

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
LAND USE PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, MAY 19, 2022**

PRESENT: John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District, Chairman
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District, Vice Chairman
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Daniel G. Lagana, Lee District

ABSENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Candice Bennett, Commissioner At-Large

OTHERS: Graham Owen, Planner IV, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning
and Development (DPD)
Leslie Johnson, Division Director, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), DPD
Carmen Bishop, ZAD, DPD
Meghan Van Dam, PD, DPD
Michael Burton, Planner III, PD, DPD
Leanna O'Donnell, Director, PD, DPD
Barbara Byron, Director, DPD
Jacob Caporaletti, Planning Commission Clerk, Department of Clerk's Services

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. ZONING ORDINANCE WORK PROGRAM POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
- B. ZONING ORDINANCE WORK PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND UPDATE
- C. SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT RETROSPECTIVE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
- D. SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS WHITE PAPER
- E. SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT RETROSPECTIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK SUMMARY

//

Chairman Ulfelder called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman Ulfelder announced that Land Use Process Review Committee would receive presentations from staff on the Zoning Ordinance Work Program and the Site-Specific Plan Amendment Retrospective for possible changes to the process.

//

Leslie Johnson, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Planning and Development (DPD), gave a presentation on the Zoning Ordinance Work Program, a copy of which is included in Attachment A, which covered the following topics:

- The timing and priorities of the work program;
- The efforts by staff to provide an annual update and note areas of reprioritization for the work program
- An overall status update on the work program for fiscal year 2022;
- A highlight of notable projects within the work program;
- The timing for the work program;
- The current topics of review within the work program;
- The estimated timelines and status for various components of the work program;
- The outreach efforts conducted by staff regarding the work program;
- The items on the work program identified as Priority 2;
- The items on the work program recommended for removal; and
- The next steps for the work program.

There was a discussion between Ms. Johnson and multiple Committee members on the following issues:

- The role of manufactured housing in the County's efforts to promote affordable housing options within the County;
- The ongoing efforts to preserve existing manufactured housing communities, the various challenges for these communities, and the potential mechanisms for expanding such communities;
- The green initiatives included within the work program and the impact of zMOD on the program;
- The issues regarding medical and septic systems that could affect the work program;
- Concerns regarding efforts to preserve areas of the County that contained special natural resources;
- Concerns regarding staffing shortages within DPD and the impact of such shortages on the development review process;
- Concerns regarding the adequacy work program's guidelines for reviewing appropriate levels of inclusion for solar panels, electric vehicle charging stations, townhouse layouts, placemaking, and accessibility on streets; and
- The subsequent topics of discussion at future Land Use Process Review Committee meetings and how they related to the issues raised within the work program.

Chairman Ulfelder announced that the next item on the agenda was to discuss revisions to the Site-Specific Plan Amendment process, but prior to staff's presentation, he noted that a working group consisting of two members of the Board of Supervisors and two members of the Planning Commission to discuss the issues identified by staff on this process. He then indicated that staff's presentation would reflect some of the issues and recommendations that had been highlighted by the working group. In addition, Chairman Ulfelder noted the importance of this process and the importance of citizens and civic associations being aware of the process.

Graham Owen, Planner IV, Planning Division (PD), DPD, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Site-Specific Plan Amendment (SSPA) Retrospective, a copy of which is included in Attachment C, which covered the following topics:

- The goals for the revised SSPA process;
- The process for determining the recommended changes to the SSPA process;
- The elements, procedures, and timeframes for the revised SSPA process;
- The justification criteria for the revised SSPA process;
- The eligibility criteria for the revised SSPA process;
- The submission requirements for the revised SSPA process;
- The conclusions and takeaways from the revised SSPA process;
- The overall planning priorities for the County and the extent to which those priorities are reflected in the Plan Amendment Work Program; and
- The next steps in evaluating and adopting the revised SSPA process.

There was a discussion between Mr. Owen; Leanna O'Donnell, Director, PD, DPD; Barbara Byron, Director, DPD; Meghan Van Dam, PD, DPD; and multiple Committee members on the following issues:

- Concerns whether DPD had adequate staffing to process the SSPA nominations in a timely manner;
- Clarification on the application and review process for SSPA nominations under the proposed revisions;
- The various issues that occurred with the previous review process for SSPA nominations;
- The expected timeline for processing SSPA nominations;
- The possibility of conducting certain steps of the SSPA process concurrently with other development review processes;
- Clarification on which nominations would warrant greater prioritization;
- Clarification on the criteria utilized for screening SSPA nominations and whether certain zonings should be ineligible for consideration;
- The role of task forces in the screening process for SSPA nominations;
- The benefits and challenges of the proposed revisions to the SSPA nomination review process;
- The issues and shortcomings of the previous SSPA review process;
- The importance of effective screening guidelines for SSPA nominations;
- The various materials and level of detailed that would be required for a standard SSPA nomination;
- The extent to which the SSPA review process accommodated submissions from various citizens, groups, and organizations of varying resources;
- The flexibility afforded to SSPA nominations and the ability of communities to utilize the SSPA process;
- Concern that the public was not adequately informed on the scope of an SSPA nomination or the overall planning and development process;
- Concern regarding the proper methods for dealing with community opposition for a proposed development;

- Concern regarding the extent of the transparency and public involvement for the new SSPA nomination process;
- The benefits of utilizing a public workshop as part of the SSPA review process;
- The expected number of nominations that would be submitted once the new SSPA review process was implemented;
- Concern regarding the incentive for citizens to utilize the revised SSPA process other existing procedures for pursuing new development;
- The role of community meetings and district land use committees in the SSPA review process;
- The timeline for implementing the new SSPA review procedures if adopted by the Board of Supervisors;
- The possibility of incorporating the SSPA process with the Zoning Ordinance Work Program;
- The process for determining which nominations were of the highest priority prior to a workshop;
- The opportunity to evaluate SSPA nominations within a broader scope to consider the impact to the overall area;
- The areas of the County that would be subject to numerous SSPA nominations;
- The possibility of providing resources to the public to assist with efforts to craft and submit SSPA nominations;
- The public outreach efforts to inform citizens of nominations that could potentially affect their property and efforts to encourage public participation in the SSPA review process;
- The potential opportunities to utilize the SSPA process to engage in discussions on various technological and economic trends throughout the County;
- Concerns regarding the staff resources required for processing, prioritizing, and reviewing certain SSPA nominations;
- The role of the Planning Commission in addressing concerns raised by the public on certain development or planning related issues;
- The possibility and timeframe for conducting public workshops to inform the public of the new SSPA nomination process prior to the submission of any subsequent nominations;
- Concern regarding the process of obtaining the necessary signatures from property owners for an SSPA nomination; and
- The importance of evaluating a nomination in terms of the larger impact on the surrounding area and the limitations of the existing SSPA process on that effort.

Ms. O'Donnell thanked the Committee for their feedback and questions. She then encouraged the Committee to submit questions and concerns to staff prior to the implementation of the revised SSPA process.

//

At the conclusion of the meeting, Chairman Ulfelder thanked staff and announced that the Land Use Process Committee was adjourned.

//

CLOSING

May 19, 2022

The meeting was adjourned at 9:13 p.m.
John Ulfelder, Chairman

An audio recording of this meeting is available in the Planning Commission Office,
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved: 07/28/2022

Jacob Caporaletti

Jacob Caporaletti, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 16th day of may 2022, by

Bobby Lee Vaught

Notary Seal

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 8050601

Commission expiration: 07/31/2027

