

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2018**

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

ABSENT: Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 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

The Honorable John T. Frey, Clerk of the Circuit Court, performed the swearing-in ceremony for Commissioner Donté Tanner, who had been appointed as Commissioner for the Sully District by Sully District Supervisor Kathy Smith for a four-year term ending in 2021.

//

Commissioner Ulfelder announced his intent to further defer the decision only for PA 2017-II-M1, Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the McLean Community Business Center, Sub-Area 12, at the Planning Commission's meeting on February 1, 2018. He then indicated that the decision would be deferred to a date certain of February 8, 2018, noting that the McLean Citizens Association was scheduled to submit a resolution on the proposed amendment prior to that date and additional time was needed to finalize that resolution.

//

RZ 2017-MA-013/SE 2017-MA-009 – VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, LLC

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a deferral. We were scheduled to have a hearing on the Vulcan Materials Company case tonight. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE TO

DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR RZ 2017-MA-013 AND SE 2017-MA-009 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of deferring those applications of Vulcan Materials Company, RZ 2017-MA-013 and SE 2017-MA-009, to a date certain of March 1<sup>st</sup>, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

CSPA 2004-LE-012 – BOZZUTO MANAGEMENT COMPANY (Decision Only)  
(The public hearing on this application was held on January 11, 2018.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Excuse my voice. I'm getting over a cold, but I do have two decision onlys. If I can have a representative the Beacon of Groveton...

Samantha Steketee, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP: Good evening. My name is Samantha Steketee with Cooley. I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Do you confirm, for the record, your agreement to the proposed development conditions dated December 27<sup>th</sup>, 2017?

Ms. Steketee: The applicant is in agreement with the development conditions dated December 27, 2017.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a very simple case. This CSPA provides the applicant with better and more visible signage along Richmond Highway and signage for the parking entrances to better circulate traffic on-site. It has our professional planning staff approval and the Lee District Land Use Committee approval. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSPA 2004-LE-012, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED DECEMBER 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2017.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CSPA 2004-LE-012, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Tanner: Mr. Chairman, please note that I abstain from that vote.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Tanner abstains.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Tanner abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

SEA 96-L-034-05 – GREENSPRING VILLAGE, INC. (Decision Only)  
(The public hearing on this application was held on January 18, 2018.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Migliaccio: And I have one other decision – decision only this evening. It's an SEA and – for the – Greenspring Village, Inc.

Lynne Strobel, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. My name is Lynne Strobel and I'm a representative of the applicant.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Ms. Strobel, do you...does the applicant confirm, for the record, your agreement to the proposed development conditions dated January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018.

Ms. Strobel: Yes, the applicant agrees with those conditions. Thank you.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this is also another very simple case. This SEA will allow this independent living facility the ability to provide better amenities for its residents and visitors on-site. It provides an expanded aquatics and fitness center, a renovated dining facility, and a parking deck with 42 additional spaces. It enjoys the support of our professional planning staff and the Lee District Land Use Committee. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SEA 96-L-034-05, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JANUARY 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.



Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SEA 96-L-034-05, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstention.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Tanner abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

RZ 2017-SU-025/SE 2017-SU-022 – JSF MANAGEMENT, LLC (Decisions Only)  
(The public hearing on these applications was held on January 11, 2018.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also have a decision only. This is on the JSF Management, LLC case. First, Mr. Chairman, I request that – if a representative of the applicant could come down to the podium.

Samantha Steketee, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP: Good evening. Samantha Steketee with Cooley. I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

Commissioner Hart: And Ms. Steketee, could you confirm, for the record, your agreement to the development conditions now dated December 27, 2017?

Ms. Steketee: Yes, the applicant is in agreement with those development conditions.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, on January 11<sup>th</sup>, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on a combined rezoning and special exception at a difficult, but visually prominent site in the southwest quadrant of the Route 28/29 interchange. The applicant requests approval for a self-storage facility, proposing architectural treatments compatible with adjacent office and retail uses. We had previously deferred the Planning Commission public hearing to work on outstanding issues and twice deferred the decision. I am pleased that we were able to reach a consensus between the applicant and staff in the meantime. I want to thank our staff coordinator, Sharon Williams, for her fine work on this application. I want to thank, also, the applicant and their agents – Molly Novotny, Samantha Steketee, and Mark Looney – for their multiple meetings with the community and continued dialogue with staff, myself, and the supervisor's office during the period of the deferral. Staff's concerns have now been satisfactorily addressed, including confirmation that a contribution to the Centreville Road Fund is not warranted because of the low amount of projected traffic from this use. The applicant also

is reiterating its important commitment to perform a Phase II archeological study. This site is near the Centreville Historic District and fortifications and almost adjacent to the McDonalds where, as the Commission may remember, several Civil War graves unexpectedly were uncovered during construction a number of years ago. The Phase II study should minimize the risk of that situation repeating itself. The applicant also is proffering out retail as a primary use and any SP or SE uses will require a separate application and public hearing process, providing the citizens another opportunity to review traffic and other impacts. The applicant has the support of staff, the West Fairfax County Citizens Association, and a vote of no opposition from Sully District Council and I concur with staff's recommendation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will have three motions. First, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF RZ 2017-SU-025 TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS NOW DATED JANUARY 12, 2018.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2017-SU-025, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Second, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2017-SU-022 TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED DECEMBER 27, 2017.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-SU-022, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstentions on both those cases.

Commissioner Hart: And finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF BARRIER REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THAT DEPICTED ON THE GDP/SE PLAT.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.



Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstention.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you.

Each motion carried by a vote of 10-0-1. Commissioner Tanner abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND REDUCTIONS
2. PA 2013-I-L1 (B) – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (LINCOLNIA PLANNING STUDY PHASE II) (Mason District)
3. PA 2017-III-T1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (SUNSET HILLS REALIGNMENT) (Hunter Mill)

This order was accepted without objection.

Chairman Murphy called the first case on the agenda

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND REDUCTIONS – To amend Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: modify Chapter 112 and Appendix Q (Land Development Services Fee Schedule) of the Fairfax County Code to add flexibility to the regulatory process by eliminating the need for some parking reductions, providing for administrative approval of some parking reductions currently requiring Board of Supervisors (Board) approval, and providing for Board approval of parking reductions ineligible for consideration under the current parking reduction provisions. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

John Friedman, Site Code Research & Development Branch, Land Development Services, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of proposed zoning ordinance amendment.

When Commissioner Sargeant asked for additional information regarding how staff had compiled the parking and traffic data that was utilized to finalize the language of the proposed amendment, Mr. Friedman explained the following:

- The parking data had been gathered from multiple developments, which were located in transit station areas (TSA);
- The parking data for multi-family residential developments was gathered from four sites, each of which were located approximately 0.5 miles from an existing transit station;
- The data gathered from those sites was incorporated into the revised parking formulas articulated in the proposed amendment and staff concluded that the revised formulas provided for adequate parking at those sites;
- The amount of parking at three of the four multi-family residential developments evaluated by staff contained excessive parking and staff concluded that the parking provisions under the revised formula remained feasible;
- The average parking reductions that had been requested by for multi-family residential development in TSAs under the existing provisions was approximately 20 percent and the average reduction permitted under the revised provisions was approximately 15 percent;
- The parking data for commercial development was gathered from 10 sites located in areas such as Tysons, Merrifield, Reston, Herdon, and Fair Oaks prior to the construction of the Silver Line Metrorail; and
- The existing parking provisions for commercial development required 2.33 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area and after calculating the average demand for the 10 sites that were studied, staff determined that the revised formulas provided adequate parking.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Friedman regarding the accuracy of staff's estimates in determining the amount of parking for a development in the TSA and the extent to which the revised formula for calculating parking compared to neighboring jurisdictions wherein Mr. Friedman confirmed that the parking provisions that would be implemented under the revised formulas were comparable to those of neighboring jurisdictions.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that the staff report referenced the flexibility of parking provisions for certain developments, such as excess parking in areas adjacent to the effected site. He then asked for additional information on how such a scenario would operate under the revised provisions. Mr. Friedman said that the existing provisions permitted parking on adjacent sites that were undergoing development, provided that there was an agreement between the property owners. However, he noted that such a provision was rarely utilized because such agreements limited a property owner's ability to reclaim the parking provided to a neighbor. Mr. Friedman



then stated that the proposed amendment would provide greater flexibility in establishing a period of time in which the parking agreement were implemented.

In response to questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Mr. Friedman confirmed that the formulas for determining parking provisions within a TSA that were included in the proposed amendment were more conservative than the reductions that had been previously approved by the Board of Supervisors. He also indicated that there were established standards for determining the amount of parking for a development in a TSA.

Commissioner Hurley expressed concern regarding the negative economic impact that permitting reduced parking would incur on commercial development in TSAs, stating that limited parking availability could discourage prospective customers. She also noted the importance of promoting the viability of businesses to residents who did not reside near TSAs. Commissioner Hurley then announced her intent to abstain from the vote on the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that the parking provisions for places of worship were often insufficient during peak demand periods, such as holidays or events, and the overflow parking frequently incurred a negative impact on surrounding areas. He then asked whether such a facility that had been permitted by a special permit or special exception would be subject to a public hearing if a parking reduction were requested. Mr. Friedman indicated that the revised formulas for determining adequate parking applied exclusively to TSAs and would not affect the existing standards for places of worship. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Friedman, with input from Commissioner Ulfelder, regarding the proposed amendment's impact on the parking standards for places of worship and the process for such facilities in requesting a parking reduction wherein Mr. Friedman indicated the following:

- The proposed amendment included textual revisions to the language pertaining to parking at places of worship;
- The revisions included in the amendment did not substantially modify the standards for parking at existing places of worship operating under a special exception or a special permit; and
- The request for a parking reduction at a place of worship operating under a special exception or a special permit could not be approved administratively and would be subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner concurred with the intent of the proposed amendment and commended staff for their analysis, adding that the amendment was consistent with the County's ongoing efforts to promote development in TSAs. However, he expressed concern regarding the impact that such parking reductions would incur on surrounding areas. A discussion between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Friedman regarding the process for monitoring the effects of the proposed amendment, the challenges associated with monitoring such impacts, and the monitoring efforts that would be conducted in conjunction with subsequent revisions to the



Zoning Ordinance wherein Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner said that he supported the amendment, but favored evaluating possible mechanisms for monitoring the associated impact.

When Commissioner Strandlie asked for additional information regarding the extent to which the provisions of the proposed amendment applied to pending applications, Mr. Friedman indicated that the amendment would not apply to applications that were under review prior to approval, adding that those applications would require approval by the Board of Supervisors in the event that a parking reduction was requested. In addition, Mr. Friedman said that there would be a process for vacating previously-approved parking reductions at sites that utilized the previous parking standards that would no longer be applicable under those prescribed by the amendment. However, he noted that parking standards that had been approved under proffers or other provisions that established parking at a development would be required to utilize a proffer condition amendment.

Commissioner Strandlie stated that certain areas of the County did not contain high-density urban areas, such as those in Mosaic or Reston. She then aligned herself with Commissioner Hurley's concern regarding the availability of parking at businesses located in TSAs and the potential impact that reducing the amount of parking would incur. In addition, Commissioner Strandlie indicated that the City of Alexandria had documented a decreased demand for parking due to the presence of the Metrorail and developers had expressed concern regarding the cost of complying with the existing parking standards. When she asked whether staff had coordinated with the City of Alexandria during the evaluation of the proposed amendment, Mr. Friedman said that staff had not directly coordinated with the City of Alexandria, but data from that area had been utilized in determining the provisions articulated within the amendment. He also noted the challenges associated with monitoring the effects that modified parking standards had incurred on an area. Commissioner Strandlie added that staff from the City of Alexandria had indicated that issues attributed parking would be monitored.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Friedman regarding the importance of transportation demand management (TDM) programs, the range or provisions utilized by such programs at various sites, the impact of those programs on parking, the process for implementing those programs, and the efforts to monitor the effectiveness of the programs wherein Mr. Friedman said the following:

- The provisions included within TDM programs varied by the constraints and challenges of a particular site;
- The revised parking provisions articulated in the proposed amendment were consistent with the standards of such TDM programs;
- The correlation between trip reductions and parking requirements was difficult to determine and there were no existing methods to connect those provisions;



- The TDM programs frequently utilized by developments required provisions that demonstrated the parking needs of that development could be met in the event that the program did not reduce demand; and
- The inclusion of parking reductions in TDM programs was unfeasible.

Commissioner Sargeant noted that individual members of the Board of Supervisors retained the authority to authorize a parking reduction for a particular application. He then expressed concern that such a practice would establish inconsistent standards for permitting such reductions at TSA sites. Mr. Friedman described the process that applicants would utilize for requesting a parking reduction and the process staff utilized for evaluating that request, noting that such requests were determined on a case-by-case basis. He then stated that the intent of the proposed amendment was to reduce the need for such requests by providing revised guidelines for parking in TSA areas, which would establish consistent standards for such areas. Mr. Friedman added that the proposed amendment did not prohibit applicants from requesting further reductions at rates below those prescribed by the amendment.

Commissioner Carter expressed support for the proposed amendment, stating that the revised standards were consistent with those utilized by other jurisdictions. He also pointed out that those standards varied based on a site's proximity to the District of Columbia, noting that those located closer to the District were subject to additional standards.

Commissioner Carter aligned himself with Commissioner Sargeant's comments regarding the importance of effective TDM programs.

Commissioner Carter pointed out that the proposed amendment contained a provision that precluded a parking reduction for areas located near a Residential Permit Parking District. He then expressed concern regarding the impact of such a provision, noting that the boundaries of such districts were subject to modifications after a development was approved. He suggested that additional language be incorporated into the proposed amendment to address that issue. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Carter and Mr. Friedman regarding the extent to which staff had considered the issue of changing Residential Permit Parking District in finalizing the proposed amendment wherein Commissioner Carter reiterated his support for incorporating additional language to address the issue.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked for additional information on the provision stating that sites located within 1,000 feet of a Residential Permit Parking District were precluded from obtaining a parking reduction under the proposed amendment. Mr. Friedman explained that the provision had been recommended by the Fairfax County Department of Transportation and indicated that the 1,000-foot limit reflected extensive evaluation of the operation of such districts. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Friedman regarding the possibility of Residential Permit Parking Districts being modified after a development was completed, the potential recourse for developers seeking a parking reduction in such a scenario, and the process for addressing complaints on the limited availability of parking at a development wherein Mr. Friedman indicated the following:



- The evaluation of a site being considered for a parking reduction would include staff coordination with the district Supervisor's office to ensure that an area was adequately evaluated prior to the approval of a parking reduction;
- The approval of a parking reduction for a development could include conditions;
- The proposed amendment would modify the base parking requirements for TSAs, but the existing guidelines for permitting a parking reduction outside such areas would be retained.

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

Scott Adams, 1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800, Tysons, representing the National Association for Industrial and Office Parks, spoke in support of the proposed amendment because it would provide greater flexibility for development within TSAs. He added that the amendment was consistent with ongoing efforts to modify the parking standards for TSAs, pointing out that there was an ongoing trend towards utilizing less parking within such areas. Mr. Adams requested clarification regarding the method for determining parking provisions for eating establishments, which differed from the standards utilized by other commercial uses. He also voiced support for the procedures for obtaining a parking reduction articulated in the proposed amendment, stating that such procedures reflected the unique challenges associated with mixed-use development. In addition, Mr. Adams asked for clarification on the impact the amendment would incur for sites that had a previously-approved parking reduction under the existing standards and the process for obtaining a subsequent reduction under the revised standards.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Adams regarding the emerging trends in the types of transportation utilized within TSAs, the trends in parking demand for restaurant uses located with TSAs, and the overall trends in traffic patterns around TSAs wherein Mr. Adams said that the parking provisions for a restaurant within a TSA were determined on a case-by-case basis, adding that restaurant owners in TSAs had testified that the demand for parking had decreased as customers utilized different transportation methods.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Mr. Friedman, who addressed concerns from Commissioners regarding the impact of the process for obtaining a parking reduction for sites located near Residential Permit Parking Districts by explaining the following:

- The provision articulated within the amendment that precluded a parking reduction request for sites located near such areas would apply at the time when the boundaries of the Residential Permit Parking Districts were finalized; and
- The modification of the boundaries of a Residential Permit Parking Districts would not impact a parking reduction that had been previously approved.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Friedman regarding the ability of a development to modify a Residential Permit Parking Districts after a parking reduction request was approved wherein Mr. Friedman stated that approved parking reductions on neighboring sites would not hinder the ability of those sites to modify such districts.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Sargeant for action on this item.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to defer this decision on this matter for a while, just so we can clarify some issues and address some of the questions and comments we've heard during the testimony tonight – and questions by my fellow Planning Commissioners. With that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ONLY ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN APPENDIX Q OF THE COUNTY CODE, REGARDING PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND REDUCTIONS, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF FEBRUARY 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on the zoning ordinance amendment regarding parking requirements and reductions to a date certain of February 1<sup>st</sup>, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Sargeant: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PA 2013-I-L1 (B) – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT  
(LINCOLNIA PLANNING STUDY PHASE II) – To consider  
proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County,  
VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter  
22. This Amendment concerns approx. 169 ac. in the Mason  
Supervisor District with an irregular border on both sides of Little



River Turnpike (Rte. 236) from the City of Alexandria boundary to Chowan Ave. The subject area extends as far north as Lincolnia Road and Wingate Street; south to 8th Street east of Manitoba Street; and south of Fran Place west of Manitoba Street. The amendment will consider designating the area as a Community Business Center (CBC) to facilitate consideration of alternative mixed use scenarios in a subsequent phase of study. The amendment will also consider designating a Revitalization Area coterminous with the CBC boundary. Lastly, the amendment will consider adding a Comprehensive Plan option for approx. 2 acres of tax map parcel 72-4 ((1)) 3 (Plaza at Landmark). The option would allow hotel and/or assisted living use at an intensity up to 3.0 FAR. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Michael Burton, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of proposed plan amendment PA 2013-I-L1 (B).

When Commissioner Strandlie asked how the task force had determined that designating a portion of the subject property as a community business center was warranted, Mr. Burton explained the following:

- The task force coordinated with staff to evaluate the high-intensity uses located around the intersection of Little River Turnpike and North Beauregard Street;
- The preservation of existing residential development in the area was a significant factor during that evaluation process;
- The task force studied various portions of the subject property and considered various uses;
- The detailed land use analysis of the site had not been conducted, but would occur during the Phase III portion of the study; and
- The surrounding community had expressed support for redeveloping and revitalizing the subject property.

Commissioner Strandlie pointed out that the area around the subject property was subject to significant traffic congestion and asked staff to address how the proposed amendment would address that issue. Kirstin Calkins, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), indicated that an analysis of the existing traffic conditions around the site was ongoing. She then stated that the area was subject to significant challenges for vehicular traffic, such as the proximity of Lincolnia Road and I-395. In addition, she said that the congestion at that intersection hindered the operation of the existing commercial development around the area, adding that such congestion negatively impacted the ability of pedestrians to



navigate the area. Ms. Calkins also pointed out that the areas were subject to frequent bus traffic, which further hindered the traffic. She then stated that designating the subject property as a Community Business Center (CBC) would provide opportunities to implement a comprehensive strategy for mitigating traffic throughout the area. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Ms. Calkins regarding the possibility of modifying the intersections around the area that had been subject to significant traffic congestion, the possibility of installing overpasses, and the cost of such modifications wherein Ms. Calkins pointed out the following:

- The Comprehensive Plan had identified the intersection of Little River Turnpike and North Beauregard Street as an area in need of improvements; and
- The intersection was the subject of an ongoing study by FCDOT to evaluate potential improvements to the function of the traffic signals in the area.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for additional information regarding the criteria for designating a site as a CBC and how the subject property had met that criteria. Mr. Burton explained that the Comprehensive Plan defined CBC areas as those containing high-intensity uses that would be suitable for mixed-use development at an appropriate scale, adding that the types of development that were under consideration for a site was subject to significant coordination with the surrounding community. He said that the intent of the proposed amendment was to establish the CBC with the support of the community and indicated that additional details about the type of development that would be considered for the site would occur during Phase III. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Burton regarding staff's coordination with the surrounding community in considering the site for CBC designation wherein Mr. Burton echoed remarks from Ms. Calkins regarding the existing transportation issues in the area, adding that designating the site as a CBC would provide additional opportunities to coordinate with the community to address traffic concerns and the boundary of the proposed CBC was intended to permit sufficient space to address such issues.

Commissioner Cortina stated that she supported efforts to revitalize the subject property. She also noted the significant safety hazards for pedestrians attempting to access the existing commercial development, noting the frequency of accidents in the area. She then encouraged FCDOT to evaluate that issue when considering revitalization efforts for the site, adding that there were existing pedestrian paths connecting with the City of Alexandria that could be utilized to improve safety. Ms. Calkins indicated that there had been coordination with transportation staff at the City of Alexandria to evaluate potential improvements to pedestrian paths in the area, adding that pedestrian access to the site would be a significant consideration in determining an appropriate development for the site.

Referring to the map of the subject property on page 12, which depicted the boundary of the proposed CBC and the areas that were subject to revised land use recommendations under the proposed amendment, Commissioner Hart pointed out that the portion of the site identified as Area 5 was located near the intersection of Little River Turnpike and I-395. He then asked for additional information regarding the existing condition of that area. Mr. Burton indicated that the area encompassed the southeastern portion of the existing shopping center. He also noted that the proposed amendment would not establish a defined boundary for that area and the boundary



included on the map was a general area of approximately two acres. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Burton regarding the proximity of Area 5 to I-395 and the accessibility of Area 5 by vehicle wherein Mr. Burdon indicated that the accessibility of Area 5 would not be modified under the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the 3.0 floor area ratio (FAR) recommendation for Area 5 that was articulated in the proposed amendment, stating that the size of the site made developing that area difficult. Mr. Burton said that the 3.0 FAR recommendation for Area 5 would be subject to further evaluation during Phase III and could subsequently be modified, adding that including that recommendation had been included in the proposed amendment to ensure the area met the exemption criteria for the proffer legislation that had been passed by the State of Virginia. He also pointed out that development options for Area 5 would not be finalized until an impact analysis was conducted in conjunction with Phase III. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Burton, with input from Commissioner Hart, regarding the possibility of modifying the portion of the site that would be designated for redevelopment at a 3.0 FAR, the purpose for establishing a 3.0 FAR as the recommended density for those areas, and the instances in which similar situations had occurred at other sites wherein Mr. Burdon stated that subsequent modifications to the land use recommendations for various areas of the subject property was possible.

Commissioner Carter suggested that staff provide more detailed depictions of the boundaries of the CBC, stating that the depictions in the staff report were not sufficiently precise in identifying the areas under consideration.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner, Mr. Burton confirmed that assigning the 3.0 FAR for the areas of the site that would be subject to revised land use recommendations had been included to satisfy the minimum requirements for a CBC. He also indicated that utilizing a higher density recommendations did not significantly impact the evaluation process for considering appropriate revitalization measures for the site.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Burton, with input from Marianne Gardner, PD, DPZ, regarding the purpose for assigning the 3.0 FAR to Area 5 of the subject property within the proposed amendment wherein Mr. Burton and Ms. Gardner stated the following:

- The evaluation conducted by staff concluded that a 3.0 FAR was an appropriate density for redevelopment efforts in the CBC, but the details of that development would be finalized after subsequent evaluations were conducted during Phase III;
- The recommended redevelopment options for the site that had been articulated in the proposed Plan text included the potential development of an assisted living facility, a hotel, and mixed-use development with ground-floor retail;
- The existing Plan text recommended that the site be developed with retail use;



- The recommended development options articulated in the Plan text were selected by staff with the intent that such options would not negatively impact the existing traffic conditions around the site; and
- The potential development options included in the proposed amendment would be subject to further evaluation in Phase III.

Commissioner Strandlie indicated that redevelopment of the site would potentially modify the ingress/egress provisions for the site and supported evaluating those provisions during Phase III.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Daren Shumate, 3920 Melvern Place, Alexandria, representing Lincolnia Planning District Study Task Force, stated that he was the Chairman of the task force. He then voiced support for the proposed amendment. Mr. Shumate described the history of the task force, stating that there had been multiple meetings over an eight-month timeframe to discuss the outstanding issues surrounding the subject property. He then said that the task force coordinated with the community to document their various concerns, adding that a public hearing had been conducted in June 2017 to receive input. Mr. Shumate added that the task force had met with the Lee District Land Use Committee to convey the issues raised at various meetings. He said that the task force supported staff's recommendations for the subject property, adding that the task force would address the concerns that Commissioner Hart had raised regarding the FAR recommendations for Area 5.

When Commissioner Tanner asked for additional information regarding the concerns of the surrounding community that the task force had encountered, Mr. Shumate stated the primary concerns documented by the community included the membership of the task force and the density that would be permitted on the site. He indicated that the task force had addressed some of the concerns regarding density for certain residents. In addition, he said that the task force supported a redevelopment of the site similar to that of the Mosaic development in Merrifield. Mr. Shumate also noted that existing traffic congestion in the area had been a primary concern of the community.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Mr. Burton, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for action on this item.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to make a motion tonight. Michael and Marianne, is it possible to amend that chart on page 12 before it goes to the Board? Great, thank you. The Lincolnia Planning Study was authorized by the Board of Supervisors on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013 as part of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Work Program. The first phase, which



updated the Comprehensive Plan guidance for the Lincolnia Planning District was completed with Board of Supervisor approval on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015. This, the second and current phase, focuses on whether a portion of the planning district should be re-designated from a suburban neighborhood to a community business center. Phase II started with a land college 101, followed by Supervisor Penny Gross appointing a task force, consisting of eight community members. Over the past year, the group has held 16 public meetings, meeting twice on – during most months – and also the community engagement session in June. The task force engaged in and received a significant amount of community input, as our Chairman just described. Using a variety of means for public engagement, outreach extended to the City of Alexandria, which boundaries abut this area. The Urban Land Institute assessed challenges and opportunities under consideration by the task force. Based on this extensive review process, and the understanding that further analysis of land use outcomes would occur in Phase II, the Lincolnia Task Force unanimously recommend:

- One, designated a portion of the Lincolnia Planning District as a CBC;
- Two, designating the proposed CBC area as a revitalization area; and
- Three, adding a plan option for an approximate two-acre area within the CBC to allow for high-intensity use for a hotel, assisted living, or a mix thereof.

If the CBC is approved by the Planning Commission and then by the Board of Supervisors, the task force will then begin in spring of this year Phase III of the Lincolnia Planning District study, outlining at that time a plan for future development and adding the detail that we seek for the land use options to the new CBC. Before I make motions, first, I would like to thank the task force members of their service. If any task force members who are here tonight, please stand and be recognized. We have the Chair, Daren Shumate, Rita Zimmerman, who is not here, Nazir Bhagat, who is traveling, Debbie Gerald, Fred Cornett, Matt Lyttle, Kathy King, and Alan Ackerman. Thank you very much for your service. Next, I would like to recognize and thank for their outstanding work members of the Fairfax County staff, some of whom have moved since the project started last spring, from the Department of Planning and Zoning, Faheem Darab, who was the original project manager who had moved in October, Indrani Sistla (sic), the Branch Chief, and she moved in August, Marianne Gardner, who is a veteran of the Seven Corners Planning Process and guided this seamlessly, and Michael Burton. Thank you very much for your service. And it was a very successful outcome and we look forward to the next phases. Just waiting for this to come back up, Therefore, Mr. Chairman, staff has provided a recommendation of approval for the designation of a community business center, a coterminous designation of a revitalization area, and the addition of an option to the Plan guidance for either hotel use, assisted living use, or a combination thereof at a maximum 3.0 FAR to approximate two acres of parcel 72-4 ((1)) 3. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF PLAN AMENDMENT 2013-I-L1 (B), PER THE RECOMMENDATION IN THE STAFF REPORT, DATED JANUARY 2, 2018.

Commissioners Niedzielski-Eichner and Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. Subject to some reworking of the figure on page 12 to get rid of the circles, somehow?

Commissioner Strandlie: As we previously discussed, SUBJECT TO THE REWORKING OF THAT CIRCLE ON PAGE 12.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve Plan Amendment PA 2013-I-L1 (B) on the Lincolnia Planning Study, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PA 2017-III-T1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT  
(SUNSET HILLS REALIGNMENT) – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment concerns the planned transportation improvements for Sunset Hills Road at the intersection with Hunter Mill Road, Tax Maps 18-3 and 18-4, in the Hunter Mill Supervisor District. The amendment will consider realigning the planned improvement of Sunset Hills Road to intersect with Hunter Mill Road at Crowell Road. Additional transportation recommendations may be modified. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kirstin Calkins, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended adoption of proposed plan amendment PA 2017-III-T1.

Referring to the depiction of staff's preferred design for the realignment of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road on page 13 of the staff report, Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for clarification on whether left turns in the existing condition of Hunter Mill Road would be



removed. Ms. Calkins indicated that the existing left-turn lane that permitted vehicular access to Sunset Hills Road would be removed under the proposed realignment.

When Commissioner Hart asked for additional information regarding the final condition of the portion of Sunset Hills Road that would be abandoned after the proposed realignment with Hunter Mill Road was installed, Ms. Calkins indicated that a small portion of the road would be maintained to permit access to the existing Reston Presbyterian Church that was located near the existing intersection. She also indicated that the map would be subsequently revised to indicate that the abandoned portion of Sunset Hills Road would no longer access Hunter Mill Road. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Calkins regarding the potential uses for the portion of Sunset Hills Road that would be maintained near the church wherein Ms. Calkins said that staff did not object to including additional text that delineated the purpose of the remaining road after the proposed realignment was installed.

Commissioner Cortina pointed out that the planned route for Sunset Hills Road depicted in the proposed amendment would traverse significant portions of undeveloped properties in the area located to the north of the existing road. She then expressed concern regarding the impact that the proposed realignment would have on those properties and asked for additional information regarding the development plan for those areas. Ms. Calkins said that the areas that the realigned road would traverse were planned for residential development at a density of approximately one dwelling unit per acre under the existing recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan, adding that the proposed amendment would not modify those recommendations. She also indicated that the proposed realignment would not preclude the owners of those properties from developing those areas in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Calkins regarding the possibility of subsequent development along the revised route for Sunset Hills Road and the ability to provide access to that development from the road wherein Ms. Calkins indicated that the road would be designed to permit access to the various parcels in the event they were developed.

Commissioner Cortina pointed out that Crowell Road was subject to significant traffic congestion. She also expressed concern that the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road would incur additional traffic from vehicles avoiding the Dulles Toll Road. Ms. Calkins stated that staff had evaluated the intersection at Crowell Road to determine the potential impact of the realignment. She then said that staff had concluded that the realignment would not incur a significant traffic increase at the intersection with Crowell Road. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Calkins regarding the possibility that the impact on Crowell Road could be greater than that determined by staff, the possibility that Crowell Road could be utilized as an alternative route for vehicles avoiding the Dulles Toll Road, and the existing condition of Crowell Road wherein Ms. Calkins stated that the condition of Crowell Road and planned improvements to other roads would discourage vehicles from using the road as an alternate route.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Calkins explained the following:



- The County did not own any of the land located north of the existing road that would be necessary for installing the realigned intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road;
- The process of acquiring the land necessary to construct the proposed realignment had not begun and would be discussed at later stages of the design process for the realignment;
- The evaluations conducted by staff on the various options for the realignment had determined that the design depicted in the proposed amendment was the most feasible; and
- The topography along the planned route for Sunset Hills Road under the realignment varied and significant grading would be necessary to install the road.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Calkins regarding the existing traffic patterns along Crowell Road and the overall traffic flow at the intersection of Crowell Road and Hunter Mill Road wherein Ms. Calkins said that a traffic signal had been installed at the intersection in conjunction with the opening of the nearby Oakcrest School and staff had determined that the signal was more effective at facilitating traffic flow than the previous measures.

Commissioner Ulfelder aligned himself with Commissioner Cortina's remarks regarding the significant traffic congestion that occurred along Crowell Road during peak traffic periods and the possibility that vehicles would utilize Crowell Road as an alternative route, adding that the road would be subject to greater traffic congestion in the event that an accident occurred on the Dulles Toll Road.

Commissioner Tanner asked for additional information on the condition of the land that would be utilized to construct the realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road and the potential environmental impact that would be incurred by constructing the realignment. Ms. Calkins stated that the land was located within the Difficult Run watershed, but indicated that the construction of the realignment would include stormwater mitigation provisions. She added that there were outstanding plans to improve the stormwater management provisions in the area and the installation of the realignment would present opportunities to coordinate on those improvements. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Tanner and Ms. Calkins regarding the extent to which condition of the land and the environmental impact of the proposed realignment had been studied wherein Ms. Calkins stated that studies of the area were limited during the plan amendment stage.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Robert Architect, 11619 Hunting Crest Lane, Vienna, stated that he supported deferral of the decision only for the proposed amendment until the impact of the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road on the Difficult Run watershed was evaluated. He



expressed concern that the installation of the realignment would negatively impact the existing stream system, which fed into a pond located within the area that mitigated flooding. In addition, Mr. Architect said that there was an existing stormwater management facility located in that area and installation of the road would elevate the risk of flooding. He then described the existing pond and stormwater management facility in the area that the proposed realignment would traverse, noting that elevated flood risks in the area would negatively impact the surrounding property values and insurance rates. Mr. Architect stated that he favored alternative designs for the realignment, such as widening both Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road. In addition, he suggested that staff conduct subsequent studies on the Difficult Run watershed. (A copy of Mr. Architect's statement is in the date file.)

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Architect regarding the location of the existing pond in the area that the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road would traverse wherein Commissioner Hart requested that staff clarify the location of the pond during the deferral period.

Benise Ungar, 11619 Hunting Crest Lane, representing the Hunting Creek Homeowners Association (HCHOA), voiced opposition to the proposed amendment. She described the history of transportation improvements around the intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road, noting that various improvements to the roads had been approved in the Comprehensive Plan, but were not implemented. Ms. Ungar echoed remarks from Mr. Architect, saying that she favored alternative designs for the proposed realignment, such as widening both roads. She added that widening Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road was less costly than constructing the realignment depicted in the proposed amendment. In addition, she stated that widening the roads would improve the flow of traffic along both roads. Ms. Ungar said that she did not concur with staff's conclusions that the alternative options articulated in the staff report were not feasible. She also indicated that the HCHOA had expressed support for multiple options other than widening Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road. In addition, she noted the difficulty of purchasing the required land for the proposed realignment compared to the widening of the existing roads. Ms. Ungar also aligned herself with concerns from Mr. Architect regarding the impact the proposed realignment would incur on the Difficult Run watershed, adding that the relocation of various infrastructure associated with the road would increase the extent of that impact. She stated that the proposed alignment would not alleviate the existing traffic congestion along Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road. In addition, she indicated that staff had not provided sufficient justification for rejecting the alternatives that had been favored by the HCHOA. She added that the proposed realignment would negatively impact the operation of the existing Reston Presbyterian Church and commuters who worked throughout the area. In conclusion, Ms. Ungar said that the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed alignment had not been demonstrated and reiterated the HCHOA's support of efforts to widen the existing roads. (A copy of Ms. Ungar's statement is in the date file.)

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Ungar, with input from Ms. Calkins, regarding the location of the Hunting Creek community and the alternative designs that the community favored for improving the traffic flow throughout the area.



A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Ms. Calkins, with input from Ms. Ungar, regarding the alternative realignment designs that the HCHOA supported, the reason that staff had not supported those design, and the challenges associated with installing a roundabout wherein Ms. Calkins indicated that one of the options that the HCHOA supported utilized a roundabout at the existing intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Drive, but staff did not support that option because of the potential impact on the Reston Presbyterian Church and the amount of the land necessary to construct a roundabout at that area was not available.

Answering questions from Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner, Ms. Calkins indicated that the owners of the Reston Presbyterian Church had not expressed an interest in moving, but supported the proposed realignment. She also stated that the existing owners of the properties that would need to be acquired did not object to the proposed alignment.

John Mansfield, 1503 Brookmeade Place, Vienna, voiced support for the proposed amendment because it adequately addressed the outstanding concerns for mitigating traffic congestion along Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Drive. He acknowledged the challenges associated with installing the proposed realignment, but pointed out there would be additional opportunities to improve the design of the alignment and address the concerns regarding the potential environmental impact. In addition, Mr. Mansfield noted the limited development potential on the existing area on which the realignment would be constructed. He also indicated that his community supported the installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Drive.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Mansfield regarding the location of his community wherein Mr. Mansfield described the size of his community and the proximity of his community to the proposed realignment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Mansfield regarding the current zoning of the land that would need to be acquired to install the proposed realignment, the ownership status of that land, and the possibility that the land would be developed by the owners wherein Mr. Mansfield said that the land was zoned R-E and the current owners had not expressed an interest in developing the land.

Jody Bennett, 1459 Hunter View Farms, Vienna, representing the Hunter Mill Defense League (HMDL), spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment and supported deferring the decision only on the amendment at the conclusion of the public hearing. She added that the HMDL would conduct a community meeting on the subject application to discuss outstanding concerns and address the issues that had been raised at the public hearing. She also requested that the Planning Commission defer the decision only to a date that permitted sufficient time for the HMDL to conduct such a meeting. Ms. Bennett described the existing condition of the intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Drive, echoing remarks from previous speakers regarding the significant traffic congestion at that intersection. She expressed concern about staff's preference for a roundabout at the intersection instead of a four-way intersection, stating that the design for such a feature had not been adequately studied. Ms. Bennett stated that staff had not provided sufficient justification to warrant recommending a roundabout at the intersection, adding that



such a preference had not been communicated to the public. She also pointed out that the language and depictions of the roundabout for the intersection at Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Drive did not provide adequate information on the designs or feasibility of the roundabout. Ms. Bennett then suggested that the language of the proposed amendment be modified to include more concise depictions of the intersection and that staff would continue coordinating with the surrounding community to address the outstanding concerns of that intersection. In addition, she voiced concerns that realigning Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road, as depicted in the staff report, would incur higher-density development throughout the area and recommended that the proposed amendment articulate that the areas along the realigned road would favor low-density residential development. Ms. Bennett also echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the impact the realignment would incur on Crowell Road. She indicated that the community would continue coordinating with staff to modify the language of the proposed amendment to address the outstanding issues associated with the realigned intersection and Crowell Road. (A copy of Ms. Bennett's statement is in the date file.)

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Bennett regarding the community's support for realigning Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road, the community's support for a roundabout at that intersection, the frequency with which the design for the intersection had been modified, the difficulty associated with installing roundabouts, and the extent to which the language in the proposed amendment favored the installation of a roundabout wherein Ms. Bennett described the history of the intersection, noting that previous plans for a roundabout and traffic signal had been revised on multiple occasions.

Commissioner Hart asked for additional information regarding why a roundabout for the intersection of Crowell Road and Hunter Mill Drive that had been included with a previous application associated with Oakcrest School was not implemented. Ms. Calkins confirmed that the roundabout was not implemented because the necessary land could not be acquired. When Commissioner Hart asked for additional information regarding the flexibility of the language of the proposed amendment in promoting both a roundabout and a four-lane traffic signal for the intersection, Ms. Calkins and Leonard Wolfenstein, FCDOT, explained the following:

- The County's Transportation Plan Map did not depict the final designs for intersections and such depictions were usually included in the Plan text for those intersections;
- The language in the proposed amendment was intended to provide flexibility for the final design of the realigned intersection;
- The language in the proposed amendment provided sufficient provisions to ensure that both a roundabout and a four-way traffic signal would be evaluated for the intersection;
- The modification of the language in the proposed amendment to strengthen the provisions for evaluating both a roundabout and a four-way traffic signal was not opposed by staff; and



- The intent of the language in the proposed amendment was to ensure that both a roundabout and a four-way traffic signal were considered for the realignment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Calkins, with input from Ms. Bennett, regarding the purview of the proposed amendment, the impact that the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road on the uses throughout the surrounding area, and the outstanding issues associated with the intersection wherein Ms. Calkins indicated that the scope of the proposed amendment was limited to realignment of the intersection and any modifications to the land around the realigned roads were beyond the scope of the amendment.

Commissioner Cortina pointed out that the language of the proposed amendment that depicted the design and route of the realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road was worded to permit flexibility and accommodate a more extensive review process for the final design. She also noted the condition of the land along the planned route for Sunset Hills Road, noting that the recommendations for developing that land were tentative. Ms. Calkins confirmed that the recommendations for that land were articulated in the existing Plan text and the scope of the proposed amendment was limited to providing appropriate guidance for the proposed realignment.

Commissioner Hurley noted that the installation of a roundabout at the realigned intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road would require more land compared to the installation of a traffic signal. She then asked for additional information on why staff had expressed support for a roundabout over a traffic signal. Ms. Calkins explained that there were ongoing efforts to mitigate the existing traffic congestion at the proposed intersection and while the installation of a traffic signal had been evaluated, staff concluded that a roundabout was preferred because it provided a buffer between the lower-density development to the north and the higher-density development to the south. She added that previous efforts to install a roundabout at the proposed intersection had been associated with rezoning and special exception applications, but the effort associated with the proposed amendment would be implemented by the County in conjunction with effected property owners. In addition, Ms. Calkins said that staff had concluded that the roundabout would more efficiently facilitate traffic flow throughout the corridor and comply with the community's goals of to differentiate the character of the areas to the north of the intersection with that of the areas to the south.

When Commissioner Hurley asked why staff had concluded that widening Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road was unfeasible, Ms. Calkins explained that staff had evaluated that option, but it was determined that there was not sufficient space along the roads to accommodate such a widening. She also indicated that such a widening would not complement the operation of the traffic signals at the existing intersection and the intersection to the south, adding that such a scenario would incur greater congestion. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Calkins regarding the traffic conditions at the existing intersections, the operation of the traffic signals at those intersections, and the existing recommendations for Hunter Mill Road within the Comprehensive Plan wherein Ms. Calkins noted the limited space for vehicles to stack at those intersections and confirmed that the existing Plan text did not recommend widening Hunter Mill Road beyond the existing intersection with Sunset Hills Road.



Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Robert Thornton, 534 Castle Mountain Road, Castleton, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment. He acknowledged the significant congestion at the existing intersection and the previous efforts to improve that intersection, but expressed concern that the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road would impact Hunter Mill Road's status as a Virginia Byway.

Addressing Mr. Thornton's concerns regarding Hunter Mill Road's status as a Virginia Byway, Ms. Calkins indicated that staff would evaluate that issue during the deferral period, but noted that a road's designation as a Virginia Byway did not affect the County's ability to modify the necessary sections of the road to accommodate the realignment with Sunset Hills Road.

Continuing his testimony, Mr. Thornton also expressed concern regarding the impact that the proposed realignment would incur on the development of the surrounding area and supported denial of the proposed amendment.

Robert Whitfield, 1587 Inlet Court, Reston, stated that he supported improving the existing conditions around Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road, but did not support the installation of a roundabout. He pointed out that the design for the realignment had not been finalized and the proposed amendment did not provide adequate details for those designs. He also stated that there were existing plans for commercial development along Sunset Hills Road and noted the need to improve the road prior to the implementation of those developments. Mr. Whitfield described the operation of roundabouts, pointing out that such features required significant amounts of land. He suggested that staff evaluate alternative measures for improving the intersection, such as reconfiguring the connections of the Dulles Toll Road with Hunter Mill Road.

Bruce Bennett, 1459 Hunter View Farms, Vienna, voiced opposition to the proposed amendment. He described the previous effort to install a roundabout at the intersection of Crowell Road and Hunter Mill Road in association with Oakcrest School, noting that the roundabout was not implemented because the necessary land could not be acquired. He also expressed concern regarding the amount of land that would be required to construct the proposed alignment between Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road, noting that the route depicted in the proposed amendment would incur significant impact on the existing development in the area. Mr. Bennett said that he favored alternative options for the realignment and supported providing additional time for staff to evaluate those options. In addition, he pointed out the location of areas around the existing intersection where the land could be more easily acquired by the County.

John Mattin, 1616 Hunter Mill Road, Vienna, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment because the installation of a roundabout at a realigned intersection between Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road would negatively impact his property. He pointed out the location of his property along Hunter Mill Road and noted the amount of land that would be necessary for installing a roundabout, which including portions of his property. Mr. Mattin described the existing condition of his property, stating that it included a resource protection area and a pond. He then indicated that he intended to continue utilizing his property for residential purposes and



the proposed realignment would impact the character of the surrounding area and negatively impact his property values. Mr. Mattin said that he had met with staff to discuss his concerns, but those concerns were not adequately addressed, adding that staff could not specify the amount of land that would be necessary to install a roundabout. In addition, he indicated that he did not intend to sell his property. He added that he had consulted with an engineer to evaluate the proposed realignment's impact on his property and the results of that evaluation concluded that the size of his property would be reduced by approximately one-fourth if the proposed realignment with the roundabout were implemented.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from staff wherein Mr. Wolfenstein explained the following:

- The Hunter Mill District Supervisors Office had instructed staff to evaluate the overall traffic circulation for the area around Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road after the approval of a Comprehensive Plan amendment regarding the Reston Transit Station in 2014;
- The issue of traffic congestion around the existing intersection and along Crowell Road had been documented by staff
- The traffic circulation study conducted by staff had reviewed the various options that were considered for realigning Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road;
- The study had also included multiple community meetings to obtain input from the surrounding neighborhood;
- The study had been halted around 2015 to permit further review of the standards for roundabouts, which were subsequently updated;
- The results of the study were available to the Commission and the public;
- The implementation of the proposed realignment would be subject to additional review by staff, including evaluation of environmental and stormwater impacts; and
- The study conducted by staff had informed the conclusion articulated in the proposed amendment regarding the design for the realignment of Sunset Hills Road and Hunter Mill Road.

When Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for additional information regarding the status of a dwelling unit located near the intersection of Crowell Road and Hunter Mill Road, Ms. Calkins indicated that the status of that unit would be evaluated during the design study phase. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Ms. Calkins regarding the impact the proposed realignment of Sunset Hills Road with Hunter Mill Road would incur on that site, the areas around the intersection that would require a taking of land, and the ownership



status of the surrounding properties wherein Ms. Calkins indicated that significant portions of land located south of Crowell Road were owned by a single contract purchaser.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Carter for action on this item.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Chairman Murphy: Okay, Mr. Carter, please. Once again, welcome to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Carter: I was going to say that, thank you. But I've done a few of these before and I've never seen a road easy or hard, as they're all difficult. Yes, we are going out on January 30<sup>th</sup> with the public hearing at one of the local elementary schools. And so we want to defer this a bit. I hear the notion about the roundabout and I think the roundabout – it is a traffic operation and it's very popular, particularly to our English friends – lots of roundabouts. But it's good for the north/south – or the aspect, if you're traveling down Hunter Mill Road. But I think, also, it might be a good solution for the Crowell – or Crowell Road, as well, going east/west to discourage use of Crowell Road a little bit because roundabouts are a little difficult to operate. And so I think it would be good in both directions. There are also – usually, the way people use them today, I think it's a character kind of issue. So it's a method of separating between this four-lane section that goes under the toll road from the designated areas of Hunter Mill Road, north and south, which are fabulous, one of the best things that have been done in the whole region – I think is the way Hunter Mill Road has turned out. So I think it would be worth strengthening that language and I talk to staff about that a little bit. I think it would be worth doing that for those three reasons. I think, looking at the truncation of existing Sunset Hills and maybe thinking about how those properties that are going to remain – how their access might be a good point to this. I'd like to find the pond too. I think that would be interesting. And maybe on the 30<sup>th</sup>, we should go over the options a little more clearly with the community. And then – this is not intended to promote a different land use – that this is a transportation plan and I think Fairfax County is certainly famous for doing that too. Just because a road comes in doesn't mean we're going to get – promote development. So with all that, to make a long story short, I'M RECOMMENDING DEFERRAL WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A PUBLIC MEETING ON THE 30<sup>TH</sup> AND WITH A DATE CERTAIN, RIGHT NOW, WOULD BE FEBRUARY 15<sup>TH</sup> FOR COMING BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION. I understand it's scheduled for the Board of Supervisors on March 6<sup>th</sup> so we want to reach that. So the motion is for deferral with those comments – a deferral with conditions – a strong letter, to follow.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: For a decision only. Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on PA 2017-III-T1, with the record remaining open for comment, to a date certain of February 15<sup>th</sup>, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//



CLOSING


January 24, 2018

The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.  
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman  
James T. Migliaccio, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: April 26, 2018

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