

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2017**

Present: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Julie Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Sully District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

Absent: John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 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

FS-H16-41 – AT&T MOBILITY, 11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE, RESTON

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a “feature shown.” It is FS-H16-41 and the name is AT&T Mobility. It is for telecommunications facilities at 1100 – 11800 Sunrise Valley Drive, which is commonly known as the International Center, the tall building. The – they meet all of the requirements. They are replacing some and putting up some. They are flush-mounted and therefore, I RECOMMEND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING THAT THE PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY BY AT&T MOBILITY, LOCATED AT 11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A “FEATURE SHOWN” PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the feature shown determination FS-H16-41, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Sargeant and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Hart announced that the Commission's Environment Committee meeting was rescheduled and would meet at 7 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center on Thursday, January 26, 2017.

//

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Secondly, you should all have gotten, at the end of November, several sets of minutes I – I am, therefore, moving those tonight. I MOVE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 15, JUNE 16, JUNE 29, JUNE 30, JULY 13, JULY 14, JULY 20, JULY 21 AND JULY 28, 2016.

Commissioner de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. de la Fe. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Yes? And the new member abstains?

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, okay.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Also, Mr. Chair, I believe that was the time period when I was out for a death in my family.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Two abstentions. Okay, all those in favor, say aye, with the two abstentions.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, thank you.

The motion carried by a vote of 8-0-2. Commissioners Keys-Gamarra and Niedzielski-Eichner abstained. Commissioners Sargeant and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy announced that the election of officers would take place next Wednesday, January 18, 2017 and at that time the form for committee selections would be distributed.

//

ORDER OF AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – RIDING/BOARDING STABLES
2. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – CRAFT BEVERAGE PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENTS

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

Z.O. AMENDMENT - RIDING/BOARDING STABLES – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows:

(1) Modify the existing riding/boarding stable definition to add clarity to the existing provisions and to increase the maximum number of horses or ponies that can be boarded by right on a property from 3 horses on any lot, to up to 5 horses on lots containing a minimum of 2 acres and less than 5 acres, and up to 8 horses on lots containing 5 or more acres. The maximum number of horses that may kept, boarded or maintained shall not include the horses owned by the resident of the property.

(2) Revise Section 10-304, Home Occupation Use Limitations, to require that all outdoor lighting must be in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance outdoor lighting provisions; and, except for schools of special education and horseback riding lessons, there shall be no customers or clients.

(3) Amend Sections 10-302 and 10-303 to allow horseback riding lessons as a home occupation use requiring Zoning Administrator approval provided that on lots containing a minimum of 2 acres but less than 5 acres, no more than 2 students are permitted at any given time and up to 8 students in any one day; and on lots containing 5 or more acres, a maximum of 4 students are permitted at any given time and up to 8 students in any one day.

(4) Require horseback riding home occupations to be subject to the same use limitations contained in Section 10-304 as other home occupation uses, except as noted in Par. 5 below.

(5) Add a new Paragraph 12 to Section 10-304 which adds use limitations that are specific to horseback riding lesson home occupations and which minimize the impacts of such activity on surrounding properties. Paragraph 12 may include, but is not limited to, the following: (a) the resident of the property shall be the applicant and shall not be required to conduct the horseback riding lessons and/or care for the horses; (b) allows one nonresident person to assist with the horseback riding lessons and/or care for the horses; (c) limits the hours of horseback riding lessons, the attendance of any nonresident person described in 5(b) above, and the use of lighted outdoor riding rings or riding areas for riding lessons; (d) requires that all horses used in the horseback riding lessons be kept on the property and no horses can be transported or ridden onto the property for the lessons; (e) may require the submission of a Conservation Plan approved by the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District for the property and all activity on the property must conform to such Plan; and (f) riding lessons, other than as permitted by Sections 10-302 and 10-304, shall require special permit approval in those districts where permitted. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

St. Clair Williams, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Zoning Evaluation, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of the proposed amendment effective as of 12:01 a.m. on the day following adoption.

Commissioner Murphy discussed with Mr. Williams how the proposal impacted applicants who also owned horses wherein Mr. Williams said there was no change to the total number of horses allowed on a property. He said the current restriction of 3 horses per acre on a minimum of 2-acre lot would not be affected by this proposal.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked staff how the hours of operation, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., were determined wherein Mr. Williams explained that the purpose was to minimize any impact, such as lighting on adjacent properties.

Commissioner Hurley asked for clarification regarding the limitation to one non-resident person assistant, such as would parents be allowed to observe the lesson or if a special needs student required their own personal assistant. Mr. Williams said the non-resident person referred to the person caring for the horses and not observers. He said that if it was a situation where they would need more than one non-resident employee assisting with the special needs student then a special permit would be required.

Following up on Commissioner Hurley's comments, Commissioner Hart discussed with staff the possibility of the Commission adding an additional employee to the proposal and how that would impact this application. Cathy Belgin, ZAD, DPZ, said that it would be beyond the scope of the advertisement; however, there was enough time to change it prior to the Board of Supervisors' (BOS) public hearing which would allow it to move forward. Commissioner Hart asked staff to determine whether there was some Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodation exemption for a helper in this kind of situation prior to the BOS hearing.

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

Ann Huffman, 10701 Creamcup Lane, Great Falls, spoke in opposition to the application stating that she lived in a neighborhood of 5-acre lots and thought that the impact of tripling the number of by-right horses would negatively impact her quality of life because it would not require any oversight, such as development conditions and Board review. Ms. Huffman said the proposed hours of operation of seven days a week, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. would be disruptive to the neighbors' weekend family activities. She also voiced concern over the lack of restrictions regarding sound amplification, special events, odor mitigation, and screening requirements to block the view of neighboring properties. Ms. Huffman said that she would prefer the proposed amendment be changed to 5 horses or more to qualify as a riding/boarding stable with 4 students per class not to exceed 6 students per day.

Commissioner Hurley discussed with staff whether special events such as competitions would be allowed wherein Mr. Williams explained that this amendment would permit small scale riding lessons under the home occupation permit. He said that the home occupation standards did not allow special events; therefore, it would require the approval of a special permit.

Commissioner Flanagan discussed with Ms. Huffman whether she had any horse facilities near her property and whether there were any issues resulting from it. Ms. Huffman explained that there were a total of three neighbors with horse facilities and one currently boarded horses. She said in the past she had made a complaint due to the constant traffic of the students transporting their horses onto the property and it was resolved through the County. In response to questions from Commissioner Flanagan, Mr. Williams said that staff was not aware nor did they have a tally of what complaints had been filed regarding this use.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi discussed with Ms. Huffman her preference regarding the riding lessons wherein Ms. Huffman said that because this proposal tripled the amount of horses, she would prefer 4 horses permitted by-right instead of the 8 in order to retain the small

scale riding opportunities. She noted that the proposal did require the horses to reside on the property which addressed her previous complaint.

John Karanik, 516 Haven Lane, Great Falls, spoke in support of the application stating that this amendment was about keeping equestrian going in Fairfax County and was not profit driven. He added that the request was to include riding as any other lesson or skill that can be taught.

Nancy Rice, 2217 Housen Lane?, Vienna, spoke in support of the proposal stating that adding horses to their property could only add to the value of their property if they desired.

Beverly Dickerson, 11003 Oakton Woods Way, Vienna, spoke in support of the proposal stating that she worked in conjunction with Fairfax for Horses and the county to promote riding lesson opportunities for county residents. She added that many people cannot participate in other physical activities such as soccer and riding offered a great alternative.

Lisa Mulville, 1420 Hunter Mill Road, Vienna, spoke in support of the proposal stating that there was a big opportunity for kids when it came to riding. She spoke of the benefits of riding outdoor with kids.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Hart?

Commissioner Hart: No, it's not mine. It's Jan.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, I am sorry. Ms. Hedetniemi.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: I got...

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Remember, I'm the rider. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing the opportunity for the people to speak up in support of this amendment and I feel strongly that the concern here is to encourage riding and boarding stables throughout the County. Accordingly, I
MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE
AMENDMENT REGARDING RIDING AND BOARDING STABLES, AS ADVERTISED.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

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

Commissioner Hurley: I support the motion, but I would still like clarification on the number of people that can assist. Especially, ADA rules override our local Zoning Ordinance because

courses are used for therapeutic instruction, as well. I would just like clarification. I recommend that we get clarification of that before it goes to the Board.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Keys-Gamarra?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: I will also be supporting the motion. I wanted to say, as someone who has worked with a number of children who I have searched for support and how they can get their appropriate therapy and how you can reach that child, I am encouraged that perhaps this will be more available in Fairfax County.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? Mr. Flanagan and Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, I just would like to say that I appreciate the – the testimony of Mrs. Huffman and that I would encourage you, as we go forward with this particular change, to keep in touch and let us know any fine-tuning that we need to consider in the future. I think we'd all be happy, particularly on the number of employees that I think various Commissioners have some concern with. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Strandlie?

Commissioner Strandlie: I wanted to concur with Commissioner Hurley's statement. I, too, had questions about the additional help for disabled students so I – I would prefer to get clarification of that before we move forward. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. I, too, am going to support the motion. I just wanted to say I appreciated staff coming in explaining the changes to Sully District Council and WFCCA and there were a number of horse people in attendance and – and appreciated the opportunity to learn about this. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, all those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt the Zoning Ordinance Amendment concerning riding/boarding stables, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Sargeant and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

Z.O. AMENDMENT - CRAFT BEVERAGE PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENT – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows:

(1) Establish and define a new principal land use of Craft Beverage Production Establishments to include facilities licensed in accordance with Title 4.1 of the Code of Virginia, where beer, wine, cider, mead, distilled spirits, or other similar beverages are brewed, fermented, or distilled in quantities not to exceed 15,000 barrels of beer (Note: advertised to permit the Board to consider any quantity up to 20,000 barrels), or 36,000 gallons of distilled spirits, wine, cider, or mead annually.

(2) Include Craft beverage production establishments as a permitted use in the C-5, C 6, C-7, C-8, C-9, PDC, PRC, PRM, PTC, I-3, I-4, I-5, and I-6 Zoning Districts; and establish appropriate use limitations which may include, but is not necessarily limited to:

a. Production shall be limited to no more than 5,000 barrels of beer or 5,000 gallons of distilled spirits, wine, cider or mead annually for establishments located in commercial and planned development districts. (Note: advertised to permit the Board to consider an alternative option in planned development districts to allow the Board to modify these limits in conjunction with the approval of a development plan.)

b. Tasting rooms consisting of up to 30% of the total gross floor area of the establishment may be permitted as an accessory use in industrial districts. Any accompanying food served shall be limited to pre-packaged food items or food items that require limited preparation and/or reheating.

c. In commercial and planned development districts, production activities and the area devoted to such activities shall be accessory to an on-site tasting room. (Note: advertised to permit the Board to consider an alternative option in the planned development districts to state that a tasting room shall be required, but the production activities and the area devoted to such activities would not be required to be accessory to the tasting room.)

d. Retail sales may be permitted in industrial districts as an accessory use, provided the associated retail sales area shall be limited to ten (10) percent of the gross floor area of the establishment.

- e. Parking in industrial districts shall be provided in accordance with the parking requirements for a manufacturing establishment pursuant to Sect. 11-105 of the Zoning Ordinance for the portion of the establishment devoted to production activities, and in accordance with the requirements for an eating establishment pursuant to Sect. 11-104 of the Zoning Ordinance for the portion of the establishment devoted to a tasting room.
- f. Parking in commercial and planned development districts shall be provided in accordance with the parking requirements for an eating establishment pursuant to Sect. 11-104 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- g. Storage of materials used in the production process shall only be permitted within a completely enclosed structure.

(3) Include food and beverage manufacturing, production and processing establishments as a permitted use in the I-4 District, rather than as a special exception use as currently permitted.
(COUNTYWIDE) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Commissioner Hart, announced his intent to defer the decision on this application.

Andrew Hushour, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Planning and Zoning presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file.

Commissioner Hurley asked Mr. Hushour if the Craft units were bound by the same food limitations as the large facilities. In response, Mr. Hushour said they were and will have the same provisions. He also stated the only real difference is that there are many restaurants that do limited beer production on site. He referenced the Sweetwater Tavern and Mike's American Grill as examples. Mr. Hushour also noted they are licensed by the ABC and the amount of production is so small and will continue to be regulated in the same manner. He made the distinction between a production brewery with a tasting room and a brew pub, in that a brew pub being a restaurant and would be regulated as such. Commissioner Hurley asked if a brew pub would be different from the Craft beverage production establishment. Mr. Hushour said they would be.

Commissioner Hedetniemi asked if there was a provision for reducing beer production in the event of a drought. Mr. Hushour indicated they are not proposing any, and is not aware of any other than the self-limiting factor, were there was no water for production. He referenced research conducted for drought production in California which has experienced a drastic drought.

Commissioner Flanagan asked if there are parallel regulations for commercial enterprises for water usage such as on the days of sprinkling. In response Mr. Hushour said he was not certain and would have to check with the Water Authority. Commissioner Flanagan discussed the challenges of large industrial sites with a slither of land and the only way they can be regulated are through the FAR and the Transportation controls. He asked if Staff was dependent upon these controls. Mr. Hushour said all factors would depend on the total FAR and in conducting the

research tanks are large and a certain headroom and space is needed to locate them. He said the concern is not only the ceiling height but also the floor low requirements being met. He said the biggest control and feedback received from the industry on the amendment was the parking regulation. In regards to the tasting room, Mr. Hushour it's a major must have and will generate a much higher parking requirement. He referred to the existing industrial parks in such that the office space especially in the Sully District being industrially zoned by largely office parks and the parking does not accommodate a brewery.

Commissioner Hart asked Staff to address the downside of 20,000 barrels vs. 15,000 barrels. In response, Mr. Hushour indicated the recommendation was tied specifically to industry standards, and the licensing requirements being on par with other jurisdictions. He said he doesn't see it as an arbitrary jump. Mr. Hushour referred to a popular well matured business in Alexandria, where based on research conducted, their production was either right at 20,000 barrels or much lower. He said most of the breweries around the area were comfortable with Staff's recommended number. Commissioner Hart asked if the use limitations in the commercial districts link 5,000 barrels of beer or 5,000 of distilled spirits, wine, cider and mead annually based on the licensing. In response, Mr. Hushour stated the lower level for the licensing for the distilleries and the lower level for beer production is 500 barrels per year, anything between 501 and 10,000 is the mid-level and anything above 10,000 is considered high level. Commissioner Hart asked if adding a use limitation in regards to availability of public water beyond the scope of the advertisement. In response, Mr. Hushour indicated it was and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of a big production component and would give the Board the opportunity and flexibility to review, should the situation arise.

Commissioner Flanagan asked Staff to clarify and describe mead. In response Mr. Hushour said he thinks mead is fermented with honey and described it as honey wine.

Scott Adams, speaker with McGuire Woods, LLP, on behalf of Liberty, stated there is a potential user who would like to do a creative and innovative use of the site to reuse the former dining hall and some cell blocks as a food hall similar to Union Kitchen in the District of Columbia. Also, use some of the cell blocks buildings as a brewery facility and then potentially come artisanal bakeries, coffee rosters and other types of uses in some of the other cell blocks. Mr. Adams said his clients were very excited when they learned this ordinance was being proposed. He had a few conversations Staff and worked with them on several changes to the ordinances, three of those changes being:

- First, one being the definition and increase from 15,000 barrels to 20,000 barrels. Mr. Adams discussed the impacts of making change to 20,000 barrels and changes being minimal.
- Second, the production limit in plan districts in most circumstances 5,000 makes sense, and asked for flexibility for unique sites able to support an in-increase production, there being an opportunity to go through the public process, the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors and show it is an appropriate location for the increase production

and mitigating any additional impact related to the increased production. By doing so, the process is vetted.

- Third, in regards to the tasting rooms, Option 2 is supported.

Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Adams if, in his view, all the Providence District have a bigger production facility that wasn't very subordinate to a tasting room. In response to Commissioner Hart, Mr. Adams said, in his view there should be the flexibility and if there was an appropriate site, there was the opportunity where the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors could determine if the site was truly appropriate. Commissioner Hart asked if there was public water at the prison site. Mr. Adams said there was.

Commissioner Flanagan asked Mr. Adams if he is asking the Commission to change the definition to 20,000 barrels. In response, Mr. Adams indicated he was and the adoption of Option 2 for both the planned district production limit and for the tasting room. Commissioner Flanagan then asked Mr. Adams if he was recommending any change to the 36,000 gallons of spirits. Mr. Adams said they are not advocating the change. Staff response was they are recommending both Options 1 and provisions in both paragraphs A and B. Commissioner Flanagan asked if that was consistent. In response Mr. Hushour said it was consistent and all tied together. However, Mr. Adams reiterated his client was advocating for Option 2.

Commissioner Migliaccio asked Mr. Adams if the client wanted initially start at 20,000 barrels or mature to 20,000 barrels. Mr. Adams said the initial startup would be for a new use at a lower production level, produce use for beer on site in both the tasting room and the dining hall building, and a long-term plan would be to ramp up production and eventually get to the 20,000 barrel per year limit. Commissioner Migliaccio asked Mr. Adams with Staff's recommendation of 15,000 barrels and then revisit an increase in 1 year, would his client be onboard. Mr. Adams said in his client's proposal they've penciled out the short and long term successes and the regulatory framework for long-term growth and does not know if revisiting in 1 year would work. Commissioner Migliaccio asked Staff the best way to address in the future with the current amendment. Mr. Hushour said they've set the cap limit, and this limit is based on the idea that the Providence District is treated similar to the commercial where a product above that amount and all it will entail, would not be appropriate. Back and forth discussion between Commissioner Migliaccio regarding the difference in site specific for different areas. Mr. Hushour said the safety valve would require Board approval.

Commissioner Hurley asked Staff if in Option 2, adding verbiage along the lines of a limit of 15,000 barrels, unless modified by the Board in conjunction with the approval a development plan, be appropriate to add, rather than going through paperwork 1 year from now. In response Mr. Hushour said it's built in the definition of the use.

Commissioner Flanagan in closing comments informed Staff that in Option 1, the subject barrels are a quantitative option with the approval and the second has do with the by-right, doesn't seem to have a limitation on the production as long as there is a tasting room. Mr. Hushour referenced the two options for the B paragraphs relation to the production area and tasting room. He offered

explanation for the size and scope. He again explained placing the cap would carry the Option 1 provision. However, allowing the Board potentially having a PCA to do the increase the production area would likely be bigger than a tasting room. Back and forth discussion regarding the applicant's preference of Option 2.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for a relation to Port City's history use based on Staff's recommendation. In response, Mr. Hushour stated the maturity and the ability to build the brand. He circled back the various discussions with other brewers and the large quantity for a Craft brewery. Mr. Hushour said the 15,000-barrel level was based the Brewers Association specific definition of a micro-brewery as well as the neighboring jurisdictions.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me, first, thank Mr. Adams for coming out this evening. Let me, also, thank Mr. Hushour and also Megan Duca, before him, for their fine work on this. The amendment itself, I think, is relatively easy. Our decision on a recommendation on the options is more difficult and I think we need some more time. And, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ON THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING CRAFT BEVERAGE PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENTS TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JANUARY 26, 2017, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on the proposed Zoning Ordinance Craft Beverage Production Establishment to a date certain of January 26th, with the record remaining open, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Sargeant and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

CLOSING

January 12, 2017

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m.
Peter F Murphy, Chairman
James R. Hart, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Teresa M. Wang

Approved on: May 4, 2017



John W. Cooper, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission

