

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 2018**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Chairman, Springfield District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large  
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District  
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill 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: Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 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

On behalf of the Commission and in honor of Flag Day, Chairman Murphy commended those serving and those who had served in all branches of the United States Armed Forces, as well as their families.

//

On behalf of Commissioner Sargeant, Commissioner Hart announced that the Planning Commission's Schools Committee would meet on June 20, 2018 at 8:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center. He added that the meeting was open to the public.

//

Commissioner Migliaccio announced that the Planning Commission's Land Use Process Review Committee would meet on June 20, 2018 at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center to review the County's Sign Ordinance. He added that the meeting was open to the public.

//

Commissioner Migliaccio said that he had intended to move for approval of the minutes for March 2018, but additional time was necessary to submit corrections; therefore, he announced his intent to move the approval of the March 2018 minutes at the Planning Commission's meeting on June 21, 2018. He requested that Commissioners submit further corrections prior to that date to John W. Cooper, Clerk to the Commission.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SHORT TERM LODGING

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment on Short-Term Lodging, we are – we need some – we need some additional time. I THEREFORE MOVE THAT WE DEFER THE DECISION AGAIN TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JUNE THE 21<sup>ST</sup>, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the decision only again on Zoning Ordinance Amendment dealing with short-term lodging to a date certain of June 21<sup>st</sup>, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Strandlie and Sargeant were not present for the vote. Commissioner Clarke was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

2232A-D99-1-2 – TURNER FARM PARK, 925 Springvale Road, Great Falls, VA 22066

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a 2232 that I would like to move on this evening. It's a 2232 application submitted by the Park Authority for Turner Farm Park, seeking a determination that all elements of the revised Master Plan adopted by the Park Authority Board are in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. It was adopted by the Park Authority Board on January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 after a series of vigorous public – a very vigorous public review process, with input from the Great Falls community and the broader community. The revision was initiated from the need to incorporate three parcels of the land acquired in 2010 and added to the existing park, which those additional three parcels total 3.6 acres and contain the historic Turner Farm House and outbuildings. Additionally, the process also provided the Park



Authority the opportunity to update the Master Plan for the entire facility with consideration of community usage patterns, management of the site's natural and cultural resources, and protection of the park's resources for future generations. The Master Plan revision also proposes the incorporation of the recently-acquired parcels into the existing park and the inclusion of the historic Turner Farm House and outbuildings into the Resident Curator Program, as well as enhancements to existing park facilities, improved pedestrian circulation, a separate entrance, and additional parking for horse trailers, and guidance for environmental and heritage resources. And I attended some of those public meetings and they were, indeed, vigorous. There were a lot of suggestions made in the first round that the Park Authority considered and incorporated into the revised plan and I think they came up with a version that very closely reflects what most of the community wants. There are still people who wanted certain other things that we weren't able to include. Therefore, I CONCUR WITH STAFF'S CONCLUSION THAT THE REVISION OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR TURNER FARM PARK, LOCATED AT 925 SPRINGVALE ROAD, GREAT FALLS, VIRGINIA, APPLICATION NUMBER 2232A-D99-1-2, IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROVISIONS AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN," PURSUANT TO SECTION 15.2-2232 OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by – oh, Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" determination in 2232A-D99-1-2, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioner Clarke was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

2232-Y17-42 – FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY, Ellanor C. Lawrence Park, 5040 Walney Road, Chantilly, VA 20151

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Tanner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for the recognition of the Air Force earlier. I really appreciate that. I also have a "feature shown" 2232 tonight for approval. It's also pretty straightforward. I don't want to belabor the point, so I'm just going to go right to the motion. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF'S DETERMINATION THAT THE PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY FOR APPLICATION 2232-Y17-42, LOCATED AT FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY, ELLANOR C. LAWRENCE PARK, 5040 WALNEY ROAD, CHANTILLY, VA 20151, IS

SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN," PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" determination in 2232-Y17-42, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioner Clarke was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

2232A-P17-19 – AT&T, 4110 Chain Bridge Rd, Fairfax, VA 22030

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too have a "feature shown." Mr. Chairman, I move that the Planning Commission concur – these are two motions at the same time – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF'S DETERMINATION FOR APPLICATIONS 2232A-P17-19 AND 2232-P18-6, THAT THE PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY BY AT&T LOCATED IN FAIRFAX AT 4110 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD, AND 2750 PROSPERITY AVENUE, RESPECTIVELY, ARE SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A "FEATURE SHOWN" OF THE PLAN, PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" determinations in 2232A-P17-19 and 2232-P18-6, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Oppose? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Sargeant abstains.



The motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioner Clark was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

2232-P18-6 – AT&T, 2750 Prosperity Ave, Fairfax, VA 21076

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too have a “feature shown.” Mr. Chairman, I move that the Planning Commission concur – these are two motions at the same time – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF’S DETERMINATION FOR APPLICATIONS 2232A-P17-19 AND 2232-P18-6, THAT THE PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY BY AT&T LOCATED IN FAIRFAX AT 4110 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD, AND 2750 PROSPERITY AVENUE, RESPECTIVELY, ARE SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A “FEATURE SHOWN” OF THE PLAN, PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the “feature shown” determinations in 2232A-P17-19 and 2232-P18-6, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Oppose? Motion carries.

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Sargeant abstains.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioner Clark was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PCA 82-L-030-13/PCA 87-L-031-03/SE 2015-LE-031 – WHITE HORSE FOUR, LLC  
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on April 26, 2018.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned earlier, I have a decision only this evening. On April 26<sup>th</sup> of this year, the Planning Commission held a public hearing for a car wash to be located in a shopping center zoned C-8 on behalf of White Horse Four, LLC. Based on testimony that evening and questions raised by fellow Commissioners, I asked that the Planning Commission defer the decision to May 17<sup>th</sup> and then again until this evening. As background, this application was accepted by the County for review in late 2015 with an initial staff report recommending approval published in September 2016. During this County review period, the applicant also went through the established community review process conducted by the citizen-led Lee District Land Use Advisory Committee. Despite the planning staff's recommendation of approval, the land use committee recommended that the application be denied. Rather than continue to the scheduled public hearing at the Planning Commission, the applicant requested an indefinite deferral to allow time to work with the whole community to address the issues raised at the denial meeting. Chief among them noise, building height, hours of operation and a lack of details for the vehicle stacking and on-site circulation. After review of the plan resubmission, a staff addendum was published in September 2017 capturing the changes made by the applicant based on community feedback. These changes included a reduction in building height, installation of 7,000 square feet of pervious pavers on-site to help with stormwater management, a reduction of hours-of operation by four hours, and a tonal alarm for noise reduction based on a newly-provided noise study. The applicant also better-explained the stacking and internal circulation to the community. This led to the Lee District Land Use Advisory Committee to recommend approval. My recommendation tonight is based on many factors. I have read the staff report addendum, and all public – public correspondence. I have attended all of the land use – Lee District Land Use Committee meetings on this subject and have separately met with the leading opponents of this application. I believe that the issues raised by the residents – specifically traffic, noise, hours of operation, and stormwater – have been effectively analyzed and addressed. Briefly, the traffic generated by this use, while greater than the existing empty parking lot, is less than from a by-right use. There is adequate stacking on site for vehicles. The applicant has proffered \$15,000 for nearby traffic improvements. Based on a noise study, the applicant has committed to noise abatement measures captured by the proffers and development conditions. The applicant has committed to the hours of operation being 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The applicant has also committed to capturing at least 80 percent of the wastewater associated with a car wash cycle. In addition, the applicant needs to receive a permit from the Virginia DEQ before opening. It is my belief that this application, with its most recent proffers and development conditions, meets all of the land-use standards and requirements to recommend approval. Before I move to my motions, I would first like to thank our professional planning staff, Casey Judge and Cathy Lewis, for the many meetings, phone calls, and emails that they handled during this process. I would also like to thank all of the citizens who spoke at the public hearing and those who communicated via email. While I understand that my recommendation may not be what some neighbors would like to hear tonight, I do appreciate their efforts in making this application better throughout the process. As noted earlier, this application has the recommendation of approval from our professional planning staff and from



the Lee District Land Use Advisory Committee. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, before I start, I need the applicant to come down please.

Robert B. Rust, Applicant/Title Owner, White Horse Four, LLC: Do you want me to reaffirm the...

Commissioner Migliaccio: No. Just state your name for the record and can you confirm that you agree to the development conditions dated June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018?

Mr. Rust: Yeah, my name is Bob Rust. I have read, agree – and agree to the development conditions dated June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PCA 82-L-030-13 AND PCA 87-L-031-03, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF – EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS DATED JUNE 14, 2018.

Commissioner Hurley: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hurley. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to the recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA 82-L-030-13 and PCA 87-L-031 [sic], say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioners Hart and Sargeant: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Hart: I'm going to abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart abstains.

Commissioner Sargeant: I'm going to abstain too, not present for the public hearing.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Sargeant abstains, not present for the public hearing.

Commissioner Cortina: And...and I abstain, as well.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Cortina abstains.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Migliaccio does not.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I further move...

Chairman Murphy: No, I...go ahead.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE SE 2015-LE-031, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Hurley: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hurley. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approves SE 2015-LE-031, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries, same abstentions for the record. Is that it?

Commissioner Migliaccio: That is it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, thank you very much. Is there any other Commission...

Commissioner Migliaccio: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I DO HAVE ONE OTHER THING TUCKED HERE. I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ASSOCIATED MODIFICATION OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENT.

Commissioner Hurley: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstentions.

Each motion carried by a vote of 7-0-3. Commissioners Cortina, Hart, and Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioner Clark was absent from the meeting.

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//



RZ 2017-MA-013/SE 2017-MA-009 – VULCAN MATERIALS COMPANY, LLC (Decision Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on March 1, 2018.)

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had some heavy traffic tonight, so I appreciate your indulgence. Tonight we have the decision only on the Vulcan Materials Company application RZ 2017-MA-013 concurrent with SE 2017-MA-009. Before I go into the motions and other comments, there have been a lot of developments since we held the March 1<sup>st</sup> hearing, so I'd like to turn staff to have an overview of what has developed since then and where we are now.

Chairman Murphy: Please.

Jay Rodenbeck, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Thank you very much. I'm Jay Rodenbeck with the Department of Planning and Zoning. I will give the Commission a brief summary of the third staff report addendum in addressing concerns, which have been raised by citizens since the publication of the third staff report addendum. On May 4<sup>th</sup>, staff received a revised Statement of Justification and on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May received revised proffers and plans removing the future asphalt plant from the applications and revising the Statement of Justification, the GDP/SE plat, and proffers to reflect the deletion. This slide depicts the special exception plat, as it was depicted at the March 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Commission hearing for the applications. As can be seen, the future asphalt plant was depicted on the previous special exception plat, which is located within the red circle. The next slide here depicts the revised special exception plat that has removed the future asphalt plant from the plat, which was previously located within the red circle. In addition to the applicant removing the future asphalt plant from the Statement of Justification, the GDP/SE plat, and proffers, staff has revised the development conditions, removing the asphalt plant from the conditions and prohibiting production of asphaltic products as a permitted use on the application property. Staff has also modified conditions and added conditions that address concerns raised by concerned citizens and the Commission since the March 1<sup>st</sup> hearing for the application, such as adding a condition requiring the establishment of a 24-hour complaint concern communication system, adding a condition requiring the silos be painted and maintained to be compatible and less conspicuous with the surroundings, adding a condition requiring the applicant implement and abide by the recommendations of a dust control plan attached to the development conditions as Exhibit C, and adding a condition requiring white noise backup alarms be installed on the applicant's trucks instead of the beeping back-up alarms, which are more traditional. I will also briefly address some concerns that have been raised by citizens regarding the applications. The first concern is hours of operation. Regarding the hours of operation for the existing and proposed facility, the facility will generally not operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. However, there will, on occasion, be projects – with, for example, projects with VDOT that will require they operate on a 24/7 basis periodically. The second concern is the proximity of the silos to residences. It's been asserted that no measurements were taken from the R-2 zoned properties north of Edsall Road regarding their proximity to the proposed silos. And I don't have zoning on here, but it's – they're the properties just off of Mitchell Street and north of Edsall Road that I'm referring to. And this – this slide shows the closest R-2 zoned residents approximate distance to the proposed silos north of Edsall Road, which is approximately 1,500 feet away. It has also been asserted that



this area is closer to the Vulcan site than most of Edsall Park and this slide also shows the closest residences approximate distance in the Edsall Park subdivision to the closest silos, which is approximately 1,179 feet away, more than 300 feet closer to the silos in the previously-mentioned residents north of Edsall Road is, which is approximately 1,500 feet away. And this is just a cross-section of the line-of-sight of the nearest residents in the Edsall Park subdivision. This is the last page of the attached SE plat and GDP. This cross-section reveals that the silos will create no additional visual impact. It's close as 790 feet away from the previously-mentioned residents in the Edsall Park subdivision. And that's all I have. Thank you very much.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Rodenbeck. Are there any question? Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Is your mic on?

Commissioner Strandlie: Now it is.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. Thank you. So with that, I just wanted to give some comments and then I will move into the motions. Okay?

Chairman Murphy: Very good.

Commissioner Strandlie: Tonight, the Planning Commission will address the decision only in Vulcan Materials Company, LLC applications RZ 2017-MA-013 and SE 2017-MA-009. The application seeks to rezone from R-2 to I-6 a small strip of land surrounded by industrial uses and parallel to 395, consistent with the I-6 zoning from the remainder of the property. The companion SE application is to reconfigure and modernize the 46-year-old concrete batching plant and to increase the height of the silos. Vulcan is located in the Shirley Industrial Park area of the Mason District directly accessible to I-395 and close to I-95 and I-495 and which is also served by railroad. The original application included a request for a future asphalt plant on the same site. For a variety of reasons, including a lack of specific information or plan development – or development conditions and strong community opposition, Vulcan withdrew its request for the asphalt plant. As you can see, the development conditions dated – the development conditions specifically state that Vulcan cannot build an asphalt plant on this site without a public hearing and approval of an SEA. Several land use terms are confusing and may not be accurately descriptive and I just want to talk about that briefly. In this case, community members have asked why Vulcan should be allowed to break the rules by applying for a special exception or an SE. An SE is not an attempt to break the rules. Instead, Article 9 of the Zoning Ordinance states that there are certain uses which, by their nature, can have an undue impact or it be incompatible with other uses of land. A special exception is required for those uses. The SE public hearing process provides for County and community review and imposition – imposition of development conditions to mitigate or address impacts. Article 9 requires land owners to file an application for an SE in a variety of zoning categories, ranging from quasi-public uses – such as child care centers, schools, and medical facilities – to commercial and industrial uses of special impact, such as car washes, drive-through pharmacies, and heavy industrial uses such as concrete



batching and asphalt plants. Because of this SE application – should the Board of Supervisors approve the application, the Vulcan property will have appropriate development conditions and restrictions where none exist today. These development conditions and restrictions reflect considerable staff and Commission time and include community input. I'll briefly address the conditions in a few minutes. First, I will recap the long road this application has taken to reach tonight's decision. First of all, the application was filed May – May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017 and considered by the Mason District Land Use Committee at its July 2017 regular fourth Tuesday of the month meeting as an information only item. The case was originally scheduled for a more thorough review by the land use committee and a November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Planning Commission hearing, but was deferred until January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 for the applicant and staff to work with the community regarding concerns about possible extensions of a regional trail. The staff report was issued on January 11, 2018, as required in advance of the – of the rescheduled January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – which 25<sup>th</sup> was a date – Planning Commission hearing. The Mason District Land Use Committee reviewed the staff report and the applicant made a presentation at that January monthly land use committee meeting. At that meeting, the land use committee heard for the first time concerns about the asphalt plant. Because of the concerns and the need for more information regarding Norfolk Southern deliveries and a request for the future asphalt plant, the applicant chose to defer the January Planning – the January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Planning Commission hearing until March 1<sup>st</sup> and I requested that Vulcan come back to the land use committee in February for reconsideration. At the February 27<sup>th</sup> monthly meeting, the land use committee ultimately recommended approval of the application if the asphalt plant was removed. Since the March 1<sup>st</sup> hearing, the decision only on this case was deferred several times as the Commission gathered input from the community and toward the nearby state-of-the-art Virginia Paving Company asphalt plant located near housing in Alexandria. In May, Vulcan withdrew the request for a future asphalt plant and submitted a revised Statement of Justification. Since March, we have been listening to and meeting with the public to refine the development conditions for the rest of the application. The staff has addressed those conditions, which included the lighting development condition, dust containment measures being spelled out, a 24/7 hotline to ensure that the community would be able to report at any time about dust blowing from dust and winds or any other concerns that they may have. Additional screening and buffering will be added along Industrial Drive, parallel to Edsall. And in addition, outside of this application, we will continue to work with VDOT on improvements to the Edsall Road/Industrial Drive intersection. I met with the plant manager today and he too was concerned with that intersection and supports changes to that. So we will be making a concerted effort on that. And I would like to encourage the community to meet with a – with the plant manager, Andreas Delgado, to continue these conversations. Before I make the required motions, I want to thank Kris Abrahamson, Jay Rodenbeck, and Ervin Uriarte for their diligent and thoughtful work – and, of course, thank Supervisor Gross for her advocacy in this matter. At this time, I'd like the applicant to come forward to affirm the development conditions.

Lori Greenlief, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP: Good evening. My name is Lori Greenlief with McGuireWoods and I confirm that we agree with the development conditions dated June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. Thank you. And I think a date mistake on that – the January land use committee and Planning Commission hearing. The land use committee was January 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Planning Commission hearing that was rescheduled was January 25<sup>th</sup>. Thank you. So with that,



Mr. Chairman, I request – oh, I already said that. Sorry. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING: APPROVAL OF RZ 2017-MA-013, SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2018.

Commissioners Cortina and Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and Ms. Cortina. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Migliaccio: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: I was not present for the public hearing, but I did watch it and participated in some of our site visits off-site and I'll be voting this evening.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be supporting this and I just want to make a note from my perspective that as we become built out as a County, it's increasingly important to assume for sure that we maintain properties zoned for industrial purposes. Our quality of life is as – is interestingly as dependent upon these now-scarce sites as protective of our parklands and, given the new additions that have been secured the quality of effort put forward by Commissioner Strandlie, I think that the community is protected. At the same time, we're protecting these industrial sites. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much. Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2018-MA-013 [sic], say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: Approval of SE 2017 – I MOVE APPROVAL OF SE 2017-MA-009, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, AND THE FOLLOWING CONDITION TO BE ADDED:

- NO SIGNALS, LIGHTS, OR ILLUMINATION OVER 75 FEET IN HEIGHT WILL BE PERMITTED ON ANY OF THE SILO STRUCTURES, EXCEPT IF REQUIRED BY LOCAL, STATE, OR FEDERAL AUTHORITIES. THIS IS NOT INTENDED TO PRECLUDE EMERGENCY MAINTENANCE LIGHTING OR REPAIRS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Hart: Second.



Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-MA-009, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: Great. And finally, I MOVE APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS CONTAINED IN THE HANDOUT DISTRIBUTED TO YOU THIS EVENING DATED JUNE 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

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

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. CSPA 85-C-088-02 – RESTON TOWN CENTER PROPERTY, LLC (Hunter Mill District)
2. PA 2017-CW-4CP – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (HERITAGE RESOURCES)
3. PCA/CDPA/FDPA 2017-DR-014 – STANLEY MARTIN COMPANIES, LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

//

CSPA 85-C-088-02 – RESTON TOWN CENTER PROPERTY, LLC – Appl. under Sect. 12-210 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend the previously approved Comprehensive Sign Plan associated with CSP 85-C-088 to permit sign modifications. Located on the S. side of Freedom Dr., W. side of Presidents St. and N. side of Market St. on approx. 1.83 ac. of land zoned PRC.

Tax Map 17-1 ((16)) 5A. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC  
HEARING.

Mary Ann Tsai, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of application CSPA 85-C-088-02.

Ben Wales, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP, indicated that the proposal would permit the installation of signage consistent with what had been previously approved for high-rise office development throughout Reston Town Center. He said that approval of the subject application was necessary because of the ongoing construction of a previously approved commercial development.

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 Carter for action on this case.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Carter: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm for the record to the proposed development conditions dated May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

Ben Wales, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP: Again, Ben Wales on behalf of the applicant, I can confirm agreement with those development conditions. Thank you.

Commissioner Carter: With that, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSPA 85-C-088-02, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MAY 31<sup>ST</sup>, 2018 AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 2 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

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 85-C-088-02, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//



PA 2017-CW-4CP – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT  
(HERITAGE RESOURCES) – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. Plan Amendment 2017-CW-4CP proposes an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, Virginia to update the Inventory of Historic Sites tables and maps that appear in the Area plans; to revise heritage resources language in the Area Plans to reflect changes that have taken place, such as editorial revisions to language which describes Historic Overlay Districts, and references to county departments; remove seventeen sites previously noted as demolished having been determined to no longer have either architectural or archaeological integrity; and to add two new historic sites. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Denise Dressel, Heritage Resource Planner, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendment PA 2017-CW-4CP.

When Commissioner Sargeant asked for clarification regarding the purpose for removing a site from the County's Inventory of Historic Sites, Ms. Dressel explained that a site was removed from the inventory in the event that the structures were no longer present and a completed archeological review concluded that there were no outstanding archeological components.

Commissioner Sargeant stated that the Commission had received a letter from a citizen regarding the status of the former location of Beacon Hill Airport as a historically significant site, but noted that there were no remaining structures on the site. Ms. Dressel concurred with that statement. When Commissioner Sargeant asked whether the former site of the Beacon Hill Airport included a historic marker, Ms. Dressel indicated that there was such a marker on the site. (A copy of the letter is in the date file.)

Referring to page 32 of the staff report, Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the recommended Plan text identified a 2016 windshield survey for potential heritage resources in Transit Station Areas (TSA) located in Reston and noted that a comprehensive survey of the area had not been conducted. He also cited a previous instance where a historically significant building in Reston had been demolished because it had not been included on the County's Inventory of Historic Sites. He then asked for additional survey on the status of subsequent surveys to identify architecturally significant structures in Reston. Leanna O'Donnell, Planning Division, DPZ, confirmed that a comprehensive survey of the entire Reston area had not been completed, but pointed out that staff had conducted a smaller study that focused exclusively on the Reston TSAs. In addition, she stated that a larger comprehensive survey had not been conducted due a lack of resources. Ms. O'Donnell added that subsequent windshield studies would be conducted in conjunction with future land use studies. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. O'Donnell regarding the sites that staff had identified as possibly having historical significance during the 2016 windshield study wherein Ms. O'Donnell



pointed out that the study had identified an area located near Association Drive in Reston as potentially significant and staff had been made aware of that issue.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. O'Donnell regarding the process for evaluating a site for historical significance, the recourse for the History Commission in the event that a significant site was identified, the method by which an evaluation would commence, and the process for evaluating the historical significance of a site that was part of a redevelopment application wherein Ms. O'Donnell indicated that the Commission coordinated with property owners throughout the process, but reiterated the difficulty of conducting such efforts due to the lack of resources.

Commissioner Ulfelder expressed concern about the effectiveness of the History Commission's process for identifying historically significant sites, citing the incident in Reston in which a historically significant building had been demolished because it had not been included in the County's Inventory of Historic Sites. He added that the community had not notified staff of the significance of that building. Commissioner Ulfelder then suggested that the procedures for reevaluating sites be modified to improve the Commission's ability to identify historically significant sites, but acknowledged the deficiencies and lack of resources associated with the existing process.

Commissioner Migliaccio pointed out that 17 of the 18 items evaluated for removal from the County's Inventory of Historic Sites had been approved for deletion. When he asked which site had been selected to remain on the inventory, Aimee Wells, Archeologist, Fairfax County Park Authority, indicated that the Spring Bank site in the Mount Vernon area had been retained in the inventory because there were two parcels that possibly contained significant historical artifacts.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Ms. Dressel regarding the process the Historic Inventory Committee utilized for conducting meetings, the extent to which those meetings were advertised to the public, the opportunities for the public to provide input at those meetings, and the availability of meeting minutes from such meetings wherein Ms. Dressel explained that the committee met regularly and those meetings were advertised publicly on the County's meeting calendar, adding that there were meeting minutes available for those meetings.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested that the History Commission provide the Commission with additional information on sites that were being added and removed from the County's Inventory of Historic Sites for subsequent plan amendments that affected historical resources. Ms. Dressel acknowledged the request and did not object to providing such information.

Commissioner Hart echoed the concerns of Commissioner Ulfelder regarding the possibility that historically significant sites would be demolished because they were not identified as such during a review of a redevelopment application. He then described the instance Commissioner Ulfelder cited in which a building that had been identified as historically significant in Reston was demolished because it had not been recognized during a redevelopment application. He added that the building had not been included in the previously-approved Comprehensive Plan Amendment regarding updates to the County's historical resources. Commissioner Hart also



expressed concern that efforts to identify historically significant buildings prior to the evaluation of a redevelopment application were not adequate and recommended that staff inform the Board that additional resources were necessary to address the issue. Ms. O'Donnell indicated that there had been subsequent evaluations of Reston TSAs, which resulted in the identification of one potential site of historical significance. She added that the History Commission and the Architectural Review Board had been informed of that site for further evaluation. However, Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged that there were significant portions of Reston that had not been surveyed. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. O'Donnell regarding the recourse for improving efforts to locate and protect historically significant sites throughout the County wherein Ms. O'Donnell indicated that Commissioner Hart's concerns would be appropriately conveyed.

Commissioner Carter said that there were existing procedures within Reston for evaluating sites for historical significance, adding that those procedures were intended to occur prior to a public hearing. He then stated that community and planning organizations within Reston were aware of the issue surrounding historically significant sites. Ms. O'Donnell added that staff had cooperated with the Reston Architectural Review Board on identifying a potentially site near Association Drive and additional surveys would be conducted of that site to determine the historical significance.

Commissioner Ulfelder echoed the remarks that Commissioner Hart had articulated regarding the previous instance in Reston where a historically significant building had been demolished because it had not been identified as such prior to the submission of a redevelopment application for the site. He noted that in the absence of the building's designation as historically significant, the Comprehensive Plan had supported the demolition of the building and developer for the site had not committed to preserve it. Commissioner Ulfelder then supported efforts to incorporate historically significant sites into the Comprehensive Plan to ensure their preservation as the surrounding areas redevelop. He also recommended that the History Commission coordinate with other groups that specialized in historic sites to improve efforts to locate and preserve historically significant sites.

Commissioner Sargeant suggested the inclusion of a follow-on motion for the proposed amendment that included a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to identify and allocate resources towards improving efforts to identify historically significant sites throughout the County. He also acknowledged the limited resources available to staff for conducting such surveys. A discussion ensued between Commissioners Sargeant and Hart, with input from Commissioners Niedzielski-Eichner and Migliaccio, regarding the feasibility of such a motion in conjunction with the proposed amendment, the limited scope of the proposed amendment, and the prioritization of certain areas of the County for historical evaluation wherein Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner favored subsequent coordination with the History Commission to determine appropriate measures for improving the evaluation of historically significant sites.

Chairman Murphy called for the first listed speaker.

Barbara Naef, 902 Westwood Drive, NE, Vienna, representing the Fairfax County History Commission (FCHC), acknowledged the impact of ongoing development efforts on historical



sites. She also indicated that the FCHC was evaluating the property located along Association Drive to evaluate potential methods for determining the historical significance of the site, adding that there was ongoing coordination with organizations that specialized in historic preservation to address that issue. In addition, Ms. Naef concurred with statements from staff regarding the limited resources available to the FCHC for evaluating sites and said she supported efforts to conduct a comprehensive survey of the overall area. She indicated that the existing Inventory of Historic Sites contained approximately 300 sites and the FCHC utilized established criteria for determining whether a site was to be removed. She then noted that the sites that were subject to removal from the inventory contained no remaining structures or archeological artifacts.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Naef regarding the potential mechanisms for improving the process of surveying sites for historical significance, the need for additional resources to conduct comprehensive surveys throughout the County to identify potential sites, and the opportunities to conduct historical surveys during the review process for redevelopment applications wherein Ms. Naef reiterated the need for additional resources for the FCHC to conduct historical surveys throughout the County and supported the allocation of additional resources for such efforts, but acknowledged the importance of encouraging further redevelopment throughout the County.

Commissioner Carter expressed concern that the process for evaluating sites was inadequate because it required a lengthy procedure. He then favored evaluating that process for possible revisions, adding that the process for modifying the Comprehensive Plan was subject to various challenges. Ms. O'Donnell stated that the County's Inventory of Sites was subject to revisions every two years, which included review of the sites to ensure that the Comprehensive Plan reflected the updates and modifications of the inventory. She then said that the purpose of the proposed amendment was to finalize the most recent updates to the Comprehensive Plan to ensure it was accurate with the County's inventory. In addition, Ms. O'Donnell acknowledged the challenges associated with identifying historically significant sites, but noted that efforts to identify such sites had been modified after the incident cited by Commissioner Hart regarding a historically significant building that had been demolished.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Naef regarding the evaluation process the FCHC utilized for determining whether a building was historically significant, the number of buildings that were listed on the County's Inventory of Sites that had been included because of their architectural significance wherein, the ongoing efforts to evaluate existing buildings in the Reston area for historical significance, and the numerous buildings throughout Reston that were potentially significant wherein Ms. Naef stated the following:

- The criteria for determining the historical significance of a building included factors such as architectural significance, events that occurred at the site, and famous individuals who had resided at the site;
- The buildings in Reston that had been constructed in the late 1960s had utilized noteworthy architects and certain buildings could be subsequently identified as historically significant; and



- The FCHC supported efforts to evaluate and catalog historically significant buildings in the Reston area to ensure that incidents, such as the one cited by Commissioner Hart, did not occur.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Naef regarding the number of buildings throughout the County that were not included in the County's Inventory of Sites because it did not fit into the 50-year timeframe that the FCHC utilized for evaluating such sites and the challenges associated with identifying sites within such a timeframe wherein Ms. Naef noted the challenges associated with determining the historical significance of sites constructed after the 1960s.

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

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Sargeant: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. In terms of the follow-on motion for a recommendation, I think we've taken that from the vague to the indefinite at this point. I'm a little concerned and perhaps we should, at this point, consider in a committee session and follow up with what we can more precisely do to make it work for the benefit of staff, for the History Commission, and for the citizens. So I'm going to hold off on that motion for this moment and then when we get to a committee – an appropriate committee – we'll follow up with staff to see what works best and that would be fine. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would very much like to thank Denise Dressel – and welcome for a very easy first reference Denise Dressel, Leanne O'Donnell, and...and Amy Wells from the Park Authority for being with us and for their – their assistance in making this happen. And also, a thanks to the History Commission for constantly working to ensure the integrity and accuracy of our County's historic record. It is not an easy feat in a county as busy and as complex and as historic as ours. As we've seen in tonight's presentation, what has happened with this update for the countywide plan amendment, it will quite simply update the information in the plan's inventory of historic sites, tables, and maps, including the addition of two new sites and the removal of 17 demolished sites. It will update the definition of the asterisk notation in the Plan's inventory of historic site tables for accuracy and clarity. It will reflect changes to the status of properties, such as listing in the National Register or demolition. It will revise references to the Cultural Resources Management and Protection Branch of the Fairfax County Park Authority to reflect a more generalized reference to archeology staff. And it revises language for all historic overlay districts for consistency to refer to the directives in the respective sections of the Zoning Ordinance. With that, Mr. Chairman, I WOULD MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2017-CW-4CP, FOUND IN APPENDIX 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2018.

Commissioner Tanner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by...

Commissioner Hart: Donté.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Tanner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt Comprehensive Plan Amendment on Heritage Resources, PA 2017-CW-4CP, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

PCA/CDPA/FDPA 2017-DR-014 – STANLEY MARTIN COMPANIES, LLC – Appls. to amend the proffers, conceptual development plan, and final development plan for RZ 2017-DR-014, previously approved for multi-family residential development to incorporate two-over-two multi-family stacked homes and associated modifications to proffers and site design at a density of 14.83 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Located on the S. side of Dulles Technology Dr. between River Birch Rd. and Sunrise Valley Dr. on approx. 11.6 ac. of land zoned PRM. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed Use. Tax Map 16-3 ((1)) 4M. DRANESVILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mark Looney, Applicant's Agent, Cooley LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 5, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Sharon Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of applications PCA/CDPA/FDPA 2017-DR-014.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Williams regarding the location of the dwelling units identified as A-4 on the Conceptual Development Plan Amendment/Final Development Plan Amendment (CDPA/FDPA) in the Option 1 plan and the extent to which the curvature of McNair Farms Drive extension that was located near these units would be reduced wherein Ms. Williams deferred to the Fairfax Department of Transportation (FCDOT) regarding the alignment of McNair Farms Drive.



When Commissioner Ulfelder asked for additional information regarding the impact that extending McNair Farms Drive would incur on the bridge in the event that the curvature of the road was reduced, Ms. Williams indicated that such a modification could potentially result in a redesign or reduction of the A-4 dwelling units on the site. Elizabeth Iannetta, Transportation Planner, FCDOT, added that staff had encouraged the applicant to reduce the curvature of the McNair Farms Drive extension to the greatest extent possible. In addition, she stated that the previously-approved Option 2 plan for developing the site included a different type of dwelling unit and the types included in Option 1 provided greater flexibility for reducing the curvature of the extension. Ms. Iannetta stated that the intent of the designs for Option 1 was to provide additional buffer space to the northern property line to accommodate the McNair Farms Drive extension.

Answering questions from Commissioner Ulfelder, Ms. Williams confirmed that the planned bridge that would cross over the area owned by the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) to the east of the site had been designed to accommodate four lanes, but would narrow to two lanes in the direction towards the site. She also indicated that the CDPA/FDPA depicted a potential widening of portions of McNair Farms Drive from two lanes to four lanes. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Williams regarding the need for widening McNair Farms Drive and the impact that the reduced density of the Option 1 plan for the site would incur on such a widening wherein Ms. Williams indicated the following:

- The evaluation of the road for a potential widening would occur in conjunction with other redevelopment efforts in the area;
- The Comprehensive Plan recommended that McNair Farms Drive be a maximum of four lanes, but did not discourage utilizing fewer lanes, provided the design remained consistent with the character of the surrounding development; and
- The traffic analysis that had been conducted for the proposal and another nearby development had concluded that two lanes would be adequate.

Commissioner Ulfelder asked for additional information regarding the status of the applicant's off-site contributions to park facilities that had been requested by the FCPA. Ms. Williams said that the applicant's commitments were consistent with the County's urban park standards, adding that the public and private park facilities would be identified at the time of site plan review, as articulated in Proffer Number 20, Great Lawn/Plaza and Stream Valley Park, in Appendix 1 of the staff report. She also stated that staff concluded that the applicant had adequately met the necessary off-site commitments through the provisions associated with the McNair Farms Drive extension.

When Commissioner Ulfelder requested additional information on the driveways for the dwelling units that would front along McNair Farms Drive, Ms. Williams said that those units would utilize longer driveways. She then indicated that the dwelling units located throughout the central portion of the site would utilize shorter driveways with single-vehicle garages. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Williams regarding the proximity of



the subject property to the planned Innovation Center Metrorail Station, the accessibility of the Metrorail station by residents of the proposed development, and the impact such proximity incurred on the design of the development wherein Ms. Williams said that the location of the site in relation to a future metrorail station had impacted the parking provisions that had been included with the proposal.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the Option 2 development plan for the site contained a significant Transportation Demand Management Plan because it included a multifamily residential building. However, he noted that the provisions of such a plan would not apply for Option 1 plan because such a development had fewer residents and less overall density compared to Option 2. Ms. Williams concurred with that statement, adding that the two-over-two style for the dwelling units of the proposed development was consistent with the impact of a townhouse development and the parking provisions for Option 1 were consistent with those of such a development. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Williams regarding the location on the subject property in which deliveries would occur wherein Ms. Williams pointed out the location of multiple areas in which delivery vehicles could park.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Iannetta, with input from Ms. Williams, regarding the extent to which the FCPA had requested the McNair Farms Drive extension and the inclusion of that road in the overall plan for the surrounding area wherein Ms. Iannetta and Ms. Williams said the following:

- The McNair Farms Drive extension had been included within the Comprehensive Plan in conjunction with a previous-approved plan amendment;
- The extension had been envisioned as a component of a grid of streets for the area to alleviate the traffic impact on major arterial roads;
- The construction of the planned Innovation Center Metrorail Station would incur additional high-density development throughout the area and a grid of streets was necessary to support such density; and
- The applicant had met the off-site parks contribution by providing the McNair Farms Drive extension and had included the on-site contributions contained in the previously-approved rezoning application for the site.

Commissioner Cortina expressed concern that the planned grid of streets would negatively impact portions of the surrounding area that had been designated to mitigate the stormwater impact for the proposed development, pointing out that the roads would traverse wetlands and resource protection areas. Leanna O'Donnell, Planning Division, DPZ, echoed remarks from Ms. Williams regarding the applicant's on-site recreation provisions, adding that contributions for off-site recreation were uncommon with such developments. She then indicated that staff supported the applicant's commitment to constructing the McNair Farms Drive extension. Commissioner Cortina reiterated her concern regarding the impact that installing a grid of streets would incur on existing stream valleys in the area and the overall impact that such an improvement would incur on the stormwater management provisions for the region. A discussion



ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Williams regarding the decoupling of the McNair Farms Drive extension from the proposed development, the practice of applicants constructing road extensions that were subsequently dedicated to the Virginia Department of Transportation, the impact that dedicating the extension would incur on the applicant's stormwater management commitments, and the frequency with which a road extension from an applicant was permitted to be decoupled from the development wherein Ms. Williams pointed out the following:

- The McNair Farms Drive extension had been included with the previously-approved rezoning for the site;
- The subject applications included Development Condition Number 7, as shown in the revised set dated June 8, 2018, which required the applicant to provide a minimum of 18 percent of the total water quality requirements on-site to mitigate the environmental impact; and
- The applicant's stormwater management commitments were supported by staff.

(A copy of the revised set is in the date file.)

Commissioner Cortina said that she did not support the practice of permitting applicants to purchase off-site water quality credits in the event that a development was modified to a reduced density and favored retaining previously-approved stormwater management commitments. She pointed out that the County's stormwater management standards encouraged assessing the impact of a development on the basis of the calculated impact of the final condition. Ms. Williams concurred with that statement, adding that staff supported the applicant's stormwater management provisions for on-site quality control instead of off-site credits and encouraged similar on-site commitments at other sites.

Commissioner Strandlie expressed support for Proffer Number 15, Parking for Affordable/Workforce Dwelling Units (ADU/WDU), which provided a minimum of one designated parking space for each ADU/WDU at no cost to the purchaser/lessee. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Ms. Williams regarding the potential inclusion of a commitment to notify property owners that usage of the garage for reasons other than the parking of a vehicle was prohibited wherein Ms. Williams said that staff supported including such a provision.

When Commissioner Strandlie inquired as to whether the applicant's commitments included the installation of a traffic signal pre-emption device, Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that such a commitment was contained within the proposal.

When Commissioner Hart asked for clarification as to why the applicant had requested that the subject property be zoned as a PRM District, Ms. Williams indicated that the PRM zoning was necessary to accommodate the previously-approved multifamily development option that had been included in Option 2 for the site.



Commissioner Hart pointed out that the proposed development would be located in close proximity to areas zoned as I-4 Districts and asked why the proposal did not include commitments for additional transitional screening between districts. Ms. O'Donnell explained that the need for transitional screening between districts was determined by the usage of a site instead of the zoning. She then stated that the nearby I-4 District was an office development, which reduced the need for screening. In addition, she said that the Zoning Ordinance did not require residential developments to provide such screening, but noted that commercial or industrial development that occurred near the subject property would require such provisions.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the narrowness of the alleys within the proposed development. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. O'Donnell regarding the ability for vehicles to navigate the alleys of the development, the distances between garages within the development, and the issues that had occurred at other sites in the county where narrow alleys had hindered internal circulation wherein Ms. O'Donnell deferred to the applicant for additional information on the issue.

When Commissioner Hart inquired as to whether emergency vehicles could sufficiently navigate the alleys within the proposed development, Ms. O'Donnell indicated that staff had determined that such vehicles could adequately circulate within the site.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern that the dimensions of the garages for the proposed development would not include enough space for certain vehicles or the effective storage of trash cans. He then said that he favored including a disclosure to inform prospective purchasers of the constraints of the garages, reiterating that there had been other sites throughout the County in which the sizes of garages had not been adequate. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. O'Donnell regarding the process for standardizing the dimensions of garages, the method for determining whether garages would be counted as parking spaces for a development, and the potential issues associated with garages that could not be utilized for parking due to the size of certain vehicles wherein Ms. O'Donnell explained that finalizing such standards would require approval of an amendment to the Public Facilities Manual (PFM), but concurred that the limited size of garages could incur potential parking issues and supported efforts to modify the PFM accordingly.

When Commissioner Hart asked whether issues relating to a disclosure of the spatial dimensions of the garages would be provided to prospective purchasers had been discussed, Ms. O'Donnell indicated that such an issue had not been considered.

Commissioner Sargeant stated that the subject property was located approximately 0.5 miles from the planned Innovation Station Metrorail Station. He then requested additional information regarding the feasibility of pedestrian access to that metrorail station from the site. Referring to Sheet 5 of the CDPA/FDPA, Ms. O'Donnell pointed out that there were planned and existing roadways that provided pedestrian paths for accessing the metrorail station. She added that staff would continue to evaluate methods for improving pedestrian connectivity to the Innovation Station Metrorail Station as the surrounding area was redeveloped.

When Commissioner Sargeant inquired as to whether staff supported the removal of references to off-site options to comply with the standards for low-impact development, Ms. William said



that staff did not favor the complete removal of such references, pointing out that Development Condition Number 8 permitted the purchase of off-site credits beyond the required 18 percent on-site water quality control provision. She added that the nature of those credits could vary, provided that the source was consistent with the appropriate standards. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Williams regarding the adequacy of the 18-percent on-site water quality control requirement and the method staff utilized for determining that standard wherein Ms. Williams said that staff had coordinated with the applicant to determine an appropriate standard, noting the constraints of the site due to the presence of resource protection areas and flood plains.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that the applicant had reserved the right to enter into a separate binding agreement with an appropriate County agency to provide the necessary ADU/WDU commitments. He then asked whether such commitments were subject to revisions, expressing concern that an agreement would not be contingent on the approval of a proffered conditioned amendment and the public input process associated with it. He added that such an agreement could potentially impact the parking provisions associated with affordable housing. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Williams, with input from Ms. O'Donnell, regarding the revisions to separate binding agreements for affordable housing modified the associated parking provisions and the ability to provide public input for revisions to such commitments wherein Ms. O'Donnell indicated that modifying those separate agreements would not modify the parking requirements for those units and staff did not object to permitting modifications without obtaining the approval of a proffered condition amendment.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner, Ms. Williams stated that staff had concluded that the requirements articulated in Development Condition Number 7 satisfied the outstanding concerns regarding stormwater management of the site, adding that 18 percent on-site water quality control standard was greater than the minimum calculations determined by staff.

Mr. Looney gave a presentation on the proposed development wherein he explained the following:

- The subject property had been subject to multiple applications since the approval of the original development options in July 2015, which were subsequently modified and approved in July 2017 ;
- The purpose of the subject applications was to permit a development option that included 172 residential dwelling units in a two-over-two architectural configuration;
- The commitments included in the previously-approved applications from July 2015 and July 2017 had been carried over with the proposal;
- The modifications to the proffers contained within the subject applications consisted of updates to sheet numbers in the CDPA/FDPA and provisions specific to the Option 1 development that included the two-over-two configuration;

- The proposed development would be located less than a mile from the planned Innovation Station Metrorail Station;
- The recommended density for the proposed development, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, was between a 0.75 and 1.0 floor-area ratio (FAR);
- The density of the previously-approved development option for the subject property was at a 0.99 FAR and the density for the Option 1 development was at a 0.82 FAR, which was consistent with the tapering of density for sites located near metrorail stations;
- The proposed extension of McNair Farms Drive would be connected to Dulles Technology Drive;
- The previously-approved development Option 2 included two multi-family residential buildings and that option also included the extension of McNair Farms Drive;
- The previously-approved proffer commitments for development Option 2 primarily involved transportation provisions, including the McNair Farms Drive extension and the mitigation of impacts to the right-of-way owned by FCPA;
- The existing development around the area consisted primarily of office and industrial development, which had been approved in the 1980s;
- The stormwater management provisions for the existing development was intended to capture the runoff from Dulles Technology Drive, but additional stormwater management facilities had been installed in conjunction with other developments to the north;
- The previously-approved rezoning application for the site included a commitment to dedicate the stormwater management pond to the FCPA, which necessitated a memorandum of agreement that articulated the design for the McNair Farms Drive extension;
- The various impacts to the existing stormwater management facilities in the area had been adequately addressed by the previously-approved rezoning application for the site;
- The proposal included subsequent improvements, such as turn-lanes onto Centreville Road from McNair Farms Drive, a traffic signal pre-emption device, commitments to green building practices, provisions for electric vehicle charging stations, commitments to affordable housing, contributions to Fairfax County Public Schools, and the inclusion of public park areas;
- The McNair Farms Drive extension had been designed in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations for the grid of streets for the surrounding area;



- The McNair Farms Drive extension included a four-lane section for the bridge area, which reflected the maximum number of lanes recommended for that road by the Comprehensive Plan;
- The McNair Farms Drive extension would taper to a two-lane road along the frontage of the proposed development, which would be constructed within the borders of the site;
- The plan for implementing the McNair Farms Drive extension had been submitted in conjunction with two previously-approved applications for the site and the cost of such an improvement was approximately \$3 million;
- The proposed Option 1 development for the site would incur less traffic compared to Option 2;
- The recreational commitments for the proposed Option 1 development included more park facilities compared to Option 2, which would amount to approximately 5.5 acres of the 11 acre site;
- The applicant did not object to the requirement articulated in Development Condition Number 7 to provide a minimum of 18 percent on-site water quality control and that requirement had not been included with the previously-approved application for the site;
- The subject applications included provisions for supplemental landscaping to improve the condition of the nearby resource protection areas, which had not been included with the previously-approved applications; and
- The proposal included provisions for supplemental landscaping between the subject property and the existing office development to the site.

Commissioner Cortina reiterated her concerns regarding the stormwater management provisions for the subject property, stating that the constraints of the area, such as the layout of the proposed development and the presence of resource protection area, limited the opportunities for facilities consistent with best management practices for stormwater. In addition, Commissioner Cortina pointed out that the surrounding area contained significant areas of mature vegetation and recommended that the applicant preserve that vegetation to the greatest extent possible, adding that such vegetation mitigated the stormwater impact on the site. Commissioner Cortina also acknowledged that the applicant's stormwater management provisions were consistent with the standards prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Hart reiterated his concerns regarding the constraints of the garages for the dwelling units in the proposed development. When he inquired as to whether the applicant supported incorporating a provision to disclose the issue to prospective purchasers of the units, Mr. Looney said that the applicant did not object to such a measure and would coordinate with staff to address the issue prior to the Board of Supervisors' public hearing for the subject applications. Ms. O'Donnell added that such a provision would be included as a proffer.



When Commissioner Sargeant asked for additional information regarding the applicant's preference to entering into a separate agreement with an appropriate County agency to provide the ADU/WDU commitments, Mr. Looney noted that the language articulating that provision had been included with the previously-approved rezoning application for the site. He added that such language was standard and intended to facilitate the process for implementing affordable housing without requiring an interpretation or proffered condition amendment. Commissioner Sargeant stated that there were instances when a proffered condition amendment would be preferable in managing the affordable housing provisions for a development, but did not object to the applicant's existing provisions.

Commissioner Ulfelder addressed Commissioner Sargeant's remarks regarding the applicant's preference for maintaining flexibility in implementing ADU/WDU commitments. He then said that he supported the language the applicant had utilized for the affordable housing commitments articulated in the proffers. Mr. Looney concurred with that statement.

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

Venkatar Mulpuri, 9705 Thorn Bush Drive, Fairfax Station, spoke in opposition to the subject applications because of the negative impact the McNair Farms Drive extension would incur on the existing commercial development to the north of the site. He expressed concern that constructing the McNair Farms Drive extension would result in reduced parking for that development. Mr. Mulpuri described the existing commercial development to the north, stating that it included multiple private schools and religious facilities. He then said that the impact of the McNair Farms Drive extension negatively impact the viability of some of those private school facilities and reduce the availability of such educational services throughout the area. In addition, Mr. Mulpuri voiced concern regarding the impact the road extension would incur on traffic and the surrounding environmental features.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Williams regarding the location of the McNair Farms Drive extension that would be constructed under the proposed development and the extent the road would impact the neighboring commercial development to the north wherein Ms. Williams indicated that the road extension included in the proposal would be two lanes, which would not impact the neighboring property, but the road could potentially be widened in the event that the site to the north redeveloped.

Sharon Staruchs, 13505 Dulles Tech Drive, Herndon, spoke in opposition to the subject applications, echoing remarks from Mr. Mulpuri regarding the negative impact the installation of the McNair Farms Drive extension would incur on the existing commercial site to the north. She stated that she owned and operated a private school facility on the neighboring commercial site and voiced concern that the planned road extension would impact the viability of that facility. She referred to a photograph that had been distributed to the Commissioners prior to the public hearing that depicted the existing commercial development, noting the architectural features of the building. Ms. Staruchs also pointed out that the extension would affect the parking provisions for the neighboring site, adding those same sites would also be subject to overflow parking from the proposed development in the event that the provisions provided by the garages was insufficient. (A copy of Ms. Staruchs' photograph is in the date file.)



Kathy Barahona, 10713 Milkweed Drive, Great Falls, voiced opposition to the proposal, echoing remarks from previous speakers regarding the impact the McNair Farms Drive extension would incur on the neighboring commercial development to the north. She indicated that she was the majority owner of one of the buildings on the neighboring site. She added that she did not object to developing the subject property, but did not support the installation of the road extension in a manner that impacted the existing commercial development. Ms. Barahona noted the limited buffering that would be included with the proposed two-lane road and expressed concern that the road would be widened in a manner that would not mitigate the impact on the commercial site. Referring to a handout that included a map depicting the planned design for the road extension that had been distributed prior to the public hearing, Ms. Barahona noted the close proximity of the extension to the neighboring commercial site and pointed out that the road would encroach onto that site. She added that the loss of parking that would be incurred by a widening of the road extension would affect the viability of the existing commercial businesses on the neighboring site. Ms. Barahona said that she had coordinated with the applicant and FCDOT on the placement of the McNair Farms Drive extension, but indicated that the design had not been adequately modified to mitigate the impact on the neighboring site. (A copy of Ms. Barahona's handout is in the date file.)

Karlos Strauchs, 25565 Arthur Place, Chantilly, spoke in opposition to the subject applications, echoing the concerns expressed by previous speakers regarding the potential impact of the McNair Farms Drive extension on the neighboring commercial development. He indicated that the extension and widening of the road would hinder the ability for the existing property owners on the site to pursue adequate compensation. Mr. Strauchs also described the existing parking issues on the site, noting that the area was subject to significant congestion due to the heavy usage of the religious facilities in the area. He then said that the parking on the neighboring site would be subject to congestion in the event that the proposed development generated the need for overflow parking. In addition, Mr. Strauchs stated that the depictions of the McNair Farms Drive extension in the CDPA/FDPA did not accurately reflect the impact of that extension on the neighboring site and referred the Commission to a handout that provided a more detailed depiction that had been distributed prior to the public hearing. He added that the accuracy of the depictions for the extension and the expected impact on the neighboring property would be subject to future litigation. Mr. Strauchs expressed further concern regarding the potential safety hazards that would be incurred on the McNair Farms Drive extension, noting that such hazards would also impact the neighboring commercial development. In addition, he said that the design of the extension did not reflect the depiction shown on the Comprehensive Plan. (A copy of Mr. Strauchs' handout is in the date file.)

Chapman Petersen, 3970 Chain Bridge Road, Fairfax, representing the Dulles Professional Center Condominium Owners Association, voiced opposition to the proposal, echoing the concerns articulated by previous speakers regarding the impact that the extension to McNair Farms Drive would incur on the existing commercial development to the north. He indicated that he represented the owners of the neighboring commercial development and noted the proximity of the road extension to the southern border of that development, adding that the absence of a buffer would intensify the impact. Mr. Petersen said that he had coordinated with the applicant to mitigate the impact of the extension by modifying the road to mitigate the impact, but noted that the issue remained unresolved. He also stated that the planned widening of the McNair Farms Drive extension would encroach upon the neighboring commercial properties, adding that the



proximity of the road would hinder efforts to redevelopment of the site. He added that the applicant's commitments to buffer the road extension from the neighboring commercial development were inadequate. Referring to Proffer Number 28, Right-of-Way Dedication, which articulated the applicant's commitments to constructing the McNair Farms Drive extension, Mr. Petersen suggested revising the language to require that the road extension was designed in a manner that did not significantly impact the neighboring commercial development to the north. He also recommended that the applicant commit to limiting the extent to which McNair Farms Drive was widened by considering a three-lane road instead of a four-lane road. Mr. Petersen stated that he did not object to developing the subject property, but favored additional provisions to mitigate the impact on existing development.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Commissioner Ulfelder regarding the review of previous applications for the subject property wherein Commissioner Ulfelder noted that the site had been subject to previously-approved rezoning applications in 2015 and 2017, which articulated the designs for the Option 2 development for the site.

When Commissioner Hart requested additional information regarding potential legal action associated with the neighboring commercial development to the north and the proposed development on the subject property due to the impact of the McNair Farms Drive extension, Mr. Petersen stated that there had been no litigation efforts since the approval of the previous rezoning applications for the site.

Commissioner Hart inquired as to the extent to which the two-over-two designs for the residential units utilized in Option 1 of the proposed development affected the proposed McNair Farms Drive extension and the associated impact on the neighboring site. Mr. Petersen explained that the unit designs in Option 1 was at a lower density than the previously-approved multi-family residential building included in Option 2, which mitigated the traffic impact of the development. However, he indicated that the reduced density did not adequately address his concerns regarding the impact of the road extension on the sites to the north. He added that he had coordinated with staff on addressing those concerns, but stated that there had been no subsequent modifications had been implemented.

Commissioner Hart said that the County did not frequently utilize condemnations to facilitate development. He then stated that the McNair Farms Drive extension would be a two-lane road under the subject applications and the road would not be widened until the neighboring site to the north redeveloped or such an effort was included in a public works project. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Petersen regarding the possibility that McNair Farms Drive would be widened in the future, the impact a two-lane road would incur on the neighboring commercial development, and the impact the road would incur on the ability for the neighboring site to redevelop at a later date wherein Mr. Petersen acknowledged that the two-lane design of that road would not encroach onto the neighboring development, but noted that the presence of the planned Innovation Station Metrorail Station would incur further development in the area that would increase the likelihood of a road widening.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Petersen regarding the circumstances in which the McNair Farms Road extension would be widened, the potential impact on property values that a two-lane extension would incur on the neighboring commercial



development, the possibility that a widening would require a taking of land, and the impact a widening on the overall value of the neighboring site wherein Mr. Petersen stated that the features and activity associated with the McNair Farms Road extension, such as right-of-way and sidewalks, would incur a significant impact on the neighboring property.

Commissioner Sargeant requested additional information on why the provisions articulated in Proffer Number 28 did not address the concerns of property owners for the neighboring commercial development to the north regarding the impact of the McNair Farms Road extension. Mr. Petersen explained the proffer did not adequately address the impact that such an extension would incur in the event that the road was widened to four lanes, adding that the ultimate design of the road included in the subject applications depicted a four-lane road. He then said that he favored modifying the design to limit the proposed extension to three lanes to mitigate the impact on the neighboring site. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Mr. Petersen regarding the applicant's commitment to provide the necessary right-of-way for the planned McNair Farms Road extension, the impact such commitments would have on the ability of the neighboring site to redevelop, and the property owners that would incur the cost of widening that road wherein Mr. Petersen voiced concern that the neighboring site would incur the cost of widening McNair Farms Road in the event it redeveloped.

When Commissioner Sargeant inquired as to extent to which the subject applications depicted the proposed McNair Farms Road extension with four lanes, Ms. O'Donnell indicated that four lanes was the maximum number of lanes recommended by the Comprehensive Plan and the continued utilization of the road at two lanes was not precluded. She added that the language in Proffer Number 28 did not include provisions that obligated the County or the applicant to widen McNair Farms Road. In addition, she explained that the purpose of the proffer was to ensure the applicant provided sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a widening of that road to four lanes, noting decision on an appropriate number of lanes would be rendered in the event that the nearby sites redeveloped. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. O'Donnell, with input from Mr. Petersen, regarding the possibility of modifying the language of Proffer Number 28 to mirror the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan language to permit greater flexibility in the design of the McNair Farms Road extension and the cost that neighboring property owners would incur in the event the road was widened wherein Ms. O'Donnell said that staff did not object to such a modification, but noted that revision of proffer language was done at the discretion of the applicant.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Looney, who explained the following:

- The applicant was obligated to demonstrate conformance to the Comprehensive Plan and since the Plan showed the McNair Farms Road extension as four lanes, the CDPA/FDPA depicted the road;
- The depiction of the McNair Farms Road extension as four lanes had been included in the previously-approved rezoning applications for the site and including a depiction that was not consistent with such a design would not constitute conformance with the Comprehensive Plan;



- The final design of the McNair Farms Road extension was contingent on the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and the proposal did not preclude or require that the road be widened to four lanes;
- The design of the proposed bridge that connected to the McNair Farms Road extension would include adequate space for four lanes to accommodate a potential widening;
- The applicant intended to construct the McNair Farms Road extension along the northern portion of the subject property with two lanes, but the process and determination for widening that road was beyond the scope of the subject applications;
- The design of the McNair Farms Road extension would begin at Dulles Technology Drive, as shown on Sheet 8 of the CDPA/FDPA, and provided a portion of the planned grid of streets for the areas around the planned Innovation Station Metrorail Station;
- The subject property was located in close proximity to a resource protection area, which limited the area in which to construct the McNair Farms Road extension and created constraints for modifying the route of that road;
- The depiction of a two-lane configuration and a four-lane configuration for the McNair Farms Road extension had been included in the CDPA/FDPA had been requested by staff and was intended to show that such configurations were feasible without legally binding neighboring property owners; and
- The applicant would coordinate with the County in the event that the McNair Farms Road extension in the event that the road were widened from two lanes to four lanes.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Looney regarding the reason the applicant included a depiction of a four-lane configuration for the McNair Farms Road extension in the subject applications, the frequency with which such depictions were included in similar developments, and the extent the right-of-way for road extensions were shared by neighboring property owners wherein Mr. Looney reiterated that the four-lane configuration had been included to reflect the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and to demonstrate that such a configuration was feasible, adding that the applicant would dedicate a greater portion of the right-of-way than the existing property to the north.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested additional information regarding the absence of buffering provisions for the McNair Farms Road extension. Mr. Looney explained that such provisions were unnecessary because the initial two-lane configuration of the road was not the ultimate condition depicted in the Comprehensive Plan and any buffering would be installed within the right-of-way. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Looney regarding the purpose of a buffer along a road extension and the responsibilities for constructing such buffers wherein Mr. Looney pointed out that it was uncommon to request an applicant to provide such features for a road that was a portion of a planned grid of streets.



When Commissioner asked for additional information regarding the applicant's preference for the configuration of the McNair Farms Road extension, Mr. Looney indicated that the applicant did not object to the road being widened to three or four lanes, adding that the process for approving such a modification was beyond the scope of the subject applications. In addition, he indicated that the presence of the road would improve the condition of the existing commercial development to the north of the subject property by providing additional routes for ingress/egress.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out the challenges associated with developing areas located near planned metrorail stations and the impacts associated with increased density throughout the area. He also noted the importance of the McNair Farms Road extension because it provided an additional connection between Dulles Technology Drive and Centreville Road, which facilitated development throughout the area.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Carter and Ms. Williams, with input from Ms. Iannetta, regarding the existing parking provisions on the neighboring commercial development to the north, the accuracy of the depictions of those areas in the CDPA/FDPA, the location of environmentally sensitive areas around the site, the existing condition of Dulles Technology Drive, the availability of street parking on Dulles Technology Drive, and the feasibility of modifying Dulles Technology Drive to accommodate four lanes wherein Ms. Williams and Ms. Iannetta indicated the following:

- The current configuration of Dulles Technology Drive utilized two lanes and could accommodate street parking;
- The configuration of Dulles Technology Drive could be subsequently modified to accommodate four lanes in the event that McNair Farms Road was widened;
- The Comprehensive Plan recommended the installation of on-road bicycle lanes throughout the area; and
- The ultimate condition of Dulles Technology Drive could utilize three lanes with on-road bicycle lanes and staff preferred that configuration over a four-lane road because three lanes provided greater flexibility in implementing additional features.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Carter and Ms. Iannetta regarding the methods for alleviating the impact of a future widening of McNair Farms Road, the feasibility of utilizing a three-lane configuration, the process for determining the final configuration of the road, and the difficulty associated with widening roads wherein Ms. Iannetta stated the following:

- The Comprehensive Plan contained sufficient flexibility to determine an appropriate configuration for the McNair Farms Road extension;
- The four-lane configuration was the recommended maximum and the Plan text did not preclude a three-lane configuration with additional features; and

- The potential widening of McNair Farms Road extension would be determined within the context of the surrounding development.

Commissioner Carter inquired as to whether the private road network within the proposed development was adequate and asked whether that road network could be modified to provide greater flexibility for designing the McNair Farms Road extension. Ms. Williams explained that the internal road network within the site had been subject to frequent revisions during the review process and staff supported the proposed configuration because it provided connectivity for residents of the development and access for emergency vehicles.

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 Ulfelder for action on these cases.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Although we have a Board date next week, we could defer this decision for a week for the Planning Commission and ask the Board to defer its public hearing to July 10<sup>th</sup> and it would not require any re-advertising because it would be within the 30 days. So since we have a lot of questions and certain things that are still floating around a bit – and I think we’d...we like to get things to settle down and get a little more information for everyone before we vote. I’M GOING TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PCA 2017-DR-014 AND CDPA 2017-DR-014 AND FDPA 2017-DR-014 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JUNE 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer these decisions – the decision only to a date certain of June 21<sup>st</sup>, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yes, and I think we would like – WE NEED TO MAKE A REQUEST TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT IT MOVE TO DEFER ITS HEARING SCHEDULED FOR NEXT TUESDAY TO A DATE – TO THEIR NEXT MEETING OF JULY 10<sup>TH</sup>.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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



Commissioners: Aye.

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

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

CLOSED SESSION MOTION

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION GO INTO CLOSED SESSION WITH ATTORNEYS FROM THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE TO DISCUSS SPECIFIC LEGAL MATTERS REQUIRING THE PROVISION OF LEGAL ADVICE AND SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE ADDRESSING SHORT-TERM LODGING AND THE RELATED PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 4 OF THE COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES, ALL AS PERMITTED BY *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 2.2-3711(8).

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

CLOSED SESSION CLEANSING MOTION

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman, IN ACCORDANCE WITH *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 2.2-3712, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS CERTIFY THAT, TO THE BEST OF EACH MEMBER'S KNOWLEDGE, ONLY PUBLIC BUSINESS MATTERS LAWFULLY EXEMPTED FROM OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE

VIRGINIA FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND ONLY SUCH PUBLIC BUSINESS MATTERS AS WERE IDENTIFIED IN THE MOTION BY WHICH THE CLOSED SESSION WAS CONVENED WERE HEARD, DISCUSSED, OR CONSIDERED IN CLOSED SESSION.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

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

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//




The meeting was adjourned at 12:48 a.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: February 6, 2019

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

