future indoor recreation center, and if that's not enough, we put an elementary school and a large central park and filled it up with roads to – to. And so, this – this lack of ability to do the planning part is – is what's missing and I think that's in part what upsets some people. I'm concerned and in our dealing is we ought to do plans differently. And I know we're gonna – to a certain extent I'm blowing in wind here, I guess about that. But get that implementation sooner. Never again should we wait this long, and it shouldn't be after the plan, even one second. It should be at the same time. I'm concerned of you loosing the PRC Zone because I think and – I'm not gonna ask the County Attorney about that – but, if we go too much of that rezoning this is gonna be problematic to existing homes. My home, will I be – now be nonconforming because we're below the cap. That's a concern and so we ought to do everything we can to not zone out, if just for that reason. I'm a little concern that we may not be going far enough and I know Commissioner Hart is gonna spend a lot of time trying to put this together. I don't wanna be back here a year from now with just the same issues just coming back in the same thing and go over this all again. We wanna come up with a more robust and a more creative system that will put Reston in place that we can get some consensus behind it. And that's where I wanna go. So whether this would do that, I'm not sure. The other concern I have is the bond issue for the new library, which and – I may not have this right – but that's expiring in 2022. And if don't put something in there that allow that to go forward and there is a proposal to make that a joint development site, because the homeless shelter and library going with that. If this constrains that in any way, that would be a problem. Now I wonder, maybe I can ask something of staff, what is the time difference between – assuming everybody likes it, which may be a big assumption. If you go through this process that Commissioner Hart is talking about – the difference in process, when you – when you we go to a Master Plan amendment or Comp Plan amendment, Development Plan, I mean zoning – Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the rezoning and the Development Plan. Could you do that together? Is that take more time when we add in this and don't raise the cap basically? The answer to that would be?

Fred Selden, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning: Fred Selden, Department of Planning and Zoning. You can do them concurrently. We – but you would be looking at probably several months between the two just to – to handle the different advertising requirements and things of that nature. So...

Commissioner Carter: So you can do them together once you got there, I guess.

Mr. Selden: Yeah, once you got there. Again, there may – there may be some spread in terms of when you might have the public hearing on the Plan and then the public hearing on the zoning change because you'd – you'd – to make the – sure that the zoning implements the plan, you'd have to get that adopted first. But again, they could both be considered at the same time and be as close – closely scheduled as possible.

Commissioner Carter: Another – Another comment – and this is the Dillon Rule state issue that – that – and sorry I'm bringing some baggage to this. I – I know from where come from, but –

Dillon Rule I don't notice much difference in the way planners do things or what planners are thinking between jurisdictions. Planners often think alike. So, maybe we have to be a little more creative over here because they're a Dillon Rule problems? But I hope we don't use that as an excuse to plan well, even for infrastructure. I know it's a challenge, but that's the fun of it, isn't it? So, again I'm probably talking to wind here, but I think this infrastructure we haven't solved yet to the satisfaction of a lot. And – and I think in our planning and replanning we ought to think about this Dillon Rule standard and not using – and I'm not saying we do, but my impression there are times, we kind of use that as an excuse to avoid certain infrastructure issues, whether it's schools or roads. Every jurisdiction has funding problems Every jurisdiction has school problems that's developing well. So, I just – you know in going ahead, with this I wonder. Now another, and I'm not sure how to do this, but I guess I'll do. What if suggested raising the cap to thirteen-and-a-half to get the library and the homeless shelter. Does that make sense? So, I'm thinking rather – to maybe telegraph our thoughts...

Chairman Murphy: I think we've already voted on the main motion...

Commissioner Carter: Yeah, well...

Chairman Murphy: To deny. It's kind of late to put that out on the floor.

Commissioner Carter: Okay. Alright.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Carter: Those are my things. Let me makes sure I got all my points out. Again, I don't us to come back with the same thing. I want us to come back with something really creative and really outside the box and deals with some of these things that we talked about, even in a Dillon Rule state the – the infrastructure. And – so that's – that's where I am.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have three more motions, but let – if I may, let me – let me just take a moment and offer a couple of comments. Staff has heard me many times and perhaps in more candid language about not again, that we'd never do this again. If this ever happens we have to do the implementation amendment together or close on the heels with it, and I think we've got that – we got that message. As to the time, let's say we have a – a development application that's got a library in it or something that we needed...

Commissioner Carter: Yeah. That's the main one I'm concerned about.

Commissioner Hart: Again, my understanding is that if the application comes in – I mean I'm assuming maybe it doesn't need a plan amendment. If it doesn't need a plan amendment, it's just they – they're filing a zoning case to do something and there's a library in it that – so long as the Board authorizes it, even if we hit the cap, the Board can do a simultaneous Zoning Ordinance amendment to do in incremental, you know 13.002 or whatever the number would be – they could do those two together and it wouldn't slow down the – the zoning case, it would just – it

would – it's a more expensive add I guess and perhaps it's a slightly longer public hearing to read all that stuff, but they could be done concurrently. Is that correct?

Leslie Johnson, Zoning Administrator, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Leslie Johnson, Zoning Administrator. Yes. It could be done.

Commissioner Hart: Alright. And finally, the thing on the Dillon Rule and I mentioned it. I didn't spend a lot of time with it. But the Dillon Rule comes up, it doesn't just come in Reston. It comes up everywhere...

Commissioner Carter: Yeah.

Commissioner Hart: It came up in Mason District, it's come up in Dranesville, it's come up in Sully...

Commissioner Carter: That's my concern.

Commissioner Hart: The Dillon Rule – we struggle with this all the time. Judge Dillon was a product of 19th century enlightenment. And one of the – the principals that the – the enlightened folks discovered, was that local government is inherently corrupt and local politicians are inherently corrupt. And, therefore, in order to have good government, clean government, the wise men – and it was just men then – the wise men in the State Legislature need to make sure that the localities are as weak as possible and that they don't have the power to do anything and they can't mess anything up. And that, in order for a locality to do something, they have to be specifically delegated the power to do it, specifically enumerating and enabling legislation. And unless and until, they say, Fairfax County you can do it, you lack that power. And there are a lot of things that we wanted to do that we've tried to do and that we've tried to do, and I think, Mr. Stoner will forgive me, but Fairfax County was at the cutting edge for decades of losing cases...

Commissioner Carter: Yes. Yes.

Commissioner Hart: On land use authority. And there're all kinds of times the Supreme Court slapped us down and said, you cannot do that. And they – and we, it came up in Reston. The – the – this moratorium business we were inundated for a while when people wanted a moratorium. Well yeah, yeah, let's do a moratorium. Nineteen seventy-five – Board of Supervisors versus Horn, the Supreme Court said, Fairfax County, under the Dillon Rule, you lack the power to have a development moratorium, even an emergency moratorium and any legislative attempt to do so is invalid. So, the solution to that is a General Assembly action that we'd have the power to do it. When I brought up the Dillon Rule in the context of infrastructure, what I meant was, we get a lot of wise opining that. Oh well we must make sure the infrastructure's in place before all this over development. I was like great, yeah. We – we don't have adequate public facilities legislation. We don't have the power to enact a requirement. We don't have the power to deny development on the basis that the schools aren't in. The roads aren't in and that would be great. And maybe they could do that in Amsterdam...

Commissioner Carter: Maybe not.

Commissioner Hart: And maybe they can do it in Portland and Seattle, and all these places. But we're stuck with all these court cases and every one of us – everyone of us stood down in the well, and we took an oath with the Clerk of the Court and we said we said we're gonna follow the law and we have to do what we're told. And the judges say, you have to follow what the Supreme Court says, we have to do it. And so, given the cards that we've been dealt, we're not going to be able deny development because of the absence of adequate public facilities. And, a slogan that – you know we're not gonna approve anything or we're not gonna, we – we have to approve the development at after the infrastructure is in place doesn't – it's not gonna change how we – how we're able to do business. That's the kind of limitation I'm talking about. It isn't possible to put that in the Plan. You put that in the Plan and a court still isn't gonna let us do it. We have to do – we have to roll up our sleeves. We have to do it the regular way. We have to do it through the staff and a combination of money from the General Assembly or commitments from a developer or maybe do a transportation bond and we – we crunch these numbers every year and we – we make adjustments on our teeter totter or we make – do recommendation to the Board and we come up with it that way. And unless and until, that rule changes – it's been 50 years, 1969 – 1969. The Committee on Constitutional reform called for a modification of the Dillon Rule in Virginia. And the General Assembly didn't do it in 1969 and they didn't do it in 1970 and 70 and 71, and so on and so forth. And we've been waiting all this time. And maybe the numbers are changing – maybe recently. Some other things are changing in Richmond – the proffer bill, where if we have a Governor who can sign a bill maybe we – we'd in the next few days that's gonna be the amendment goes in. Until the General Assembly changes that or gives us some specific powers, we're always gonna be limited on things like infrastructure. And even if we could extract things from developer – from developers, that doesn't help us for the people driving through from Loudon County. Doesn't help us with the impacts that we're getting from commuters from West Virginia. We have to deal with those in a regional way rather than, simply Reston. We have to look at things Countywide and regionally, which tells us again, that the conclusions of the task force were correct. That we shouldn't be having sprawl. We should be focusing our development throughout the County at these Transit Station Areas, and where – where the infrastructure is largely in. Were it's more efficient to put people, where some of them are gonna walk to work or some of them are gonna take the Metro. And that just reinforces in my mind the correctness of the conclusions of the task force four years ago even if the Village Centers, which to my mind was sort of an afterthought, or was a residual thing we brought forward instead of an affirmative implementation of principals of smart growth and regional planning. And maybe I'll get off the soap box get back to my motions. But that's the Dillon Rule thing I was thinking about. If that make sense.

Commissioner Carter: If I – if I can just try a little bit of a pushback....

Commissioner Hart: Samantha, I'm sorry, you're gonna be here 'till...

Chairman Murphy: Yeah let's, can we move on with the motions? Okay, go ahead.

Commissioner Hart: Alright, secondly Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE A DRAFT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSIDERATION FOR THE WORK PROGRAM AND AUTHORIZATION FOR ADVERTISING, AS A RESUMPTION AND COMPLETION OF

THE RESTON PLANNING WHICH RESULTED IN THE 2014 AND 2015 AMENDMENTS, TO BE RECOUPLED WITH THE TOPIC OF THE DENSITY CAP IN PRC. THIS NEW PLAN AMENDMENT WOULD ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1. WHETHER THE VILLAGE CENTERS, OR ANY OF THEM, SHOULD HAVE AN UPPER LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF ANTICIPATED RESIDENTIAL UNITS, LESS THAN 50 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE;
2. CLARIFICATION OF PLAN LANGUAGE DESCRIBING VILLAGE CENTER MIXED-USE AND DEVELOPMENT, TO CONFIRM IT IS TO APPLY ONLY TO THOSE PORTIONS OF THE CENTERS ALREADY DEVELOPED WITH NONRESIDENTIAL USES, AND NOT THE VILLAGE CENTERS' STABLE RESIDENTIAL AREAS;
3. CLARIFICATION OF THE 50-PLUS DWELLING UNIT PER ACRE HIGH-DENSITY MULTIFAMILY LAND USE CATEGORY, TO CONFIRM THAT IT APPLIES TO CAPTURE THE EXISTING PROJECTS THAT HAVE AN EXISTING DENSITY ABOVE 50 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE, AND CLARIFY THAT IT DOES NOT PROVIDE UNLIMITED DENSITY TO THOSE SITES;
4. INCLUSION OF UPDATED PLAN LANGUAGE REGARDING HISTORIC RESOURCES, PARTICULARLY ANY UPDATES AT THIS TIME, FOR SITES LESS THAN 50 YEARS OLD BUT DESERVING OF CONSIDERATION.

THIS PLAN AMENDMENT SHOULD THEN BE COUPLED WITH ANY APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENT TO THE PRC DENSITY CAP, IN RECOGNITION OF ANY ADJUSTMENT TO THE VILLAGE CENTERS.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Third, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, THAT THEY, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE HUNTER MILL DISTRICT SUPERVISOR, ESTABLISH A BROAD-BASED CITIZEN TASK FORCE, INCLUDING REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMUNITY AND INDUSTRY, TO REVIEW AND DEVELOP A RECOMMENDATION ON THE PLAN AMENDMENT, COUPLED WITH AN EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION ON APPROPRIATE MODIFICATIONS TO THE PRC DENSITY CAP, AND TO REPORT BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WITH THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Fourth, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, THAT THE NON-SUBSTANTIVE EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS PREVIOUSLY ADVERTISED WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT PACKAGE, BE REVISITED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEXT SET OF MINOR EDITORIAL REVISIONS.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 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



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jacob L. Caporaletti".

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