

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 2017**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commission At-Large
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Karen A. Keys-Gamarra, Jr., Sully District
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:18 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 2013-III-DS1 (Sub. DSC-E4-1) – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (POHANKA, DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER STUDY) (Decision Only) (The workshop/public hearing on this application was held on March 29, 2017.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: I have an approval motion from the Dulles Advisory Group on submission DSC-E4-1, Pohanka, Dulles Suburban Center Study. As staff indicated, the amendment would modify the plan language for Tax Map Parcels 34-4 ((1)) 49, 50, 50A, 51, and 53 to add an option for auto dealership use, with the maximum intensity of 0.30 FAR. The language shown on the handout distributed at the March 23rd, 2017 public hearing includes changes to the staff recommendation that reflect the Dulles Advisory Group's recommendation, which is different than the staff recommendation in that removes site specific guidance for maximum building height on Parcel 53 and does not include a restriction on additional access to Vernon Street. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION THAT REFLECTS THE DULLES ADVISORY GROUP'S RECOMMENDATION FOR SUBMISSION DSE-E4-1, POHANKA OF THE DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER STUDY, PA 2013-III-DS1, AS SHOWN ON THE

HANDOUT DATED MARCH 23RD, 2017 AND SHOWN BELOW, PROVIDED TO THE COMMISSIONERS.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt PA 2013-III-DS1, Comprehensive Plan Amendment Pohanka, Dulles Suburban Center Study, as articulated this evening by Ms. Keys-Gamarra, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. CSPA 80-P-039-05 – ICF CONSULTING GROUP, INC.
2. SE 2016-SU-022 – COPT STONECROFT, LLC
3. RZ/FDP 2015-PR-017 – FP TYSONS I, LLC
4. PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005/FDPA 2011-PR-005-02 – TYSONS CENTRAL LOT A, LLC
5. RZ 2016-HM-010/SE 2016-HM-007 – SCIMORES ACADEMY LLC
6. FAIRFAX FORWARD COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROCESS-PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

This order was accepted without objection.

//

CSPA 80-P-039-05 – ICF CONSULTING GROUP, INC. – Appl. under Sect. 12-210 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend the previously approved Comprehensive Sign Plan associated with RZ 80-P-039 to permit sign modifications. Located in the N.W. quadrant of the intersection of Lee Hwy. and Nutley St. on approx. 13.99 ac. of land zoned PDC and HC. Tax Map 48-4 ((1)) 1E & 1G. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Who reaffirmed the affidavit?

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

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

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do ask that the applicant confirm for the record her agreement with the proposed development conditions.

Elizabeth Baker with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC: Yes. Elizabeth Baker with Walsh Colucci and the applicant does agree to the development conditions.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you. With that Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSPA 80-P-039-05, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED APRIL 5TH, 2017.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CSPA 80-P-039-05, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2016-SU-022 – COPT STONECROFT, LLC – Appl. under Sects. 5-307 and 9-607 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit an increase in building height from 75ft. up to a maximum of 120 ft. Located at 4850 Stonecroft Blvd., Chantilly, 20151 on approx. 64.28 ac. of land zoned I-3 and WS. Tax Map 43-2 ((2)) 39C. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Robert Brant, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated March 7, 2017.

Chairman Murphy asked for disclosures from the Commission.

Commissioner Hart disclosed the Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. currently has one case where the attorneys in Mr. Brant's firm representing an adverse party or adverse parties. He stated that matter and those parties are unrelated to the above referenced case. Commissioner Hart said The Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. has no business or financial relationship and does not think this matter will affect his ability to participate in the case.

Chairman Murphy asked for staff report and polled the audience there were no speakers and the applicant's presentation and staff report was waived without objection and went directly to the motion, closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Keys-Gamarra.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant – I believe we already confirmed the affidavit. Yes?

Chairman Murphy: Right.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Okay. I move that the planning commission recommend approval of SE 2016-SU-022...

Chairman Murphy: Could you invite the applicant up to go over the development conditions?

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Oh, I'm sorry.

Robert Brant with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC: Yes, I can confirm the applicant's agreement to the development conditions.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Ok.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

Robert Brant: Thank you.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Dated April 19th, 2017.

Robert Brant: That's correct.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: There was some changes, correct?

Robert Brant: That is correct. Thank you.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra: Thank you. All right. Then, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2016-SU-022 SUBJECT TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED APRIL 19TH, 2017.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2016-SU-022, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ/FDP 2015-PR-017 – FP TYSONS I, LLC – Appls. to rezone from PTC, SC, and HC to PTC, SC and HC to permit office and retail development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 8.32 and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on a portion of Service Dr. right-of-way along Leesburg Pike (RTE. 7) immediately S. of Greensboro Metro Station on approx. 1,119 sq. ft. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Transit Station Mixed Use. To be vacated and/or abandoned public right-of-way associated with Leesburg Pike adjacent to Tax Map 29-3 ((1)) 65A. (Concurrent with PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005 and FDP 2011-PR-005-02). Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public rights-of-way for Leesburg Pike to proceed under Section 15.2-2272 (2) of the Code of Virginia). PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005/FDPA 2011-PR-005-02– TYSONS CENTRAL LOT A, LLC – Appls. to amend the proffers, conceptual development plan, and final development plan for RZ 2011-PR 005, previously approved for mixed-use development, to permit office and retail development and associated modifications to proffers and site design with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 8.32. Located on the E. side of Leesburg Pike immediately S. of Greensboro Metro Station on 1.13 ac. of land zoned PTC, SC and

HC. Comp. Plan Rec: Transit Station Mixed Use. Tax Map 29-3
((1)) 65A. (Concurrent with RZ/FDP 2015-PR-017).
PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Elizabeth Baker, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 4, 2017.

Chairman Murphy asked for disclosures from the Commission.

Commissioner Hart disclosed the Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. currently has one case where the attorneys in Ms. Baker's firm representing an adverse party or adverse parties. He stated that matter and those parties are unrelated to the above referenced case. Commissioner Hart said The Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. has no business or financial relationship and does not think this matter will affect his ability to participate in the case.

Stephen Gardner, Staff Coordinator, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked staff to address the analysis referencing concerns about the open space calculation. Mr. Gardner stated the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) right-a-way in the approved design functioned as streetscape and was being rezoned to Planed Tysons Corner (PTC), was being incorporated into the building footprint. He stated there was a slight decrease in open space from that which was approved. This was not highlighted as an issue because the open space exceeded the standards and that it was more of a point of reference. The design, connectivity and functionality improved and was only highlighted for transparency purposes of the net decrease.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Gardner discussed the loading dock doors, the two design options (previously approved and current) and landscaping. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner made reference to the landscaping in front to the docking area and the changes that were required as a result of understanding the inability to move the utilities from underneath causing a more shallow soil base for landscaping. The discussion continued regarding circumstances where some uncertainty may arise where the future ability of the landscaping to blossom and ways to deal with the prospective inability.

Ms. Baker gave a presentation wherein she stated the development was metro oriented and surrounded by park land and plazas. She then explained the following:

- There were some constraints to the site with regard to loading;
- This application was primarily a final development plan with some minor changes to the conceptual development plan with regard to building height increase in the maximum from 300 to 310, and an increase in the Gross Floor Area from 382 to 400;

- There was a slight mix change from more retail, up to 65,000 square feet of retail were reduced to 35,000 square feet.
- Major improvements were made to the park design;
- Changes were made to the Metro Plaza;
- Informed the Commission that Gensler Architect were the project architects on record and Land Design as the Landscape; and
- Showed visuals referencing changes, improvements made and the water wall feature coming down the edge of the staircase and a view of the loading area. The design goal was to bring the in-doors out and out-doors in.

Andrew Kobalka, Gensler Architects, stated the following:

- The loading dock and the treatment of the loading dock door, centers around bringing the elements of the above grade garage skin down to the ground level;
- Four instances the metal panel was brought down to grade. He made reference to the instances at Metro Plaza, the Sky Park, Tysons Central Street and the loading dock area. Mr. Kobalka stated the reason for this was to “ground the skin”; to bring the skin down to the ground plain and also did it to focus attention to the corners of the building and to place emphasis on the retail moments and location;
- There was a retail presence at each corner of the building; and
- At the loading dock door some of the coloration in the white strips that were above were brought down to help camouflage.

Commissioner Hart and Ms. Baker discussed the components of retail and possible changes under the proffer amendment.

Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Baker discussed the primary reason for the trees along Leesburg Pike; one being to provide separating and screening from the loading dock and two being able to provide a streetscape to the public waking down Route 7 and provides shade and attractiveness of the streetscape. They further discussed the branches and their height. Ms. Baker explained the size of the tree and not being part of the large category because they required more soil volume. The trees were smaller canopy, ornamental trees and shrubbery which would benefit screening. Commissioner Flanagan indicated Building F would be primarily residential and as a result people getting off the Metro would use the building stretch as sidewalk where the trees were. Ms. Baker said there were several routes that someone within the residential building could

use. She made reference to number of available sidewalks and parking garage which connects to the building. Ms. Baker said the sidewalks were intended to be shaded.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner for action on these cases.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask Ms. Baker to come forward and confirm, for the record, her agreement or the applicant's agreement to the amended proffers listed in Appendix 1 of the Staff Report, dated April 3rd, 2017 and the development conditions contained in Appendix 3 of the Staff Report.

Elizabeth Baker with Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC: Yes, we accept those conditions.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Okay, thank you Ms. Baker. Mr. Chairman, in light of the absence of public concern for the applicant's proposed changes this site design, the staff and applicant responses to questions and concerns raised here this evening and staff's overall analysis and recommendation and support –in my belief this development promotes the goals of the Tysons Urban Center. I'd like to make a number of motions required to fulfill the applicant's desire to move forward with this development. To begin, and bear with us, this is a number of motions – to begin, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT AND DATED APRIL 3RD, 2017.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Mr. Flanagan and Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005, say aye.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairman I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 2011-PR-005-02 (SIC), SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED APRIL 6TH, 2017 AS CONTAINED in April – I'm sorry – IN APPENDIX 3 OF THE STAFF REPORT AND SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF PCA/CDPA 2011-PR-005.

Commissioners Flanagan and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Same seconds. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDPA 2011-PR-005-02 (sic), subject to the Board's approval of the PCA, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAIVE THE TREE CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS OF PART 4 OF SECTION 13-400 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REAFFIRM ALL PREVIOUSLY APPROVED WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS, AS OUTLINED ON SHEETS 21 AND 22 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And just two more, Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE RZ 2015-PR-017, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONDITIONS, DATED APRIL 6TH, 2017 AND AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 2 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of that motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2015-PR-017, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP 2015-PR-017, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF RZ 2015-PR-017.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDP 2015-PR-017, subject to the Board's approval of the Rezoning, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ 2016-HM-010 – SCIMORES ACADEMY LLC – Appl. to rezone from R-1 and C-5 to R-2 to permit a private school of special education with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .17. Located in the N.E. corner of the intersection of Centreville Rd. and West Ox Rd., on approx. 5.94 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: 1-2 du/ac. Tax Map 25-1 ((1)) 16, 17pt., 19pt. and 21. (Concurrent with SE 2016-HM-007). (Hunter District)

SE 2016-HM-007 – SCIMORES ACADEMY LLC – Appl. under Sect. 3-204 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a private school of special education. Located at 2625, 2629 and 2633 Centreville Rd. and 2703 and 2705 West Ox Rd., Herndon, 20171, on approx. 8.07 ac. of land currently zoned C-5 and R-1 with all R-1 and a part of C-5 land proposed to be rezoned to R-2. Tax Map 25-1 ((1)) 16, 17, 19, 20 and 21. (Concurrent with RZ 2016-HM-010.). (Hunter District)

Andrew Painter, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 6, 2017.

Chairman Murphy asked for disclosures from the Commission.

Commissioner Hart disclosed the Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. had one case where the attorneys in Mr. Painter's firm represented an adverse party or adverse parties. He stated that

matter and those parties were unrelated to the above referenced case. Commissioner Hart said The Law Firm of Hart & Horan, P.C. had no business or financial relationship and did not think this matter would affect his ability to participate in the case.

Commissioner Sargeant stated the President and CEO of the Arts Council of Fairfax County would be testifying regarding the application and he served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Arts Council. He noted that neither Ms. Sullivan or the Arts Council and the Board had taken vote regarding this application, nor had he heard any presentation regarding the application before the Board. Commissioner Sargeant said he didn't believe this affects his ability to participate in the case, but wanted to make the disclosure for the record.

Wander Suder, Staff Coordinator, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked about the Heritage Resources, the workflow of the draft proffers, and the fact that in Section 2-A the applicant would retain the two existing historic houses as well as any accessory structures they decided to keep in perpetuity. Ms. Suder indicated this is the way the proffers were structured. Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Suder had a discussion regarding the permitted use to retain the existing residential as the principal use and use of the historic houses and the requirement of renovating the buildings. Ms. Suder discussed the intent of the applicant to renovate the historic buildings and not use only as part of the school activities but also make them available to the Park Authority. Commissioner Ulfelder asked if an initial feasibility study was conducted, due to the fact he already read one was conducted. Ms. Suder indicated they had. She said they have an idea of the existing conditions of the buildings based on the feasibility study. Ms. Suder indicated there is a general understanding; however, no detailed specific study was conducted. Commissioner Ulfelder asked what would be required to bring the building up to code and make them useful. Ms. Suder deferred to the applicant's consultant for the full details. Commissioner Ulfelder inquired if any thought was given to a preservation easement to the structures. Ms. Abrahamson, Branch Chief, ZED, DPZ, said bringing the buildings up to code was not part of the discussion. Commissioner Ulfelder discussed the consideration of preservation easements and having a third party adhering to the terms of the easement and the fact that one was and appropriate consideration for a case such as this one for the three buildings.

Mr. Painter gave a presentation wherein he noted the following:

- One single point of fine arts quality education in one central location;
- Enhance environmental preservation through sustainable architecture and site design;
- Preserve and enrich the remaining historic structures that were on the property;
- Provide a new gateway and enhancements to the visitor experience of Frying Pan Park;
- Complement the existing arts programs that were offered in the county; and

- Landscaping and view sheds were scaled to use.

Mr. Painter stated that although the property was listed on a nationally overlay historic district, the existing three homes were not protected from a zoning prospective. The homes were in deteriorating condition and absent from any type of stabilization of the homes in the near term, they could be lost forever. Mr. Painter also stated they held numerous meetings with the History Commission and the Architectural Review Board and the application was well received. His team also worked with staff to develop language regarding stabilization, renovation and the preservation of the structures, and worked with DHR in Richmond to ensure the project can be used as a way of enhancement. His team also worked with the Park Authority on a number of issues in relation to special events, landscaping, view sheds into the park, and vehicular inside access issues and other programmatic aspects. Mr. Painter discussed the issues with traffic which was currently surrounded by established residential communities. He discussed the goals of the proposal which were as follows:

- Propose a land use to reduce traffic relative to what could otherwise be built as a matter of right on the property;
- The proposed use would result in a reduction of the 432 trips over the by-right alternative, with the real savings on the weekends where there would be a reduction of about 1,600 fewer trips on a daily basis. Those numbers were reviewed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and Fairfax County Department of Transportation;
- Environmental conditions as part of the proposed design and over 32,000 square feet of tree preservation were proposed on the property;
- 55% open space, where 20% was required;
- Perkins + Will, the architect, had already been selected by the applicant; and
- Implemented storm water management upgrades to the property; meeting all Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) requirements for storm water and quantity.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Painter regarding the current shape of the houses and the applicant's intent to renovate, restore and reuse the three historic homes. In response, Mr. Painter stated the following:

- In regards to the proffers, the applicant does not have a choice in which no renovation will be done to the houses;
- The applicant had a commitment within the proffers to permanently preserve the houses on site; and
- There was no objection to making a change to the text language in the proffers.

Chris Morrison, Managing Director of Perkins + Will, said he had been overseeing the structural analysis of the three building. Mr. Morrison stated as part of the initial assessment, archeological review, the structures were surveyed by a licensed structural engineer who assured the applicant the buildings can be stabilized in order to maintain them. Mr. Morrison stated any of the flexibility that was being read into, was meant only because of the uncertainty of what the buildings were actually going to be used for. He stated they have reached out to the Parks Services and various aspects of the County for partnerships. So far there were no partners that were willing to commit. Mr. Morrison said their intention was to integrate the homes into a more permanent sustainable use. Commissioner Ulfelder asked if partners were necessary to handle the cost of the potential renovations. In response, Mr. Morrison said partners were not necessary for the stabilization of the initial structure. The goal was to find active use of the buildings through adaptive reuse that would have programmatic benefits either to the forest historic community or to the academy. Commissioner Ulfelder indicated he would feel more comfortable if this was addressed in the proffers as a two-step process where there was a definite commitment to the stabilization effort with flexibility left for the eventual use/reuse of the houses. The applicant agreed to the conditions in the proffers. Commissioner de le Fe stated he saw the proffer conditions as shall be used and did not see the houses as being abandoned by neglect.

Commissioner Hedetniemi stated she had a concern of the impact of the academy on Frying Pan Park and asked how the noise level from traffic and students would be modified. In response, Mr. Painter stated the applicant would comply with the Zoning Ordinance noise requirements. He stated most of the activities would be to the interior of the facility and the applicant did not envision any additional noise at the property line, more than what the Zoning Ordinance allowed. He also discussed in detail all required steps taken to comply with and address the Park Authority issues.

Linda S. Sullivan, President & CEO, Arts Council of Fairfax County spoke in support of the application. Ms. Sullivan stated that with over 1.1 million residents, the County was significantly ‘underbuilt’ when it comes to the arts. With the rapid growth of population, businesses, schools, and other infrastructure over just the past few decades she emphasized the need for this project. Ms. Sullivan stated the following:

- The neighboring County to the north for example, was home to more than 58 performing arts venues. 32 music schools; 33 dance studios; 60 art galleries; and 50 historical museums and venues; that was a tally of their nonprofit arts facilities;
- Many organizations had to find space outside of the County to perform, rehearse, and hold classes. Not only was this inconvenient, it took our residents’ extracurricular and other disposable income to other jurisdictions;
- From a 2016 arts organization survey, the demand for arts education programming was very high, and the nonprofit organizations had limited funds and facilities to meet that demand;
- Fairfax County benefits from a handful of large arts and cultural facilities such as Wolf Trap, George Mason University’s Center for the Arts, the Air and Space Museum, and

Mount Vernon. These were the “redwoods” in the community, but we had a long way to go to fill out the forest;

- Many small organizations were looking for regular and occasional facility use;
- Many people of all ages who wish to be engaged in the arts without having to travel a great distance;
- The immediate area which the Floris Conservatory would serve had the highest percentage of teens in the County;
- The Arts Council was in the process of working on a Master Arts Plan for the County, and in the near future would assist with a countywide arts market study;
- The Arts Council was engaged in this activity because the County had specified the development of the visual and performing arts in the 2010 County Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sullivan stated the Floris Conservatory would be a great service to the western side of the County. She concluded by saying that it would be a community builder and would serve a very real need for arts education and cultural activity.

Leila Gordon, Chair, Fairfax County Master Arts Plan Task Force, spoke in support of the application. She gave a brief description of the arts and the benefits to the community. Ms. Gordon said the subject application represented an opportunity to realize a new arts venue that could serve a host of critical needs. She noted the following:

- Students who seek educational opportunities in the arts can find the type of training and practice options that are not available through public education facilities and curricula. They would have the ability to practice their art in a beautiful, well and properly-equipped settings;
- The audiences would be able to enjoy it in an appropriate setting that supported the work of the performers and exhibitors;
- The project would serve the area of the County that lacks this kind of venue and programming;
- The arts were the glue that binds civilizations to their own history and to each other;
- The ability to understand each other and to appreciate the diverse cultural perspectives of various communities was connected to fine arts; and.
- is the art was the manifestation of humanity’s greatest potential and testament to people’s universal desire to create and to experience beauty and truth.

Ms. Gordon urged the approval of the application. She stated the proposal was thoughtful, environmentally sensitive and exceptional in its design. She added it would foster the creativity of future generations and may well contain the best part of the most cherished legacy.

Ms. Caroline Warren, 3816 Whitman Road, Annandale, spoke in support of the application. She gave a brief description of her resume and her involvement with the arts. Ms. Warren stated the following:

- Provided an opportunity for the County to support the development of the arts and arts education as well as a new performing venue;
- The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors adopted the Strategic Plan to facilitate the economic success of Fairfax County in March of 2015;
- One of the six goals identified in the Strategic Plan discussed the need to create places where people want to be, by supporting local businesses to build these unique and energized spaces utilizing the arts;
- The conservatory would provide professional level training in music, dance, fine arts and more to children ages 4-18;
- The conservatory would become the arts center where adults could learn and engage in the arts as part of their own personal development and stress relief from the demands of our fast pace Northern Virginia society; and
- The environmentally friendly building included a performing arts facility equipped with professional lighting, sound, and other technical theater considerations.

Ms. Warren stated for the past several years she had the privilege to work with Leila Gordon on the Fairfax County Master Arts Plan team. A lot of time was spent evaluating the needs for a performing arts venue in the county, taking into consideration what currently exists and what still needs to be built. She indicated the community suffers with the lack of such facility. Sometimes high school auditoriums and experience scheduling difficulties and low priority often being bumped at the last minute for school activities. She referenced George Mason University School of the Arts and the Northern Virginia Community College fine arts center that are very expensive and too large for a medium size theater or dance troop might need.

Commissioner Hedetniemi made a brief statement in support of the application.

Commissioner Flanagan made reference to a letter from Mayor Walter J. Mason in favor of the application. He also made a disclosure he was part of the staff of Perkins + Will which would not influence his vote in anyway.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this case.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As everybody that has testified and that we have heard from, agrees that this is a very worthwhile enterprise. Mr. Ulfelder raised an issue with respect to clarification of Proffer number 4A, particularly. I think all the other questions have been – have been answered. However, this doesn't have a Board date and we do meet next Wednesday. So I would – I will be moving, if it's alright, to defer the decision until next week. Not with any intent – negative – please don't read that as any kind of prejudice to this, but just to get that language clarified because the commission doesn't like to send to the Board of Supervisors something that is still hanging. I don't think it's a major issue at all and you already said what you meant. But, you know if you...if we can have that language clarified by then, we will move at that time. Is that alright with you?

Wander Suder, Staff Coordinator, Department of Planning and Zoning, Zoning Evaluation Division: Certainly.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I appreciate Commissioner de la Fe's siding to defer one week. And, we can get – I think it's going to be just a little bit of language change, maybe even just one sentence in that proffer concerning making a sustained...sustainable in the – while you are waiting to do the additional type of work. So I think it's fairly straight forward and I agree entirely what Commissioner de la Fe said and it's not any intent to hold this up in any way because it's a terrific application and I'm looking forward to seeing this come into being.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, therefore, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ONLY ON RZ 2016-HM-010 AND SE 2016-HM-007 UNTIL APRIL 26TH, 2017, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

Commissioners Sargeant and Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on RZ 2016-HM-010 and SE 2016-HM-007 to a date certain of April 26th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

FAIRFAX FORWARD COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING
PROCESS-PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS – To consider proposed revisions to procedures regarding the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the Code of Virginia, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. The review of the Comprehensive Plan is organized through a Plan Amendment Work Program that schedules activity center, neighborhood, and countywide policy amendments, and any additional amendments that are authorized by the Board of Supervisors. The current work program was adopted in July 2013. The proposed changes to the planning process would add a regular cycle for proposing Plan amendments on specific properties, referred to as site-specific plan amendments. Nominations for site-specific plan amendments would be accepted once every four years and reviewed in coordination with a community task force. Updates to the current work program are also proposed.

Bernard S. Suchicital, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of the modifications.

Commissioner Migliaccio said he would defer the decision only to May 4th, 2017 upon conclusion of the public hearing.

Commissioner Hedetniemi asked how the public would be notified of the subject modifications. In response, Mr. Suchicital stated the following:

- Staff attended about 22 meetings around the County;
- Staff planned a series of educational meeting leading up to the close of the nomination period.
- During the three-month period staff planned to hold meetings at the districts in North County to educate community groups such as land use committees and other organizations at their request.

Commissioner Hedetniemi asked if the plan would be set forth in plain language. Mr. Suchicital said it was, and the staff was working on series of materials including pagers, flyers, posters, as well as elements that could be found on the Internet. On the main webpage there were YouTube videos to help further explain Planning 101 elements.

Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked about the status of applications that were previously submitted and staff indicated they would be dropped and resubmitted. Ms. Suchicital stated they

were asked and directed to cease review of those application submissions from last year. Those submitters can resubmit under the new process they fall in. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked how staff determined what progress was made on those applications. In response, Mr. Suchicital stated the Planning Commission never made a formal action on the applications and during the work session last spring. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked if staff worked with some of the applicants with respect to those applications. Mr. Suchicital said staff worked with a handful of the submissions, some have moved on and some were incorporated into the Dulles Suburban Center Study. One was authorized by a Board member, the Pine Crest Road Plan Amendment and a few others were identified to be possibly incorporated into the Embark Richmond Highway study. Other applications were identified by staff as not meeting a certain criteria to be added to the work program. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Keys-Gamarra and Mr. Suchicital regarding the status of submitted application. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked to explain task forces and how they would work. Mr. Suchicital indicated the task forces will be very similar to what was conducted on the APR process. He said that would be based on the district Supervisor. They could either use a standing land use committee, create their very own task force that's devoted solely to this process or cobble together something different; look at where the nominations fall and gather citizens from that neighborhood or neighborhoods. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked if there will be one task force of the four areas. In response, Mr. Suchicital said each supervisor district will have their own setup. Some may have task force per Supervisor district and it all depends on the supervisor. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra and Mr. Suchicital also had a discussion about their roll and how the supervisor plays a part determining it. Commissioner Keys-Gamarra asked about the APR process and length of time for the process. Mr. Suchicital gave a detailed time summary of the APR process, everything involved in the process, and length of time from start to finish of an application. Meghan Van Dam, Planning Division, Department of Planning of Zoning also gave information in terms of length of time regarding the application process expedited track from start to finish with an approval. This all includes the nomination window, the setup and background. A discussion continued between Commissioner Keys-Gamarra and Ms. Van Dam regarding the process of the standard and expedited application process.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked staff to define from the 2016 Reform Bill exempt and non-exempt of property from consideration from any type of zoning activity, and whether that significantly reduce the anticipated workload coming out of the process since non-residential is excluded from consideration. Chairman Murphy corrected stating it's residential that is included and not non-residential. In response, Mr. Suchicital stated it sets up the potential for a small workload and it all depends on the property owner's intent. Marianne Gardner, Director, Planning Division, Department of Planning of Zoning stated that in the past in the plan review process, most of the nominations were in the activity centers. She stated the department did receive some outside of those applications for infill development and wasn't close to what was received in the activity centers. Ms. Gardner stated she did not believe there would be a major difference. She said the Board of Supervisors could always authorize a plan amendment in those areas if they so choose. One couldn't submit a nomination through the site specific process if the Board of Supervisors thought it was important they could direct staff to take a look.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated in reference to the 22 items staff recommended the Commission defer, a number of those appeared to be infill development so they were non-

exempt under the proffer law and wondered if this was a correct interpretation. Mr. Suchicital stated that from the 2016 Work Program, a lot of them were located inside the beltway, along the Richmond Highway corridor, Reston and the Dulles Suburban Center area. These are places that could be considered infill. He stated a number of them are on non-residential sites and some of them did ask for residential uses. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked why defer if they were already on the work plan. Mr. Suchicital stated they were not on the work program and never made it that far. He said they asked the Planning Commission to cease review. When the Planning Commission began review of them at a work session last year, there were some questions in regards to the Fairfax Forward process. He said they asked for the old 22 submissions be resent. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked if it was possible that some of the submissions, not be eligible for Fairfax Forward. Ms. Gardner said the Planning Department would be happy to take a close look and come back with a specific answer. She said in taking a quick look at the list, most of these land use changes were in activity centers, there were some that were not. One was authorized as a plan amendment, but there may be two or three that would fall into the basket of not being eligible for Fairfax Forward.

Commissioner Hart followed up regarding the issue of constraints. He said in some ways the APR process outgrew the staff resources to administer it, particularly in the last South County cycle. Commissioner Hart stated there too many nominations and did not have the staff resources to devote to it. He stated this proposal as refined, would allow for site specific nominations that are not part of a larger study, allow for citizen nominations, and a number of things which were prohibited, which could be done without a Board out of turn authorization. He asked if part of the rationale for the narrower limitations on what can be nominated. Ms. Gardner stated that was the case and that there was a number of special studies going on at any one time as directed by the Board of Supervisors that influenced the ability to take on another area plan review process. In addition the resources constraints, the other concerns it was not possible when they were scattered site specific nominations. Some were grouped to become special studies and others such as transportation, schools, could not be looked at in a holistic way. Commissioner Hart asked if the now shifted resources would slow down the rest of the work program for the special studies. In response, Ms. Gardner indicated it would.

Commissioner Flanagan asked if the proposal prepared two years ago exceeded or matched staff's capability. Ms. Gardner stated she had hoped it would match staff capability. Commissioner Flanagan said that the program was being augmented, would the current proposal going to exceed staff capability. In response, Ms. Gardner stated this was the reason staff wanted to bring the work program back to the Planning Commission after they did the screening of the nominations, in order to understand how many nominations were going to move forward and what it meant to continue with the special studies outlined previously. Commissioner Flanagan indicated there were twenty-two nominations during the previous Fairfax Forward proposal that staff recommended deferral on in the staff report; however, no reference was made as to the reason for deferral. Ms. Gardner stated they were never authorized and that staff asked for them to be erased to start from zero. Initially, there were many staff did not support and should not have been only staff recommendation, but rather staff and community. Staff was in touch with the nominators to have a clean slate. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Gardner regarding the upcoming nomination process, the parties responsible for the election and the timing. Ms. Gardner stated the Planning Commission would make a determination.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated that he supported the direction of the application and the thoughtful consideration given by staff. In regards to the twenty-two projects he said he believed staff would be able to clarify who they would play out if they were deferred. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked staff if there was a point where they would be able to integrate any recommendations coming out of the Chairman's Community Council in terms of executing Fairfax Forward in the future. Mr. Suchicital said he believed they were scheduled to wrap up in May and any suggested recommendations or ideas from the special committee would be incorporated into the new process such as communication techniques or other outreach techniques.

Commissioner Sargeant asked if there was a way to list the steps for community engagement and for future reference some form of visualization. Mr. Suchicital stated staff would put together requested information as additional material for the process. During the nomination process and the educational period there would definitely be public meetings throughout the process. He stated during the screening process was another opportunity for the community to engage with the County to discuss them at the taskforce level as they do the screen review phase. Commissioner Sargeant referenced the report that noted ". . . the subject areas must be located outside of the boundaries of pending plan amendment." He inquired about the beginning of the timeframe where one could submit a nomination. In response, Mr. Suchicital said staff would review with the Planning Commission before the start of any new cycle. Commissioner Sargeant indicated that in the interest of fairness and understanding, it would be helpful to identify a protocol, so there was an understanding of the fairness of the process. Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Van Dam discussed the non-residential proposals and nominations and areas subject to the Proffer Law which was not meant to limit applications and the possibility of concern. Ms. Van Dam stated those types of proposals should be approached with caution. These proposals required extra training with any task force involved. The recommendation was based on the fact that the timeline was very structured and may not fit because of the extra care that particular proposal would require. This process may not be built for such a proposal because of the constraints of the timeline. Ms. Van Dam also stated staff would not want to delay the other nominations from getting to public hearing because of one nomination that may require extra time. Commissioner Sargeant and Commissioner Hart discussed the process of providing more flexible language in line with economic success agendas there being more flexibility to make changes to plan amendments in the future to better refine an application. Ms. Van Dam stated the proffer legislation based on the County Attorney's guidance to staff, could severely limit how staff looked at plan guidance and it needed to be approached with caution. Commissioner Sargeant asked in reference to task forces, what was the role of civic associations or land use committees. In response, Mr. Suchicital stated this is up to the district Supervisor.

Katherine Ward, Co-Chair of The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Associations, Inc. spoke in reference to the application and staff's recommended changes. Ms. Ward stated the following:

- Locking plan nominations into firm fixed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and types of uses, especially in mixed used developments, should not be the norm. Form based language should be the norm coupled with concurrent rezoning;
- Staff must provide technical support and advice to citizen nominators throughout the process

- A parcel may be nominated by an organization as well as an individual. Create a system that can take the best of these nominations. Find a way to make this a collaborative process;
- Tracking and staff interaction from start of the process to the Board of Supervisors decision must occur between staff and nominator. A clear tracking system must be in place;
- Policy Plan nominations must be considered if they were relevant to a parcel nomination;
- During the initial evaluation period staff must accompany the nominator on a site visit;
- Task force members must receive a more in-depth training program than Planning 101;
- Parcels related to a current special study, an area study or a board matter should not be precluded from being nominated;
- Permit Comprehensive Plan nominations to be adjusted as they move through the process in response to community input;
- The County website was poorly designed and it was difficult to find the status of work plans, special studies, plan amendments, etc.;
- High level screening by staff and the task force to determine validity of nominations could be problematic if the nominator was not included in the process;
- Expediting a nomination becomes a concern – North Gateway traffic study had to be “undertaken immediately and completed expeditiously” as directed by BOS in Jan 28, 2014—it’s still not done. And there appears to be no method for tracking of these directives. How will this work in this new process?; and
- Staff recommended that current nominations under the present Fairfax Forward Process be suspended and resubmitted under the new process.

Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Ward discussed the complications of scripted plan amendments. Ms. Ward advocated for a less restricted, prescriptive, comprehensive plan that would reduce the workload of staff and get to a viability a lot faster for development. She stated that the plan should be more on the lines of a guide, making the language, design and the text a true guide. Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Ward discussed her proposal for consolidating the nominations.

Shane M. Murphy, Reed Smith LLP, on behalf of the Land Use Bar discussed the flexibility of the Comprehensive Plan and the ability to do plan amendments in concert with zoning applications. Mr. Murphy noted the following:

- The previous APR process was slow, cumbersome and did not provide for a thoughtful and meaningful review for consistency of applications; thereby, frustrating numerous viable opportunities for economic development and adding uncertainty to the development review process;
- Applicants spent significant amount of time and resources to prepare and submit an application that, after a quick staff report and brief presentation, was decided by up-or-down vote rather than a more nuanced decision which would provide opportunities for adjustment;
- Special studies provided area-wide opportunities to seek site specific amendments but such studies were time consuming and often met the timing needs of a particular proposal. Out-of-turn site-specific amendments, if expedited and processed concurrently with an accompanying development review plan were probably the most useful mechanisms. However, this required authorization by a Supervisor to initiate;
- Adopt a process that permitted properties to seek concurrent comprehensive plan amendments whenever and wherever a development application was filed;
- Permit special area-wide studies consistent with current practice by the County staff of the Planning Commission;
- In regards to the Fairfax Forward process:
 - Allow proposed comprehensive plan amendments to evolve with the review process and in response to feedback by permitting applicants make adjustments or changes, rather than requiring an up or down vote on the original proposal;
 - Eliminate the barrier to areas of the County considered non-exempt under the proffer law; and
 - Eliminate the ban on properties subject to proposed or approved comprehensive plan amendments within the proceeding five years.
- Reduce the level of detail in the Comprehensive Plan;
- Economic development should be made a priority consideration to justify approval of a proposed comprehensive plan amendment; and
- Continue to seek opportunities to streamline the comprehensive plan amendment review process.

Pete Sitnik, 4909 Godfrey Avenue, Alexandria, gave a brief history of his family's resident life in the Fairfax County area. He made reference to the revamping of the Embark Comprehensive Plan Amendment language for Richmond Highway. He also made reference to a VDOT presentation he attended at Mount Vernon High School and complemented the visual informative presentation. However, based on the VDOT presentation, Mr. Sitnik said he learned VDOT was recommending changes to US-1 he was not aware of. Reference was made to super streets and sound barriers. He stated none of this was discussed by Embark or Mount Vernon. He stated this concept was out of sync and wonders if VDOT is collaborating in anyway with County staff. Mr. Sitnik stated it also appeared to him VDOT's concepts may hinder the opportunity for visionary nominations. He said he hoped the Planning Commission assured that VDOT helped and did not hinder the nomination process for the plan amendments.

Jon Clark 7227 Auburn Street, Annandale was with the Mason District Council Board and said that they did a lot of outreach to the community and videotaping. Mr. Clark stated his experience with videotaping various meetings for the certain agencies within the County. He directed the Commission to the number of videos uploaded to YouTube. Mr. Clark stated this was a method of outreach.

Chairman Murphy pointed out that this was another transition the comprehensive plan process. He mentioned some of the various transition periods and times dedicated to the policy plan. Chairman Murphy stated this process would be done one step at a time and would include citizen involvement. The concern was that Fairfax Forward did not appear to be citizen oriented and did not do enough to involve the development community into the process.

Commissioner Migliaccio asked if staff was looking at anything along the way of the other amendment process currently with Fairfax Forward. Mr. Suchicital indicated the only change was the site specific plan amendment process. The work program was still proposed to be in place. He said that Board authorization plan amendments should still be in place and countywide plan amendments still moving forward.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Migliaccio for action on these cases.

//

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As we heard tonight from the speakers in a discussion among Planning Commission members, we have some things we might be able to tweak with this process and take a look at and reexamine one more time. And, as I mentioned earlier, I am going to defer the decision only for this until May 4th. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE TO DEFER DECISION ONLY ON THE MODIFICATIONS TO COMPREHENSIVE

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 4TH, 2017, WITH THE
RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to
defer this study to – with a date certain of May 4th, with the record remaining open for
comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hurley and Strandlie were absent.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 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: Samantha Lawrence

Approved on: July 27, 2017



John W. Cooper, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission