

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 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 C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Donté Tanner, Sully District
Mary D. Cortina, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 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

2232-H18-3 – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES,
Capital Facilities, Replacement of Reston Fire and Rescue Station #25 Facility, 1820 Wiehle
Ave., Reston, VA 20190

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Carter: I've been to the community meetings, along with staff, on this item. So, as such, I'M GOING TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE STAFF DETERMINATION THAT THE PROPOSED FACILITY FOR 2232-H18-3, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, CAPITAL FACILITIES, REPLACEMENT OF THE RESTON FIRE AND RESCUE STATION NUMBER 25, LOCATED AT 1820 WIEHLE AVENUE, RESTON, VIRGINIA, 20190.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Seconded.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by 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 2232-H18-3, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS – NORTH COUNTY MARK-UP (Decision Only)
(The public hearing on this item was held on June 21, 2018.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last week, we held the public hearing for the five remaining North County Site-Specific Plan Amendment nominations. Tonight, we will be using the staff report recommendation to mark up the amendments and move it forward to the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Murphy: Ulfelder wants to make a statement at some time.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Oh, yeah. This will be very – very brief and then the three North County nominator district Commissioners...

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Migliaccio: This all started one year ago when the Board adopted this new Site-Specific Plan Amendment process with the expectation that it would provide an easy-to-track, predictable process for stakeholders and would increase public participation compared to previous methods. Hopefully, this has proven to be true. Planning staff and the three district task force worked together to analyze the 10 nominations and came to the same conclusions on all but one item. They differed on PC17-PR-005. Tonight, I will be advancing the staff's position in my motion because the adopted Comprehensive Plan provides a sufficient alternative and I think that the proposed nomination does not raise – rise to the level of being added to the work program. Before I proceed to the motion, I do have one question of staff for clarification. Last week, we focused on the five remaining nominations. Attachment 2, starting on page 137, indicates that there will be some items removed from the work program, including some that are not in North County. Can you briefly just tell me the staff process that went into that – any outreach that happened with either the Planning Commission or a district office or citizens in South County?

Bernard Suchicital, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. Bernie Suchicital with the Department of Planning and Zoning. Staff did reach out with the district Supervisors and some of the Planning Commissioners to – as well as other County staff and department agencies to review and identify a number of Plan Amendments that have gone inactive due to either the incorporation or review of other subsequent studies or due to shifting priorities in the County.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay, so there were no active nominations that you're stopping and taking off the board?

Mr. Suchicital: That is correct.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Okay, thank you. Okay, Mr. Chairman, I do have one motion to start this. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE REVISED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS FOUND ON PAGES 137 TO 141 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 7TH, 2018. THIS WOULD FORWARD FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION FOUR SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NOMINATIONS SUBMITTED IN THE 2017 NORTH COUNTY SSPA PROCESS:

- PC17-DR-001;
- PC17-PR-001;
- PC17-PR-002; AND
- PC17-SU-001, WITH PC17-PR-001 AND 002 GROUPED INTO A STUDY OF THE MERRIFIELD SUBURBAN CENTER.

Commissioners Hart and Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and Mr. Niedzielski. Is there a – Eichner – is there a discussion of the motion? Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last week, just prior to our public hearing on these nominations, we received a letter from Virginia Tech asking us to consider including in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program a nine-plus-acre site adjacent to the WMATA West Falls Church Metro Station proposal, PA17-DR-001, the Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia jointly own in part and lease in part. At the time, it was noted that we had not heard from the University of Virginia, the joint owner and leasee. Well, this week, the University of Virginia submitted a letter indicating its agreement with Virginia Tech's request. Since the joint request was submitted very late in the SSPA process, we are still considering it and how to appropriately respond. In the meantime, I support Commissioner Migliaccio's motion recommending the inclusion of WMATA's nomination in the Comprehensive Work Plan Program.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much. Is there further discussion of the motion? Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Three Providence District sites are nominated to be added to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program under this process. The Commission convened a public hearing last week to hear from the community about whether or not these sites should be added the Work Program. I want to thank those who nominated their sites for consideration, the Providence District Task Force members who took the time to develop their recommendations, the staffs for – the staff for its diligent efforts, and to those members of the community who shared their perspectives and concerns with us last week. You may recall, Mr. Chairman, we had some confusion as to the Providence Task Force

recommendation regarding the Merrifield at Dunn Loring Station nomination. At the public hearing, I asked staff to explain the task force recommendation for PC17-PR-005, as it relates to the redevelopment option in the adopted Plan. As I understand it, a redevelopment proposal on the subject area may seek an intensity in excess of the adopted Plan option, based on bonus density associated with provisions of affordable units, and that it may include some limited non-residential supporting uses. The intensity could approach the task force recommended intensity. However, the proposal would not be relieved of the championing the other Plan recommendations, such as those about building heights, open space, buffering, and noise mitigation. Mr. Chairman, I will be supporting Commissioner Migliaccio's motion. Specific to the Providence site, I support not adding the Merrifield at Dunn Loring Station to the Amendment Work Program at this time. I believe the adopted Plan remains viable and is in line with the community's vision and prefer the consideration for changing the designation from an area adjacent to the core area of the Dunn Loring Transit Station Area, thereby permitting a higher-density mixed-use development – redevelopment be considered more comprehensively, along with the overall TSA. My view is that there will be a time when such a study will be needed to be undertaken. Regarding the INOVA and Fairview Park nominations, I do support adding both sites to the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and conducting an area-wide study of the Merrifield Suburban Center that considers both sites in tandem. This study will need to first include an existing conditions analysis inclusive of the transportation network, the schools, human services, parks, recreation, and other public facility and service needs. And with regard to the transportation network, once the existing conditions analysis is completed, we need to consider options that will reduce the Beltway as a barrier to achieving the synergies I believe are possible to further strengthening – excuse me – Merrifield as one of our premier activity centers. We know the traffic is the key barrier to success in this regard and I hope that the study, if added by the Board, will include the same detailed analysis, as was achieved for the award-winning EMBARK process, to include possible mass transit, the vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian options, and connections over the Beltway. Finally, Mr. Chairman, a successful study must include inviting participation from the community. I know that there will be an open invitation to participate through the work of a task force that will be set up specific to the Merrifield Suburban Center Study, which will be chaired by Tom Fleury, who I believe is in the audience. Tom, thanks. And I intend to stay active and engaged as the study progresses – and invite any interested or concerned parties to reach out to me and/or Supervisor Smyth for assistance, if necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much. Is there further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Commissioner Migliaccio, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Vice Chairman Hart: Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Strandlie: Mr. Chairman, if I can be recorded as – abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Abstain. Ms. Strandlie abstains.

The motion carried by a vote of 11-0-1. Commissioner Strandlie abstained from the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. PCA 91-Y-006/SE 2018-SU-001 – TRUSTEES OF PENDER UNITED METHODIST CHURCH
2. 2232-D18-2 – PIMMIT RUN STREAM VALLEY PARK
3. PCA 82-L-071 – BELL GROUP, LLC
4. RZ/FDP 2016-HM-007 – ONE RESTON COMPANY, LLC AND TWO RESTON COMPANY, LLC
5. RZ 2017-HM-032/SE 2017-HM-030 – CORESITE REAL ESTATE SUNRISE TECHNOLOGY PARK, LLC
6. RZ 2017-DR-023 – TRADITION HOMES, LLC
7. SEA 99-P-046-02/SEA 84-P-105-4 – FLINT HILL SCHOOL

This order was accepted without objection.

//

PCA 91-Y-006 – TRUSTEES OF PENDER UNITED METHODIST CHURCH – Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ 91-Y-006 previously approved for a church with a child care center to permit building additions and associated modifications to proffers and site design with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.25. Located on the N. side of Lee Jackson Memorial Hwy., W. of Adler Woods Dr. on approx. 4.4835 ac. of land zoned R-3, WS and HC. Comp. Plan Rec: 2-3 du/ac. Tax Map 45-4 ((1)) 8. (Concurrent with SE 2018-SU-001). SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

SE 2018-SU-001 – TRUSTEES OF PENDER UNITED METHODIST CHURCH – Appl. under Sect. 3-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a church with a child care center. Located at 12401 Adler Woods Dr., Fairfax, 22033 on approx. 4.48 ac. of land zoned R-3, WS and HC. Tax Map 45-4 ((1)) 8. (Concurrent with PCA 91-Y-006). SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Shane Murphy, Applicant's Agent, Reed Smith, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 29, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Zachary Fountain, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of applications PCA 91-Y-006 and SE 2018-SU-001.

Commissioner Tanner said that he supported staff's recommendation for approval, but noted that there was outstanding concern from the community on the traffic conditions along Alder Woods Drive, which ran along the eastern border of the site. Commissioner Tanner explained that the surrounding community had sought traffic calming measures, which involved conducting a study to determine whether the road qualified for those measures. He stated that such a study concluded that the conditions on Alder Woods Drive warranted traffic calming measures. Commissioner Tanner added that there were ongoing efforts between the community and the applicant to pursue such measures, but the process had not been completed and a task force would be assembled to continue those efforts.

Mr. Murphy waived the applicant's presentation.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

John Gaevara, 3713 Corlis Oak Court, Fairfax, said that he spoke on behalf of the Fair Woods Homeowners Association. He then commended staff and the applicant for operating in a manner that preserved the character of the surrounding residential communities. However, Mr. Gaevara expressed concern regarding the traffic impact the proposal would incur on Alder Woods Drive. He noted that the road was primarily utilized by residents of the Fair Woods community and those accessing the subject property. He then described the growth in traffic volume along Alder Woods Drive, citing significant growth in the surrounding area. Mr. Gaevara also pointed out the narrowness of Alder Woods Drive, citing multiple accidents that had occurred along the road. He requested additional study of the traffic in that area, adding that increasing traffic volumes would generate safety hazards for residents of the existing residential communities. In addition, Mr. Gaevara indicated that the line of sight for the egress on the subject property was obstructed by vegetation, which incurred a safety hazard for vehicles utilizing Alder Woods Drive. He then suggested that the applicant remove portions of the vegetation to improve the line of sight. He also asked that the Commission consider the overall traffic impact of future developments on Alder Woods Drive, noting that the existing condition of the road could not safely accommodate heavy traffic volumes.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Tanner and Mr. Gaevara regarding the coordination of the Fair Woods Community with the staff that had evaluated Alder Woods Drive for traffic calming studies, the community's efforts to address traffic-related issues with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and the opportunities for further coordination with the Sully District Office wherein Mr. Gaevara indicated that staff had not contacted the Fair Woods Community, adding that efforts to work with VDOT to address the issues had not been successful.

Commissioner Tanner stated that the capacity of the on-site child care center/nursery school would be increased from 75 to 99 and staff concluded that it would not generate a significant

traffic impact. Mr. Fountain concurred with that statement, adding that the proposal would not increase the number of seats within the existing church. He also pointed out that the child care center/nursery school operated during the week, which mitigated the traffic impact. Mr. Fountain added that the Fairfax County Department of Transportation had identified the issue regarding sight line distances at the egress point and staff supported the removal of vegetation to mitigate that issue. Mr. Murphy acknowledged the line of sight issue on the site, adding that the applicant owned the portion of the site that contained the vegetation. He then indicated that the applicant did not object to removal of some vegetation to improve the sight distances. In addition, Mr. Murphy said that the applicant had conducted a traffic impact analysis for the proposal, which concluded that the impact of the proposed increase on enrollment to the on-site child care center/nursery school was negligible. He also stated that the applicant had coordinated with the residents of the surrounding neighborhood and no objections were expressed, noting that the operation of the facility did not incur a significant traffic impact on Alder Woods Drive. Mr. Murphy added that the proposal would not increase the capacity of the existing church on the site.

There were no more speakers; therefore, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Murphy, who declined. 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 Tanner for action on these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Tanner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I'd like to request that the applicant state on the record their acceptance of the development conditions dated June 26th, 2018.

Shane Murphy, Applicant's Agent, Reed Smith, LLP: Shane Murphy again, Reed Smith, for the applicant. And we do accept those conditions.

Commissioner Tanner: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this is a – a pretty straightforward case. The church has been a great neighbor and, you know, wants to continue to do so. We are recognizing the conditions of Alder Wood Road and we actually making sure that we address those going forward. But I don't see any reason to stop this case from moving forward and make sure that – with the understanding that we're going to continue to address those community concerns. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I have three motions. First, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PCA 91-Y-006, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS DATED MAY 29TH, 2018.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA 91-Y-006, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Tanner: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE SE 2018-SU-001, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 26TH, 2018.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2018-SU-001, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Tanner: And finally, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS, PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-305, IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN – SHOWN ON THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN/SPECIAL EXCEPTION PLAT, AS CONDITIONED.

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.

Commissioner Tanner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-D18-2 – PIMMIT RUN STREAM VALLEY PARK – To consider the proposal by the Fairfax County Park Authority to replace the Area 1 Maintenance Shop facility, located at 1927 & 1929 Pimmit Drive, Falls Church, VA 22043. Tax Map Numbers: 40-1 ((13)) A, 40-1 ((15)) B, and 40-1 ((9)) A. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Yvonne Goh, Planning 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 2232-D18-2.

Commissioner Ulfelder said that a letter from David Bowden, Planning and Development Division (PDD), Fairfax County Parks Authority (FCPA), to the McLean Citizens Association (MCA) had been submitted to the Commission prior to the public hearing wherein concerns were raised regarding the usage of board-on-board fencing and pervious pavements. He then inquired as to whether those modifications had been incorporated into the site plan. Ms. Goh indicated that the modifications to the fencing on the site had been incorporated into the site plan, but the permeable pavement provisions had not been included. (A copy of the letter is in the date file.)

Commissioner Ulfelder stated that an underground stormwater management facility would be utilized for capturing stormwater runoff from the proposed facility, but some runoff would flow over the asphalt parking lot. Ms. Goh concurred with that statement. He then asked whether the stormwater runoff from that parking lot would empty into the nearby Resource Protection Area (RPA). Ms. Goh indicated that the runoff would flow into the 100-foot buffer on the site and would not impact the RPA.

Answering questions from Commissioner Ulfelder, Ms. Goh said the following:

- The permeable pavement was located on the eastern portion of the site and the purpose of that pavement was to capture the stormwater runoff that was not captured by the underground facility;
- The area between the proposed maintenance facility and the Pimmit Run Stream was heavily wooded with mature vegetation; and
- The Pimmit Run Stream Valley Park ran from McLean down to the George Washington Parkway and subsequently emptied into the Potomac River.

Commissioner Cortina expressed concern that the site was not ideal for the installation of a maintenance shop, but acknowledged the historical reasons for why such a facility had been located there. She then requested that the applicant provide additional information on the process utilized for considering alternate locations for the facility.

When Commissioner Cortina inquired as to whether the fuel tank that would be relocated on the site utilized a spill guard, Ms. Goh indicated that the tank would be located on a concrete pad to mitigate the environmental impact. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Goh regarding the measures the fuel tank would utilize to prevent or mitigate spills wherein Ms. Goh stated that the tank utilized appropriate measures prescribed by the County.

Valerie Maislin, PDD, FCPA, gave a presentation wherein she explained the following:

- The County was divided into six geographical areas and each contained a maintenance shop that provided support for park facilities;

- The subject property was located in the geographical area identified as Area 1 by the FCPA and that area included Oakton, Vienna, Tysons, Falls Church, Langley, and Pimmit Hills;
- The FCPA owned approximately 1,800 acres in Area 1 and included 92 parks, 37 athletic fields, 50 playgrounds, and approximately 52 miles of trails and those facilities required significant maintenance;
- The existing facility on the site operated from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday and employed approximately 20 people, who conducted maintenance operations at the various park facilities throughout Area 1;
- The existing facility also provided training areas, storage, and equipment for carpentry operations;
- The site was located within the Pimmit Run Stream Valley Park and was adjacent to Pimmit Drive;
- The area around the subject property consistent of low-density residential development and park area, which were buffered by existing wooded areas;
- The existing entrance to the site included a wooden fence and mature trees;
- The proposal would remove some of the existing buildings from the subject property and relocate the existing fuel tank;
- The proposal would not modify the shed on the northeast portion of the site, which was utilized by the Pimmit Hills Civic Association;
- The existing buildings on the site were in poor condition and subject to significant leakage during inclement weather;
- The existing buildings did not provide sufficient space to adequately conduct maintenance operations;
- The proposal would not modify the location of the existing entrance;
- The building that would be constructed under the proposal would be a one-story structure that contained approximately 7,500 square feet, which was sufficient to accommodate the necessary maintenance activities for the FCPA;
- The driveway that led into the site from Pimmit Drive would be modified to provide additional area to accommodate vegetation;

- The proposal included additional plantings on various portions of the site, as had been suggested by residents of the surrounding community;
- The additional plantings would provide a buffer for the existing residential community and pervious surfaces to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff;
- The location for the fuel tank would be downhill from the existing residential development to the west and was surrounded by a wooden fence;
- The parking lot of the site would consist primarily of asphalt, but certain areas would utilize pervious pavers to mitigate the stormwater impact onto Pimmit Run;
- The majority of the stormwater runoff generated by the site would be captured by an underground detention facility;
- The proposed building for the site included offices, training rooms, locker rooms, rest rooms, and a maintenance bay;
- The proposal included supplemental buildings that would be utilized for storage and the washing of vehicles;
- The roof of the proposed building would utilize an appearance consistent with the character of the surrounding area;
- The plantings included in the proposal included evergreens and deciduous trees;
- The entrances to the maintenance bays would be oriented to minimize the visual impact on the neighboring residential development;
- The proposed facility would be at a lower elevation compared to Pimmit Road, which mitigated the visual impact of the site;
- The proposal included fencing and environmental provisions to ensure that the visual impact of the facility was less than that of the existing condition on the site; and
- The applicant had coordinated with the Pimmit Hills Citizens Association and the MCA to address community concerns, which resulted in additional commitments to supplementing the transitional screening provisions and utilizing a board-on-board fence.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Maislin regarding the personnel that would utilize the proposed maintenance facility and the daily operations of the facility wherein Ms. Maislin confirmed that the crew responsible for maintaining the Oak Marr Recreation Center would operate out of the proposed facility, adding that some staff would operate from Oak Marr until construction of the facility was completed and the rebuilt facility would accommodate a crew of approximately 20 to 25 individuals.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the height of the proposed maintenance facility on the site was 26 feet, which was a four-foot increase from the previous design. He then inquired about the visual impact of that increase on the surrounding residential development. Ms. Maislin clarified that while the average height of the building was approximately 22 feet due to the presence of a pitched roof, the top of the building was approximately 26 feet in height and that height was reflected in the designs. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Maislin regarding the extent to which the designs for the building in the staff report accurately reflected the dimensions of the proposed facility.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked why the applicant had determined that it was not feasible to capture additional stormwater runoff within the underground detention facility, Ms. Maislin explained that the runoff that was not captured by that facility flowed from an RPA and increasing the amount of runoff detained would require significant grading of the RPA. She added that such a significant land disturbance was not permitted in the RPA.

Commissioner Cortina reiterated her question regarding the applicant's consideration of alternative sites and expressed concern regarding the impact of the fuel tank on the nearby stream valley. Ms. Maislin explained that the applicant had evaluated five alternative sites, but none of those sites met the necessary criteria of location, lot size, and availability. She then indicated that the fuel tank would be enclosed within a concrete vault and the facility staff had existing procedures to address potential spills. Ms. Maislin added that the proposal would relocate the fuel tank to an area that was less likely to impact the existing stream valley. Commissioner Cortina then recommended that the applicant utilize locks to improve the security around the fuel tank. She also suggested further enhancements to the buffer along the stream valley to ensure potential spills and stormwater runoff was captured. She added that she supported the subject application.

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 Ulfelder for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In light of the fact that the – I'm going to – okay – I think the questions that we've had have been adequately answered. I think that the presentation has been thorough and I think that it represents and reflects a significant improvement and change at this site. I understand that some of the questions about whether this – another site would be better or whether there's things that could be done to – and further improve it, but I think that what we've had is a – a good plan presented to us to deal with a – an ongoing difficult maintenance facility that has been past ripe for change and improvement. And I'm – this is important to the Area 1 folks to have a good and operational facility to help take care of their parks and trails. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I concur with staff's recommendation for application 2232-D18 – let me ask one thing first before I make my motion. I want to get a commitment from the Park Authority that they will revise the site plan exhibit to reflect the

changes that we discussed tonight and that were discussed in some of the previous correspondence, including the pervious pavers, and so on, so that as it goes – as you go forward with the work, it's understood that when we concur with this, we're concurring with a – the site plan that includes those commitments from the Park Authority. Do you agree with that commitment? David, do you want to commit to it?

David Bowden, Planning and Development Division, Fairfax County Park Authority: Yes, I'm David Bowden, Director of Planning and Development at the Park Authority. Yes, we are certainly committed to all those items and in – to address one of Mary's questions, also. In our CIP projects, we typically set about three percent of our budget aside for natural resource mitigation for impacts from development. So that's one area where we can address the lack of vegetation in the stream valley also.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay, thank you. With that, Mr. Chairman, I CONCUR WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION FOR APPLICATION 2232-D18-2, FOR THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF THE AREA 1 MAINTENANCE SHOP LOCATED AT 1927 AND 1929 PIMMIT DRIVE, SATISFIES THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve 2232-D18-2, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Ulfelder: Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-D18-2 SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioner: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PCA 82-L-071 – BELL GROUP, LLC – Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ 82-L-071 previously approved for contractor's offices and shops to permit additional uses and associated modifications to proffers and site design with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of up to 0.25. Located on the N. side of Oakwood Rd., E. of South Van Dorn St. on approx. 36,689 sq. ft. of land zoned I-4. Comp. Plan Rec: Alternative Uses. Tax Map 81-2 ((3))
30. LEE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Keith Martin, Applicant's Agent, Tramonte, Yeonas, Roberts & Martin, PLLC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated December 13, 2017.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

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

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Migliaccio: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Martin, I do have one issue in the proffers. I'm going to defer the decision because I don't think it syncs up with what the Lee Land Use Committee had asked for, so I'm just going to defer until July 12th because my notes are different than what the proffer is saying – one of the uses that was being proffered out. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 12TH, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on PCA 82-L-071 to date certain of July 12th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ/FDP 2016-HM-007 – ONE RESTON COMPANY, LLC AND
TWO RESTON COMPANY, LLC – Appls. to rezone from I-4 to
PDC to permit mixed use development with an overall Floor Area
Ratio (FAR) of 2.62 and approval of the conceptual and final
development plan. Located in the W. of Reston Pkwy., N. of
Sunrise Valley Dr., E. of Edmund Halley Dr. and S. of Dulles
Airport Access and Toll Rd. on approx. 36.1 ac. of land. Comp.
Plan Rec: Office/ Transit Station Mixed Use. Tax Map 17-3 ((8))
1A1 and 1B. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mark Looney, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 19, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

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 applications RZ/FDP 2016-HM-007.

Commissioner Hart inquired as to whether there had been modifications to the loading space waiver between the publication of the original staff report dated June 14, 2018 and the addendum dated June 21, 2018. Ms. Tsai indicated that there had been no modifications to the loading space waiver and staff had not voiced objections. Commissioner Hart stated that while the applicant had provided the required number of loading spaces for the proposal, the location of those spaces was unevenly spread throughout the site. He then expressed concern regarding the adequacy of the loading spaces and the possibility that such spaces would be utilized more frequently, due to trends in economic activity and the growing need for delivery areas. When Commissioner Hart asked for additional information regarding the proximity of the loading spaces to residential areas, Ms. Tsai said that the applicant had committed to the installation of short-term loading spaces, which was articulated in Proffer Number 29G, Short-Term Loading, in the revised set of proffers dated June 6, 2018 contained in Attachment 1 of the staff report addendum. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Tsai, with input from Commissioner Carter, regarding the availability of loading spaces for each residential building and the procedures for conducting deliveries wherein Ms. Tsai stated that each building would utilize designated areas within the garages to accommodate deliveries and Commissioner Carter added that the proposed development would also utilize on-street parking to provide additional flexibility for delivery vehicles.

Commissioner Carter explained that the subject applications had two outstanding issues at the time the original staff report was published. He said that one of those issues involved the applicant's athletic field commitment, but that issue had been resolved after the finalization of a proffer to provide one full-size off-site soccer field with 50 parking spaces and a practice facility. In addition, he said the applicant had finalized a second option to provide an athletic field on-site atop one of the parking garages, but noted that staff preferred the first option.

Commissioner Carter then explained that the second outstanding issue pertained to the applicant's affordable housing commitment, pointing out that the existing commitment would

provide workforce dwelling units at lower income tiers in lieu of larger monetary contribution to the affordable housing fund. He indicated that the issue had not been resolved and expressed concern that the applicant's method for addressing the affordable housing requirements would establish a precedent for other cases in Reston.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner noted that staff had concluded that the mixed-use character of the proposed development and the site's proximity to a planned Metrorail station would generate fewer trips than a commercial or industrial development. He then pointed out that the applicant had included language in Proffer Number 10, Transfer, which permitted flexibility to transfer square-footage of a use in a building to another building. He also indicated that staff would subsequently review how such a transfer would affect the character of the proposed development and inquired as to how that review would incur modifications to the development. Ms. Tsai explained that such impacts would be evaluated during review of subsequent final development plan applications. A discussion ensued between Commissioners Carter and Niedzielski-Eichner, with input from Ms. Tsai, regarding the need for flexibility in transferring uses between buildings within the development and the intended character of the community the applicant was pursuing wherein Ms. Tsai confirmed that subsequent modifications to the mix of uses within the development would be subject to further review by the Commission.

Mr. Looney gave a presentation on the subject applications wherein he explained the following:

- The subject property had three existing access points, which would remain under the proposal;
- The proposal would implement a grid of streets that would align with the existing access points to the site to create the urban blocks recommended by the Comprehensive Plan;
- The site was located to the south and west of the planned Reston Town Center Metrorail Station;
- The proposal consisted of between 1.5 and 1.6 million square feet of development and approximately 385,000 square feet had been previously constructed;
- The proposed development was within the density range recommended by the Comprehensive Plan with a 2.62 floor area ratio, which included the 15-percent bonus density afforded by the applicant's affordable housing commitments;
- The first phase of the proposed development included a 110,000 square-foot grocery store with residential units mixed into that area;
- The proposal included urban park spaces;
- The applicant's commitment to reserve 30 percent of the site as landscaped open space was greater than the 20 percent recommended by the Comprehensive Plan and the requirements prescribed by the urban parks framework;

- The applicant had committed to purchasing seven acres of undeveloped property off-site on which a full-sized athletic field would be constructed;
- The applicant would dedicate the seven-acre site containing the athletic field to the Fairfax County Park Authority after the purchase was finalized;
- The proposal included an alternative mechanism for providing an athletic field in the event that purchase of the seven-acre site was not obtained, which would be subject to a separate review procedure;
- The proposal included interim park spaces that would be located near the planned Reston Town Center Metrorail Station with the intention of enhancing the visual impact for those utilizing the Metrorail;
- The installation of planned 110,000 square-foot grocery store included park facilities with accommodations such as a bell park and fitness area;
- The existing stormwater management ponds would be modified with park amenities to provide additional open space for recreational activities;
- The proposal included a neighborhood park that would be located in front of the planned 110,000 square-foot grocery store and hotel/residential block that was similar in size to the existing facility located in the Mosaic development in Merrifield;
- The applicant would implement an urban corridor pathway near the planned Reston Town Center Metrorail Station that would connect with the pedestrian path network throughout the site;
- The proposed development included a commitment to public artwork and the applicant would coordinate with Public Art Reston to provide appropriate features;
- The subject applications included transportation improvements such as a widening of the Reston Parkway, providing a grid of streets, and installing the necessary turn lanes;
- The applicant had coordinated with staff after the publication of the original staff report on provisions that would accelerate the implementation of the planned transportation improvement in accordance with the guidelines prescribed by the Reston Road Fund;
- The applicant would contribute to the Reston Road Fund, as articulated in Proffer Number 25, Reston Road Fund;
- The applicant would provide adequate short-term loading spaces within the development to accommodate and facilitate deliveries;

- The proposal included provisions for the implementation of a network of bicycle and pedestrian paths, which included bicycle lanes and six to eight-foot sidewalks;
- The pedestrian paths within the proposed development would connect the planned 110,000 square-foot grocery store with those accessing the planned Reston Town Center Metrorail Station;
- The applicant had committed to achieving Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design certification for each building on the site;
- The subject application included a commitment to Fairfax County Public Schools and on-site recreation facilities;
- The applicant had coordinated with neighboring property owners to vacate previous covenants for a 750-acre plot of land that precluded the installation of residential and destination retail on that area;
- The vacation of those previous covenants had been finalized upon approval of a section exception application amendment by the Board of Supervisors in July 2009, which permitted mixed-use development in that area;
- The applicant had concluded that the cost and efforts to obtain that previously-approved special exception amendment application warranted an exemption of the initial 724,000 square feet of office development from the affordable housing contribution requirements, but not from other commitments, such as the Reston Road Fund;
- The applicant favored an alternative mechanism for fulfilling the affordable housing requirements prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan that included providing units at a rate that took into account the 724,000 square-foot exemption incurred by the existing office development on the site, but at a lower income tier;
- The applicant did not object to providing a monetary contribution for affordable housing in the event that the Board of Supervisors did not exempt the 724,000 square feet of office development from the proposal, but favored the provisions articulated in Proffer Number 31 through 33 that outlined the alternative method; and
- The subject applications contained building architecture and designs for the planned 110,000 square-foot grocery store on the site, which included commitments to screening the parking structures.

Referring to the memorandum dated May 14, 2018 from Denise James, Environment and Development Review Branch, Department of Planning and Zoning, which was included in Appendix 9 of the staff report, Commissioner Cortina pointed out that staff had concluded that the two existing stormwater management ponds could be utilized in a manner consistent with the provisions for the previously-approved commercial development on the site, provided that the

proposal did not increase the amount of impervious surface on the site. She expressed concern regarding the possibility that the proposed development would require additional impervious surfaces and inquired as to the process for evaluating the adequacy of such surfaces on the site. Ms. Tsai explained that the Zoning Ordinance contained grandfather provisions and time limits to permit the applicant's usage of the existing stormwater management ponds, adding that a certain amount of development could be implemented on the site before the current stormwater management standards were applied. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Ms. Tsai, with input from Mr. Looney, regarding the process for evaluating the amount of impervious surface that would be utilized by the proposed development and the recourse the applicant would incur in the event that additional stormwater management provisions were necessary wherein Ms. Tsai and Mr. Looney stated the following:

- The extent of impervious surfaces on the site would be assessed at the time of site plan review;
- The applicant had limited opportunities to increase the amount of impervious surface on the site due to the commitments for open space; and
- The existing stormwater management ponds had sufficient capacity address the stormwater management requirements for the proposed development.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Looney regarding the applicant's justification for complying with the affordable housing standards prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan, the objectives of the applicant's affordable housing commitments, the usage of lower income tiers as an alternative mechanism for complying with the affordable housing standards, the cost incurred by the applicant from complying with the affordable housing policy, and the extent to which staff did not support that applicant's affordable housing provisions wherein Mr. Looney said the following:

- The applicant's affordable housing contributions would provide adequate workforce housing for every square-foot of the proposed development above the existing 724,000 square feet of office development;
- The lower income tiers for the applicant's affordable housing commitment would increase the accessibility of the affordable units; and
- The long-term cost of the applicant's alternative affordable housing provisions was less than that incurred by a standard affordable housing commitment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Looney regarding the lower income tiers the applicant would utilize for the alternative affordable housing commitment, the current income levels for affordable housing provisions, the number of Affordable Dwelling Units (ADU) that would be included with the proposed development, and the process for selling the AMIs wherein Mr. Looney explained the following:

- The current AMI for the County was approximately \$109,000 and the applicant would offer the affordable dwelling units at the 70/80/100 income tiers;
- The proposed development would reserve 15 percent of the dwelling units for affordable housing, which amounted to a total of 721 units with 230 units being reserved for the 70 percent income tier;
- The owner of an affordable dwelling unit was required to sell the unit to a purchaser at an income tier consistent with the County's affordable housing policy.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Looney regarding the difference between the affordable housing contribution the applicant had proposed and the contribution prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan wherein Mr. Looney indicated that the cost of a standard contribution was approximately \$2.1 million greater than the applicant's proposed alternative and Commissioner Ulfelder supported providing affordable units at a lower AMI.

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 these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Carter: Okay, this has been a long ride to get here. I've been to many Planning and Zoning meetings in Reston to go over these – the many constructive comments have come along the way. I think we got an 11-to-1-to-1 approval from the Reston Planning and Zoning, which is – is somewhat unusual with my somewhat limited experience. It is adjacent to the Reston Metro Town Center. It will create the lively mixed-use community. It's large, 4.61 million square feet that includes retail, hotel, residential buildings – and the retention of exiting – two existing, plus new office buildings plus the Wegmans grocery store. So the land use mix and density is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and, certainly, the Wegmans provides a sense of reality to this that some of the other projects don't always have. The WDUs – we seem to be down to that one issue. I'm going to defer this. There's a third issue. And there's the math and there's just sort of this dollars and – I must admit I do lean away from the dollars. I – the dollars bother me a little bit. But the third issue is I have two or three, or four, or five more of these following this. And I want to make sure that whatever we're doing here is about this project, not about all these – those other that are – that are following. If there's any experience in Tysons or other areas, that that would be good. I asked the County Attorney about this and they sort of said, "Well, it's up to you, John." So...

Chairman Murphy: You ought to take that and run.

Commissioner Carter: Place-making – this is among my favorites, as you know. Ms. Cortina, the comments about the imperviousness – I don't believe you can change the imperviousness in the future. It's 30 percent. That's in the proffers – we have that the building forms and the building layouts – I don't think we can change that very much, so that leads – lends some comfort to me. I like the off-site field. I think that's a great solution – and some of the other projects we'll be able to add onto that. I like that. The Brookfield is famous for this. And no, this has nothing to do with the Bethesda site that I used to be involved in before that I have nothing to do with now – if you've read about that in the paper today. Transportation mobility – I want to touch on that because it's all the rage in the Reston community. It has an extensive grid of streets, which we would expect. But one of the big benefits of that – it specifically allows for an alternative use to the intersection of Sunrise Valley Drive and Reston Parkway. Could you put the exhibit back up? Maybe it might be useful. It provides an additional lane on Reston Parkway so we'll have six there. It provides improvements to the Reston Parkway and Sunrise Valley Drive intersection. It improves the connection to the Metro station – the Town Center Metro Station, which is a little bit circuitous. I know it's not open yet, but if you left it the way it was – it is now, it's a little bit circuitous. That intersections down there in the lower right – that is a real bottleneck in Reston today, so improving that is – is a major plus. It includes traffic signal pre-emption devices for emergency vehicles. It accelerates the improvements to Sunrise Valley Drive. And then the streetscaping, which you've heard me harp on that on some of these other projects – this is a challenge for us in Virginia with the state ownership in roads. I think the state is one of the most progressive when it comes to lane widths of any state that I know of. It's the sidewalks where we are challenged – getting on-street parking and I remember what we did with the Boros in Tysons. That was a nice project, well worked out. And I think this one runs along in similar ways. The older Reston Town Center has great streets that they created. But basically, we want on-street parking as much as possible for a whole host of reasons. We want the closely-spaced street trees that Jill Parks is tired of me harping about – 30 feet on center. And that seems to be worked out. We have trouble with lighting in Reston. They have a proffer for that, but the type and the spacing is – is still challenged by what VDOT allows. Environment and energy conservation – it satisfies the stormwater management concepts, despite the fact being that there are two existing stormwater management ponds. I supported that because they're very photogenic and they're really part of this development. But this is the headwaters of Sugarland Run and so that – that there are – there is no compromises on the stormwater management. It handles the stormwater manage the way it should. LEED Silver for the buildings and LEED for the residential buildings – electric charging stations and something that they might not be aware of, but something that they have – it has daylighting for buildings because of the north/south orientation of the grid of streets and the buildings. So I...I do want to thank Brookfield because they do a great job on their public space – spaces and animating them. And I've experienced that before. We're lucky to have them. The design team of MVA Architects, Land Design Landscape Architects, Urban Limited Civil Engineers and Mark Looney and Jill Parks of Cooley, especially the staff, Mary Ann Tsai just gets barraged by me and others on these larger projects like this. And certainly the Reston Planning and Zoning, who landed several pretty constructive comments, I thought, to the whole project. With this, unless there's more discussion, what I think we should do is defer. I think we've got most of the issues resolved, but I'm still not ready to leap on the WDU and I'd like to see what we've done elsewhere and then I'd like to make sure we're not setting up a precedent on these next ones in Reston or Tysons or South County before we – we act. So with that, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of – let's see, wait a minute.

I move that the Planning Commission defer action only on RZ 2017-HM-032 and SE 2017-HM-03...

Chairman Murphy: 2016.

Mary Ann Tsai, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Commissioner, I think you're reading the wrong motion.

Commissioner Carter: You're right. Hold on. Hold on.

Chairman Murphy: Well let's...

Commissioner Carter: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION...

Chairman Murphy: We could kill two birds with one stone.

Commissioner Carter: ...DEFER, WITH RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS FOR RZ/FDP 2016-HM-007 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 12TH.

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 defer decision only on RZ/FDP 2016-HM-007 to a date certain of July 12th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ 2017-HM-032 – CORESITE REAL ESTATE SUNRISE TECHNOLOGY PARK, LLC – Appl. to rezone from I-4 to I-5 to permit data center and associated office development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.99. Located on the S. side of Sunrise Valley Dr., approx. 600 ft. E. of its intersection with Fairfax County Pkwy. on approx. 21.73 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Industrial. Tax Map 17-3 ((1)) 17B, 23 and 32A. (Concurrent with SE 2017-HM-030). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

SE 2017-HM-030 – CORESITE REAL ESTATE SUNRISE TECHNOLOGY PARK, LLC – Appl. under Sect. 9-618 of the

Zoning Ordinance to permit an increase in Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.5 up to a maximum of 0.99. Located at 12343 and 12379 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston, 20191 on approx. 21.73 ac. of land zoned I-5. Tax Map 17-3 ((1)) 17B, 23, and 32A. (Concurrent with RZ 2017-HM-032). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Gill, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 29, 2018.

Commissioner Sargeant disclosed that he was employed by Dominion Virginia Power and while he was not directly involved in the contracting of providing electric service to the site or in relation to the subject applications, he recused himself from the public hearing out of an abundance of precaution to avoid any perception of conflicts of interest.

Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart & Horan, PC, had a client who was an adverse party on an unrelated case involving the applicant; therefore, he recused himself from the public hearing.

Wanda Suder, 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 RZ 2017-HM-032 and SE 2017-HM-030, but had outstanding concerns regarding the adequacy of the applicant's green building commitments.

Commissioner Hurley pointed out that data centers had significant energy requirements and requested additional information regarding the criteria for LEED Silver certification for such a development. Denise James, Planning Division, DPZ, explained that the criteria for certification was dependant on the type of commercial development and the applicant could utilize multiple provisions to comply with those criteria, such as the utilization of cooling towers, quieting fans, and energy efficient landscaping.

Commissioner Carter requested that the applicant provide additional information on the criteria for obtaining LEED Silver certification for a data center in their presentation.

Mr. Gill gave a presentation for the subject applications wherein he explained the following:

- The applicant was a major provider of data centers throughout the Country;
- The applicant had determined that the subject property for the proposed data center was optimal because of the close proximity to potential clients;
- The proposal would adapt buildings within an existing office park to accommodate a data center;
- The majority of the buildings within existing office park on the site were vacant;

- The installation of a data center within the existing office development would occur in phases;
- The applicant had coordinated with staff to finalize a plan for achieving LEED Silver certification and the language of that plan would be included with the proposal prior to the Board of Supervisors' public hearing;
- The third and fourth phases of the proposed development would include the demolition and reconstruction of multiple existing buildings;
- The process for achieving LEED Silver certification utilized criteria unique to data centers and the applicant intended to fulfill those criteria;
- The traffic impact generated by data centers was minimal and the proposal would reduce the number of overall trips compared to the existing development on the site;
- The parking requirements for data centers were significantly less than that of other commercial developments and the proposal included a reduction of approximately 700 parking spaces;
- The interior of the facility would utilize state-of-the-art cooling mechanisms to ensure energy efficiency, such as the use of an underground cistern that captured stormwater runoff for the purposes of cooling;
- The proposed development would generate significant tax revenue for the County and would not incur a significant impact on school systems, recreational services, or traffic; and
- The subject applications were supported by the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee and the Reston Design and Review Board.

Brian Carpenter, 2230 Cocquana Drive, Reston, stated that he resided in an existing residential community located near the subject property and expressed concern regarding the impact of the usage of security cameras on the site. He then requested that the applicant implement provisions to ensure that the cameras did not view portions of the neighboring residential development.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Gill, who stated that the applicant did not object to including a proffer articulating that the security cameras on the site did not view neighboring properties.

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 these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Carter: So, Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm, for the record, agreement to the Special Exception development conditions dated June 12th, 2018.

David Gill, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP: I confirm acknowledgement of those conditions.

Commissioner Carter: I have a couple comments. The core development provides a data center that's – it's – it supports cloud computing. It's basically a warehouse for servers. Unusual features is its three stories high. It's close to the metro station, but more than half-a-mile so it's not taking up land that we would ordinarily want for mixed-use development. I would point out that the proximity is the backbone of certain high-tech industries that need to be near their servers and this is unusual, although we have some of them in the Dulles Corridor. I think it's critical to have features like this in the Dulles Corridor if you want a real high-tech corridor and want those high-tech businesses to work. It saves time – fewer long distance trips and certain is more efficient for the users. It generates less traffic, only 45 employees maximum. It meets the urban park and open space standards. Again, my streetscape comments. It provides for closely-spaced street trees along the new sidewalks – Sunrise Valley Drive – and additional trees in open spaces to meet the tree canopy requirements that we like to have. It establishes an important transition to the existing homes by building on the existing building footprint. It provides a 90-foot setback from the property line and 115 feet from the nearest home – two fences, an existing six-foot high wood fence to remain and additional parallel 10-foot high metal fence – additional landscaping and limited lighting on the – in the setback area. It – some of these generate a lot of noise – this one, the noise is internal, so it shouldn't generate much noise – excuse me – to the adjacent community. And then I like the cistern that collects the rainwater for reuse – reuse in meeting the high cooling standards. Again, the Reston Planning and Zoning, in this case, unanimously recommended approval. So we'd like to thank Wanda Suder and staff, the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee, for their constructive recommendations and the design team for producing a quality project. All that being said, I move that – unless there's more comments – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION, WITH THE CHANGE TO THE PROFFERS TO ALLOW FOR LEED SILVER FOR ALL BUILDINGS AND ADDING THE CONDITION ABOUT THE SECURITY CAMERAS, I RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING: APPROVAL RZ 2017-HM-032, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE MODIFIED PROFFERED CONDITIONS, CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 11TH, 2018, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion...oh.

Commissioner Hurley: I am a bit unclear. You're saying the applicant should meet LEED Silver for all buildings?

Commissioner Carter: Right. Right.

Commissioner Hurley: Despite what the applicant just described to us.

Commissioner Carter: Well, he changed it. He changed the...

Commissioner Hurley: If the applicant's okay with that? Okay, thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2017-HM-032, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Oppose? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: Okay, THEN APPROVAL OF SE 2017-HM-030, SUBJECT TO THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 12TH, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-HM-030, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: And third, APPROVAL OF MODIFICATION OF SECTION 13-1303 AND SECTION 13-305 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO PERMIT THE TRANSITIONAL BARRIER AND SCREENING, AS SHOWN ON THE GDP/SE PLAT.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Each motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hart and Sargeant recused themselves from the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:48 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 10:04 p.m.

//

RZ 2017-DR-023 – TRADITION HOMES, LLC – Appl. to rezone from R-1 to R-3 to permit residential development with a total density of 2.26 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Located on the E. side of Dranesville Rd. approx. 960 ft. S. of its intersection with Wiehle Ave. on approx. 5.76 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential 2-3 du/ac. Tax Map 10-2 ((1)) 5. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Chairman Murphy noted that the subject application was subject to certain restrictions contained in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4, which had been enacted by the Virginia General Assembly in 2016. He added that the law restricted the ability of a locality to discuss possible proffers in certain residential rezoning applications and such discussions could violate the statute, which would incur significant liability on the County. Chairman Murphy indicated that, out of an abundance of caution, the Commission would exclusively consider the existing proffers contained within the subject application and the potential impact of the development. He then explained that while discussion on the mitigation of impacts was permitted, there could be no discussions between the Commission and the applicant were to be construed as a request, suggestion, or requirement for a proffer. In addition, he said that testimony and comments represented the views of the individuals and not of the locality.

Shane M. Murphy, Applicant's Agent, Reed Smith LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 24, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Catherine Lewis, 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 application RZ 2017-DR-023.

Commissioner Ulfelder said that the subject property contained an existing barn and residential dwelling unit that were of potential historical significance, noting that the structures had been constructed in the 19th century. Ms. Lewis concurred, stating that barn was the oldest structure on the site. Denise Dressel, Heritage Resource Planner, DPZ, concurred with that statement as well. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Dressel, with input from Ms. Lewis, regarding the historical significance of the existing structures on the site, the mechanisms for preserving those structures, the process for preserving historically significant structures, the existing condition of the structures, and the timeframe for those preservation efforts wherein Ms. Lewis and Ms. Dressel indicated the following:

- The applicant had opposed staff's request to consider preserving of the site;
- The applicant had offered to assist with the relocation of the existing structures on the site instead of preserving them;
- The process for preserving the structures could include deconstruction and reconstruction of the building, but a structural evaluation had not been conducted on the barn;
- The existing barn on the site had been subject to multiple modifications that had been implemented in conjunction with a previous dairy farm operation;
- The preservation of the barn at an off-site location was determined to be feasible by staff;
- The preservation of the existing dwelling unit could be achieved by making it available for purchase and relocation to another portion of the site; and
- The process for the purchase and relocation of the existing dwelling unit for the site was subject to a 90-day timeframe, but the feasibility of such a process was subject to further study.

Commissioner Ulfelder noted the challenges associated with selling and preserving historically significant structures on the site. He then expressed concern that the timeframes articulated in the subject application were unfeasible.

When Commissioner Ulfelder requested additional information on the joint permit application (JPA) process, Yosif Ibrahim, Site Development and Inspections Division, Department of Land Development Services (LDS), explained the following:

- The JPA process involved obtaining approval from the Corp of Engineers prior to the initiation of land disturbing activities;
- The involvement of LDS in the JPA process was not significant unless a proposed development utilized a significant area of resource protection area (RPA); and
- The applicant was required to complete the JPA process prior to disturbance of the site.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Ibrahim regarding the timeframe for completing the JPA process, the information involved in that process, and the impact it would incur on the applicant's stormwater management provisions wherein Mr. Ibrahim indicated that the timeframe was approximately three to four months and the process would not significantly impact the applicant's stormwater management measures, but noted that the applicant would be subject to the standards for treating runoff into an RPA prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Ulfelder inquired as to whether the applicant's stormwater management provisions would meet the appropriate standards. Mr. Ibrahim indicated that the proposal would

comply with the necessary requirements for on-site stormwater retention, adding that the applicant had not pursued off-site provisions.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked whether the site was subject to stormwater runoff from neighboring properties, Mr. Ibrahim confirmed that the site was impacted by the runoff from those properties. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Ibrahim, with input from Denise James, Environment and Development Review Branch, DPZ, regarding the presence of an existing spring on the site, the applicant's ability to preserve the existing environmental conditions on the site, and the challenges of implementing stormwater management features without disturbing the RPA wherein Mr. Ibrahim and Ms. James stated the following:

- The stormwater runoff generated by the site would impact sites downstream;
- The efforts by the applicant to reduce the amount stormwater runoff generated by the subject property and detain the water on-site were supported by staff; and
- The completion of a hydraulic and hydrological study was supported by staff to determine additional measures for mitigating impact of stormwater runoff on the nearby RPA.

When Commissioner Hart requested additional information on the age of the existing barn and dwelling unit on the site, Ms. Dressel indicated that the barn had been constructed in the 1850s and the dwelling unit had been constructed after that. Referring to the paragraph under Heritage Resources on page 4 of the staff report, Commissioner Hart point out that the Comprehensive Plan stated that, "In those areas where significant heritage resources have been recorded, an effort should be made to preserve them. If preservation is not feasible, then, in accordance with countywide objectives and policies as cited in the Heritage Resources section of the Policy Plan, the threatened resource should be thoroughly recorded and in the case of archaeological resources, the artifacts recovered." Commissioner Hart said that staff had indicated that a determination on whether the preservation of the barn was feasible had not been rendered by staff. He then requested that staff provide further justification for recommending approval of the subject application in the absence of a conclusion on the preservation of the barn. Ms. Lewis explained that the applicant had stated that there was no purposeful intent to preserve the site because the structures on the site were in poor condition. She added that there was an outstanding code violation on the site, which was under appeal by the existing property owner. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Lewis regarding the ability of staff to determine the feasibility of preserving the existing structures on the site in the absence of the applicant's commitment to such an effort and the previous instances in which staff had recommended approval of an application that included the demolition of a potentially historic structure wherein Ms. Lewis said that staff could make suggestions to the applicant for efforts to preserve the existing structures on the site, but the restrictions contained in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4 precluded the extent to which such a recourse could be discussed.

Answering questions from Commissioner Hart, Gregory Fuller, Capital Projects and Operations Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), explained the following:

- The existing condition of Dranesville Road did not include a median break;
- The proposed development did not include interparcel access;
- The vehicles attempting to travel south on Dranesville Road were required to conduct a U-turn at Wiehle Avenue to the north of the site, but there were other routes that could be utilized;
- The vehicles traveling south on Dranesville Road were required to conduct a U-turn at the traffic signal located south of the site;
- The preference of FCDOT for vehicles conducting U-turns was for those vehicles to utilize signalized intersections;
- The necessary usage of U-turns to access a site was not opposed by FCDOT, provided an evaluation by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) concluded that such routes were appropriate;
- The intersections to the north and south of the site along Dranesville Road did not prohibit U-turns and VDOT had not expressed concerns on potential safety hazards at those intersections;
- The evaluation conducted by FCDOT had not calculated the potential number of additional U-turns that the proposed development would incur, but staff did not object to the proposal because the existing road network could accommodate the additional trips generated by the development;
- The subject property would be accessed by emergency vehicles and school buses; and
- The determination on the ability of emergency vehicles and school buses to conduct the necessary U-turns to access the site would be evaluated at the time of site plan review.

Commissioner Sargeant asked whether staff had outstanding concerns regarding the applicant's school contribution, as articulated in Proffer Number 21, School Contribution, in the set included in Appendix 1 of the staff report. Ms. Lewis indicated that staff had expressed concern regarding the language of that proffer and there had been no subsequent revisions to the proffers since the publication of the staff report.

Mr. Murphy gave a presentation wherein he explained the following:

- The utilization of U-turns to access the subject property was feasible;
- The location of nearby emergency services was such that a U-turn was not necessary for emergency vehicles to access the site;

- The existing intersections to the north and south of the site could accommodate U-turns for emergency vehicles in the event that such maneuvers were necessary;
- The subject property was zoned R-1 and contained a rural development that included a farm and a dwelling unit;
- The subject application would rezone the site to an R-3 District, which would permit the construction of a 13-lot residential development;
- The development of an R-3 District on the site was consistent with the character of the surrounding community and was within the recommended density range prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan;
- The applicant intended to comply with the requirements for tree save and environmental preservation;
- The applicant had reduced the footprints of the proposed residential dwelling units at the request of staff;
- The applicant had included a voluntary contribution to schools and off-site parks;
- The site had been subject to a Phase One archeological study in November 2017, which confirmed that the existing dwelling unit on the site was eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places;
- The existing condition of the barn and associated structures on the site was in poor condition and had been cited by the County for a building code violations;
- The cost of repairing the structures on the site to address the outstanding violation was a significant burden and that violation had been subject to an appeal;
- The applicant had evaluated the existing dwelling unit on the site and concluded that the structure could be moved and renovated;
- The relocation of the existing dwelling unit would be required to occur within 90 days of the applicant's purchase of the subject property;
- The applicant did not object to the timeframe or feasibility of preserving the existing dwelling unit on the site;
- The cost of purchasing the lot that contained the existing dwelling unit would include the appraised value of the lot, minus \$25,000 prior to the conveyance of the unit;
- The subject property utilized underground pipelines to mitigate the stormwater impact due to the close proximity of Herndon High School, which was located to the south;

- The approval for Herndon High School included a commitment to pipe stormwater runoff through neighboring properties over easements, which emptied into an open channel;
- The limits of clearing and grading on the existing pipelines was depicted in the subject application;
- The stormwater provisions utilized by Herndon High School had been reapproved by the Board of Supervisors in 2016;
- The applicant would implement stormwater management features that would pipe runoff from the subject property and the Herndon High School site into an appropriate outlet;
- The applicant had coordinated with the Corp of Engineers and the Virginia Department of Environment and Quality Corridors, which concluded that there were no outstanding concerns regarding the proposed development's impact on the existing wetlands around the site; and
- The stormwater runoff from both the subject property and the Herndon High School site flowed into an existing stormwater bond, which subsequently flowed into a stream.

Commissioner Ulfelder reiterated Commissioner Sargeant's concern regarding the language of the applicant's school contribution commitment articulated in Proffer Number 21. He noted that the language specified that the contribution was to be utilized for capital improvements or capacity enhancements. He then said that staff had expressed concern that such language would conflict with the restrictions articulated in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4 regarding the definition of public facility improvement. Commissioner Ulfelder then requested clarification from the applicant on the applicability of that language. Mr. Murphy indicated that the applicant intended to comply with the provisions prescribed by the County and the State of Virginia. He added that he did not object to modifying the proffer to ensure that the provisions complied with the restrictions included in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Murphy regarding the Commission's concerns on the compliance of the proffer language with *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4 and the potential that such language could be interpreted as a potential conflict wherein Mr. Murphy said that the applicant would continue evaluating that issue.

Commissioner Ulfelder stated that there was a possibility that the completion of the JPA process could require the applicant to obtain approval of a proffered condition amendment to modify the proposed development. When he asked the applicant to explain why the JPA process had not been completed prior to the submission of the subject application, Mr. Murphy acknowledged the risk of potentially requiring approval of a proffered condition amendment at a future date in the event that the JPA process made it necessary. He then indicated that the applicant had coordinated with the appropriate staff to determine that the JPA process would not incur an issue that warranted a proffered condition amendment. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Murphy regarding the opportunities for further evaluation of the site after the completion of the JPA process wherein Mr. Murphy indicated that such evaluations would be conducted prior to the site plan review process.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the configuration of the proposed development would create irregularly shaped lots, which generated issues for residents pursuing modifications to their dwelling units. He then noted that the applicant had included a provision in Proffer Number 4, Disclosure, to notify prospective purchasers. Mr. Murphy acknowledged the issue of irregularly shaped lots, adding that it was a common issue in developments that utilized cul-de-sacs. He indicated that the applicant had designed the configuration of the site to ensure that homeowners were informed of the constraints on those lots. He added that the footprint of the proposed dwelling units had been reduced to address that issue.

When Commissioner Ulfelder asked whether the applicant had considered mechanisms to preserve the existing barn on the site or enlist a service that would relocate the structure, Mr. Murphy explained that the barn was in poor condition and while moving it was feasible, such a process was subject to multiple challenges. He reiterated that the applicant had determined that preservation of the existing dwelling unit on the site was feasible, but the condition of the barn was poor. He then noted that the process and cost of preserving the barn was significant, adding that moving the barn required that another site be secured. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Murphy regarding the possibility of securing a purchaser of the barn, the feasibility of moving the barn to another site, and the challenge of securing a buyer for a historic structure wherein Commissioner Ulfelder stated his intent to defer the decision only at the conclusion of the public hearing and Mr. Murphy indicated that the applicant would evaluate potential mechanisms for preserving the existing barn, noting the challenge associated with moving such structures.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Joyce Wilkinson, 1321 Grant Street, Herndon, stated that her residence was located near the subject property and that she had previously participated in the Fairfax County History Commission. She said that the site had been vacant for years and pointed out that it had since become inhabited by wildlife. Ms. Wilkinson then requested that the applicant coordinate with the County to remove that wildlife for relocation to an appropriate area.

Cindy Bojokles, 729 Center Street, Herndon, spoke in support of redeveloping the subject property. She stated that she had been an acquaintance of the previous homeowner and acknowledged the poor condition of the existing buildings on the site. Ms. Bojokles described the existing access to the site and indicated that it was adequate. She pointed out that the previous homeowner had operated a dance studio on the site, but that operation had ceased. Ms. Bojokles said that redevelopment of the site would improve the character of the surrounding community.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Mr. Murphy, who stated that the applicant would coordinate with Ms. Wilkinson on the relocation of the wildlife at the site. He added that the applicant would also coordinate with other wildlife preservation groups for such an effort.

Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Ms. Lewis, who declined.

Commissioner Hurley pointed out that there had been a similar situation at the former site of the Silas Burke property wherein the relocation of an existing farm house had generated issues regarding wildlife. She then stated that local garden clubs had coordinated to preserve or relocate existing wildlife and artifacts from that site. Commissioner Hurley suggested that the applicant pursue a similar recourse in preserving the wildlife on the subject property.

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

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Ulfelder: Would the representative of the applicant come forward, please?

Shane Murphy, Applicant's Agent, Reed Smith LLP: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I have a series of questions.

Mr. Murphy: I figured you might.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Q&A. During the course of tonight's proceedings on this rezoning application, has the locality or anyone acting on behalf of the locality suggested, requested, or required a proffer?

Mr. Murphy: No, sir.

Commissioner Ulfelder: And more generally, has anyone acting on behalf of the locality at any time suggested, requested, or required any proffer with regard to this application?

Mr. Murphy: To this point in time, no.

Chairman Murphy: What does that mean?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: You've been walking around with too many raccoons, I think.

Mr. Murphy: They're on-site. So I think they're...

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay, and do you further affirm that all the proposed proffers conform to the requirements of *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2303.4?

Mr. Murphy: I would say yes that they do and we will look at the one proffer that you brought to our attention – that staff brought to our attention.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Right, but that's an existing...

Mr. Murphy: To confirm that that does...

Commissioner Ulfelder: But that's an existing proffer and we're just talking about clarifying the language in the...

Mr. Murphy: Correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: ...in the proffer that you all volunteered...

Mr. Murphy: Correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: ...in connection with the schools.

Mr. Murphy: Correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay.

Mr. Murphy: Correct.

Commissioner Ulfelder: All right, thank you.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I'm going to move that we defer the decision on this application so, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON RZ 2017-DR-023, TRADITION HOMES, LLC, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 25TH, 2018.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on RZ 2017-DR-023 to a date certain of July 25th, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

approved for a private school of general education to permit the construction of a middle school resulting in an increase in enrollment from 700 to 800 and associated modifications to site design and development conditions. Located at 10900, 10910, 10824, 10816 Oakton Rd. and 3400, 3320, 3310, 3300, 3308 and 3408 Jermantown Rd., Oakton, 22124 on approx. 35.16 ac. of land zoned R-1. Providence District. Tax Map 47-3 ((1)) 16B, 17A, 18, 19, 19A, 20, 20A, 20B, 21A, 22, 22A, 23, 24, 34A, 34B, 34C. (Associated with SEA 84-P-105-04). PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

SEA 84-P-105-4 – FLINT HILL SCHOOL – Appl. under Sect. 3-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend SE 84-P-105 previously approved for a private school of general education to permit a decrease in enrollment from 700 to 500. Located at 3012 Chain Bridge Rd., 10429 & 10431 Miller Rd. and 3044 Jermantown Rd., Oakton, 22124 and portions of Academic Dr. Public right-of-way to be vacated and/or abandoned on approx. 14.7 ac. of land zoned R-3. Tax Map 47-2 ((1)) 36A, 37, 38 and 52A. (Associated with SEA 99-P-046-02). (Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public rights-of-way for Academic Dr. to proceed under Section 15.2-2272 (2) of the *Code of Virginia*). PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Francis McDermott, Applicant's agent, Hunton Andrews Kurth, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 18, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Kelly Posusney, 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 applications SEA 99-P-046-02 and SEA 84-P-105-4.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested additional information regarding the status of Oakton Road and the number of existing access points for the subject property. Ms. Posusney indicated that the site utilized three access points, one of which were located along Jermantown Road and two of which were located on Oakton Road. However, she noted that the access points located on Oakton Road for the existing school facility was reserved for emergency vehicles and the other access was utilized by a private residence. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Ms. Posusney regarding the parking provisions the site utilized for event at the school facility on the site, the parking provisions for faculty at the facility, and the parking provisions that would be implemented under the subject applications wherein Ms. Posusney said the following:

- The subject property included parking areas on the southern and western portions of the site that were utilized for events at the school and at the athletic field on the site; and

- The applicant had acquired the neighboring residential lot that was located to the south and west of the site in September 2017, which was identified as Lot 16B in the staff report.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner said that there had been a previous public hearing on SEA 99-P-046-02 on the subject property in July 2017. He explained that the purpose of that application was to permit the relocation of the middle school portion of the existing private school faculty on the site. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested additional information on the configuration of Oakton Road for that application. Ms. Posusney confirmed that SEA 99-P-046-02 included the relocation of the middle school, but noted that the application included provisions for a 60-foot left-turn lane into the site from the access on Oakton Road, which would function as the primary access to the Middle School. She then explained that the decision for that application had been deferred indefinitely and during that deferral period, there had been multiple modifications, including an extension of the left-turn lane an additional 100 feet to accommodate approximately 10 vehicles. Ms. Posusney added that the applicant had purchased Lot 16B during that period and proposed utilizing that area for additional parking. In addition, she said that the applicant had also revised the development conditions to address stormwater management issues and finalize a transportation demand management plan to address the expected traffic impact on Oakton Road. However, Ms. Posusney indicated that after subsequent coordination with staff, the applicant removed the left-turn lane from Oakton Road in favor of installing a channelized entrance that exclusively permitted right turns. She added that the applicant had also supplemented the parking provisions along the southern and western portion of the site to provide parking for events and athletic fields.

When Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked for additional information regarding the impact that the purchase of Lot 16B had incurred on the queuing of vehicles on Oakton Road, Ms. Posusney explained that the purchase of that lot had expanded the capacity of the parking lot and internal circulation provisions for the site. She then said that after the purchase of that lot, the southern parking area could accommodate approximately 64 vehicles. She added that the removal of the left-turn lane onto Oakton Road would further streamline the process for vehicles exiting the site.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked about the revisions to the development conditions regarding modifications to the bell schedule for the middle school portion of the facility. Ms. Posusney stated that the applicant had modified the development conditions to stagger the start times between the middle and upper school facilities on the site by 20 minutes, as articulated in Development Condition Number 5 in the revised set contained in Attachment 1 of the second staff report addendum dated June 26, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested additional information regarding the evaluation conducted by the Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) and the Virginia Department of Transportation on the applicant's removal of a left turn lane from Oakton Road to access the subject property. Brittney Nixon, Transportation Planner, FCDOT, stated that there had been a traffic study of the Oakton Road access with and without the left-turn lane. She then said that FCDOT concluded that the access was feasible as a right-in/right-out only access. In

addition, Ms. Nixon indicated that FCDOT had not objected to the applicant's previous proposal to provide a left-turn lane into the site from Oakton Road.

Mr. McDermott gave a presentation on the subject applications wherein he explained the following:

- The existing development on the site consisted of a private school facility that consisted of two campuses, one for high school students and one for middle school students;
- The site was located along Jermantown Road, which connected to I-66 and Route 50;
- The private school facility had previously acquired neighboring lots in 2005 to permit the construction of an athletic field and an additional building;
- The acquisition of Lot 16B had not been included in the initial staff report that had been published on July 12, 2017 and heard by the Commission on July 27, 2017;
- The applicant had conducted a community meeting after the previous public hearing for the proposal in September 2017;
- The acquisition of Lot 16B by the applicant was finalized in October 2017;
- The proposal would utilize Lot 16B to implement additional parking provisions and vehicular stacking capacity;
- The proposal would construct an additional building that would be occupied by the middle school portion of the facility;
- The subject applications would install a travel aisle that connected the parking lot on the southern portion of the site with the ingress/egress located on the eastern portion along Jermantown Road;
- The proposal included a multi-use athletic field that would utilize an all-weather surface;
- The subject property was located near the wooded areas of Oak Marr Park and multiple residential development;
- The existing condition of Oakton Road consisted of three lanes, which included two left-turn lanes onto Jermantown Road and one right-turn lane;
- The proposed access to the site that was located on Oakton Road would utilize a right-in/right-out access;
- The subject applications had removed a left-turn lane from Oakton Road into the subject property to address concerns raised by the surrounding community, ensuring that there would be no left turns for ingress/egress to the site;

- The applicant would install a 245-foot right-turn lane along Oakton Road to accommodate vehicles accessing the subject property;
- The vehicles that accessed the subject property from Oakton Road would be required to exit from the access point located along Jermantown Road, which was located on the northeastern portion of the site;
- The applicant would install a gate to prohibit traffic flow from the northern portion of the site to southern areas located near the Oakton Road access, but there would be a mechanism to permit access for emergency vehicles;
- The installation of gates along the service road that connected the southern parking lot with those located along the northeastern portion of the site would prohibit parking along that road for non-emergency vehicles;
- The applicant had conducted a survey to determine the method by which students for the middle school accessed the site during traditional school operation and that survey concluded that approximately 66 percent of the students accessed the school by methods other than a single-occupancy vehicle;
- The limited number of students utilizing single-occupancy vehicles would mitigate the traffic impact along Oakton Road during the traditional hours of operation for the school;
- The majority of the vehicles accessing the site during the hours of operation for the middle school portion of the facility would utilize the right turn-in lane on Oakton Road to access the site;
- The size of the parking lot located along the southern portion of the site and the staking capacity of the right turn-lane that would be implemented along Oakton Road was sufficient to accommodate the traffic accessing the site;
- The absence of a left-turn option from the site onto Oakton Road would limit the traffic impact on that road;
- The subject applications would not significantly increase the number of morning and afternoon peak-hour trips on Oakton Road from vehicles accessing the middle school portion of the site;
- The subject applications would permit a maximum enrollment of 200 students for the middle school portion of the facility, but the applicant had concluded that the facility was unlikely to exceed that capacity due to ongoing trends in the County's student population;
- The existing start time for the middle school portion of the facility was 7:50 a.m. and the start time for the high school portion was 8:00 a.m.;

- The subject applications would modify the start time for the middle school portion of the site to 7:40 a.m. and the majority of the traffic generated by that portion would arrive at the site between 7:15 a.m. and 7:24 a.m.;
- The faculty that served the middle school portion of the site would continue to use Oakton Road to access the site;
- The school buses accessing the private school facility would not utilize Oakton Road for either the middle school portion or the high school portion; and
- The proposal would improve the overall operation of the private school facility.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether the proposal included provisions to re-stripe Oakton Road in a manner consistent with the proposed traffic patterns for a right-in/right-out access to the site. Mr. McDermott indicated that the road would be appropriately re-stripped to reflect the proposed patterns depicted in the subject applications.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Tanner, Mr. McDermott stated that the average time spent on pick-up/drop-off operations for the private school facility on the site was approximately 15 minutes and the average period for a single vehicle conducting such operations was approximately 2 to 3 minutes. He then indicated that the applicant had concluded that the timeframe for such operations would not significantly change under the subject applications.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hurley, Mr. McDermott said the following:

- The vehicles accessing the site from Oakton Road were required to exit from the ingress/egress located to the north and east that connected to Jermantown Road;
- The start time for the middle school portion of the private school facility would commence 20 minutes prior to that of the high school portion;
- The school buses that serviced the site would transport both high school students and middle school students;
- The proposal would permit the relocation of approximately 100 students from the northern portion of the campus to the buildings in the southern portion;
- The proposal would reduce the enrollment of the elementary school portion of the facility by 200 students to mitigate the traffic impact on the surrounding area and address concerns raised by the surrounding community on such impacts; and
- The overall reorganization of the elementary, middle, and high school portions of the facility resulted in a net enrollment reduction of approximately 100 students.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Cortina and Mr. McDermott regarding the internal circulation of vehicles within the subject property, the wayfinding provisions that would be

utilized to facilitate internal circulation, the adequacy of those provisions, the number of vehicles that would exit onto Jermantown Road after entering the site from Oakton Road, and the traffic flow from Oakton Road into the site wherein Commissioner Cortina voiced concern on the viability of the circulation patterns for vehicles entering the site from Oakton Road and Mr. McDermott indicated that the applicant would utilize appropriate markings to guide vehicles throughout the site, adding that staff from the facility would provide additional instructions if necessary.

Mr. McDermott asked that supporters of proposal that were in attendance stand and be recognized by the Commission. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner commended those citizens for their participation in the public hearing.

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

Leslie Campbell, 3023 Miller Heights Road, Oakton, spoke in opposition to the subject applications because the proposed modifications to the private school facility would negatively impact the traffic conditions along Oakton Road. She stated that the removal of the left-turn lane to access the site did not adequately address the community's concerns. Ms. Campbell indicated that the community had met with the applicant on multiple occasions and while she commended the applicant's efforts, she said that the community favored the removal of the access to the site from Oakton Road, except for usage by emergency vehicles. Ms. Campbell said that the existing access located along Jermantown Road was sufficient for both middle and high school students. She then described the condition of Oakton Road, noting that the character of the road was rural and could not support the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposal. In addition, Ms. Campbell said that she opposed permitted right-out egress from the site onto Oakton Road. She also expressed concern that retaining the access to the site from Oakton Road would establish a precedent for permitting more traffic onto that road.

Robert Andersen, 11008 Lance Lane, Oakton, stated that he supported the applicant's efforts to expand the operation of the existing private school facility, but he did not support utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the site. He said that permitting an access along Oakton Road would incur safety hazards and negatively impact the residential character of the road. Mr. Andersen pointed out that the expansion of the parking area along the southern portion of the site would permit areas that could be utilized for criminal activity. He commended staff and the applicant for coordinating with the community, but favored additional coordination to address the outstanding issues of the residents during the deferral period.

Randy Krout, 11000 East Oaks Court, Oakton, Oakton Crest Homeowners Association (OCHOA), voiced opposition to the subject applications. He commended staff and Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner for coordinating with the community, but indicated that the OCHOA's concerns had not been adequately addressed. Mr. Krout said that he did not object to the applicant's proposed modifications to the facility, but objected to utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the site because it would incur a negative impact on the surrounding community. He pointed out that access to the site from Oakton Road had previously been restricted to emergency vehicles and expressed concern that modifying the usage of that access would establish a precedent for future revisions that would subsequently generate a greater amount of traffic for the area. Mr. Krout also echoed remarks from speakers regarding the potential safety hazards

associated with utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the site, noting the rural character of the road. In addition, he referenced an instance where Oakton Road had been the site of an accident. He then stated that the installation of an access to the site on Oakton Road would compound those existing safety concerns, adding that the road did not include sufficient pedestrian paths. Mr. Krout described the character of Oakton Road, noting the limited sight lines, the significant slopes, and the difficulty associated with buses navigating that road. He then said that he supported utilizing the access on Jermantown Road as the primary access to the subject property. Mr. Krout also expressed opposition to the applicant's acquisition of Lot 16B because it would modify the character of that lot in a manner inconsistent with that of the existing residential development, adding that such usage would establish a precedent for incorporating commercial uses within a community. In addition, he echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the potential impact that expanding the parking lot on the subject property would incur on criminal activity throughout the area, citing an instance where vehicles had been parked at the site outside the established hours of. Mr. Krout added that a community petition of opposition to the subject applications had been distributed to the Commission prior to the public hearing, noting that signees of the petition had included testimonials regarding the increasing traffic volumes and safety concerns along Oakton Road. (A copy of the petition Mr. Krout referenced is in the date file.)

Chairman Murphy addressed Mr. Krout's concern regarding the potential encroachment of commercial activity into the surrounding community, pointing out that school facilities located within residential areas were recognized as institutional uses by the County.

William Tse, 10886 Mimosa Place, Oakton, representing Oakton Ridge Estate, spoke in opposition to the subject applications, echoing remarks from previous speakers regarding the potential impact that utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the site would incur on the surrounding community. He then commended the Commission and staff for coordinating with the surrounding community to address their concerns. Mr. Tse also said that he did not object to the applicant's effort to modify the existing private school facilities on the site, but favored restricting access from Oakton Road to emergency vehicles. He added that he did not support the applicant's expansion of the parking lot on the southern portion of the site, which would extend into Lot 16B. Mr. Tse also echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the safety hazards that utilizing Oakton Road as an access would incur on the surrounding community and the community's preference for utilizing Jermantown Road as the primary ingress/egress to the subject property. In addition, Mr. Tse pointed out that the area would be subject to greater traffic volumes due to the planned widening of I-66. He acknowledged that the applicant had been a responsible member of the surrounding community and noted the quality of the educational services the private school facility provided, but reiterated that the majority of residents opposed utilizing Oakton Road as an access. Mr. Tse added that applicant's plans for how the modified buildings would be utilized had not been adequately delineated in the subject applications and requested that additional provisions be included to ensure that the operation of the facility did not negatively impact the surrounding community. He also echoed the opposition expressed by previous speakers regarding the utilization of Lot 16B as a parking lot and recommended that the lot be utilized for another purpose that served the facility, such as a tennis court. He also suggested that such a feature include a memorial to acknowledge the previous resident of Lot 16B.

Jeffrey Shen, 10880 Mimosa Place, Oakton, supported Mr. Tse's suggestion that Lot 16B be utilized as a tennis court, adding that the area provided an opportunity to install a court that was consistent with the standards of tennis facilities. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Mr. Tse, with input from Mr. Shen, regarding the possibility that a tennis court on Lot 16B would include lighting fixtures, the lighting features included on the existing tennis court on the site, and the applicant's efforts to coordinate with the surrounding community to address outstanding concerns wherein Mr. Tse reiterated that he did not support the installation of a parking lot on the southwest portion of the site.

Cynthia Dell, 3358 V Lane, Oakton, voiced opposition to the proposal. She echoed remarks from previous speakers wherein she expressed support for the applicant's efforts to modify the existing private school facility on the site, but did not support utilizing Oakton Road as an access. She commended the applicant for coordinating with the community and implementing multiple revisions to the proposal, but voiced concern that the inclusion of the Oakton Road access would negatively impact the residential character of the surrounding community. Ms. Dell also reiterated that the Commission had received a petition opposing the subject applications had been submitted to the record prior to the public hearing. She then encouraged the Commissioners to read and review the comments from citizens that had been included within that petition. Ms. Dell stated that installing an access along Oakton Road would generate higher traffic volumes. She added that the expanded parking facility on the southern portion of the site and the construction of a building near that area would incur a significant visual impact on the surrounding community. Ms. Dell expressed support for utilizing Jermantown Road as the primary ingress/egress. In addition, she favored efforts to improve the level of service along that road to accommodate larger traffic volumes and requested that the applicant consider other revisions to address that issue. She also noted that Oakton Road was a two-lane road and did not contain sufficient space to accommodate the traffic volumes that would be generated by an access along that road.

Joanne Starnes, 10454 White Granite Court, Oakton, spoke in favor of the subject applications. She noted that her residence was located near the subject property. She then expressed concern regarding the methods utilized in compiling the petition opposing the proposal that had been referenced by previous speakers.

Nicholas Welch, 2931 Aran Court, Oakton, representing the Oak Marr Courts Homeowners Association, requested additional information regarding the planned vacation of the public right-of-way located along Academic Drive and requested additional information on the impact of that provision on the surrounding community.

Ms. Posusney addressed Mr. Welch's question, explaining that the vacation of that right-of-way had been included in the initial staff report that had been heard by the Commission in July 2017 and that provision had been retained with the associated addendums. She then indicated that the vacation of that right-of-way would occur in the event that the proposed facility on the southern portion of the site was constructed. She adding that the only modification to that facility in the addendums was the reduction of the maximum enrollment from 700 students to 500 students.

Jim DeLanoy, 10928 Blue Roan Road, Oakton, voiced opposition to the subject applications. He echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the impact that utilizing Oakton Road for

access would incur on the surrounding community. Mr. DeLanoy said that such an access was not consistent with the criteria for approving a special exception application, as prescribed by Zoning Ordinance Section 9-006, because such a feature would incur a significant traffic impact. He described the existing condition of Oakton Road, noting that the road was a two-lane road and had limited sight lines. He then recommended that Jermantown Road be utilized as the primary access for the subject property, adding that the road could accommodate the additional capacity generated by the proposed modifications. Mr. DeLanoy pointed out that FCDOT had concluded that utilizing Jermantown Road as a primary access was feasible, as indicated in their memorandum dated June 6, 2017 that had been included in Appendix 6 of the staff report. He also noted that the service of a police officer, as required in Development Condition Number 7, provided adequate measures to ensure that access to the site from Jermantown Road remained viable without the usage of Oakton Road. In addition, Mr. DeLanoy expressed concern regarding the absence of a pedestrian path along Oakton Road and noted that the Comprehensive Plan recommended the installation of such a path. He also noted that the maintenance of such a path had not been finalized.

Taylor Chess, 5111 Brookridge Place, Fairfax, spoke in support of the subject applications because the proposed enhancements would improve the quality of service provided by the existing private school facility. He added that such a facility would incur a positive impact on the overall character of the County. Mr. Chess also noted that the facility had received multiple accolades in recognition of its educational services. In addition, he said that such facilities incurred a positive economic impact on the County.

Megan Von Leer Dhar, 2804 Oakton Manor Court, Oakton, voiced support for the proposal. She said that she was a faculty member of the existing private school facility on the site. In addition, she echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the methods utilized to simplify the petition opposing the proposal, adding that the petition was not reflective of the opinions of the surrounding community.

John Magner, 3024 Hunt Road, Oakton, spoke in support for the subject applications. He stated that he was a counselor at the existing school facility on the site. He then addressed the safety concerns voiced by previous speakers for the access located along Oakton Road wherein he acknowledged the rural character of the road, but noted that the applicant's provision to utilize a right-in/right-out access adequately addressed those concerns. Mr. Magner described the route vehicles from the east utilized to access the site, pointing out that the impact of an access on Oakton Road was not significant. He also noted the need for the proposed improvements to the facility on the site, stating that such improvements would improve the internal navigation of the facilities by students. Mr. Magner added that the installation of a second access along Oakton Road would improve the overall safety at the facility by providing relieving congestion at the existing access on Jermantown Road. He also pointed out the effectiveness of the facility's existing safety and traffic management policies.

Yoshia Lewis, 3815 Inverness Road, Fairfax, voiced support for the proposal because it would improve the operation of the existing private school facility. She echoed remarks from Mr. Magner regarding the need for such improvements. Ms. Lewis acknowledged the concerns of previous speakers regarding the potential traffic impact the proposal would incur on Oakton Road, but pointed out that the impact of the access on that road was not significant. She also

supported further coordination between the community and FCDOT to improve transportation management throughout the area to accommodate the growth of the County.

Deborah Cohen, 3199 Wheatland Farms Drive, Oakton, spoke in support of the subject applications. She said that the citizens expressing concerns regarding the impact of utilizing Oakton Road as an access had not sufficiently justified those concerns. She also pointed out that there were no outstanding studies that supported the safety concerns that had been raised by previous speakers. Ms. Cohen added that the applicant had provided sufficient provisions to address the potential traffic impact an access on Oakton Road would incur on the surrounding community. In addition, she noted that the applicant's studies had the support of VDOT and FCDOT. She also commended the applicant for coordinating with the surrounding community to address their outstanding concerns.

Elizabeth Merritt, 11105 Lakenheath Way, Oakton, voiced in opposition to the proposal, echoing concerns from previous speakers regarding the traffic impact that an access on Oakton Road would incur. She supported the applicant's commitment to remove left turns from Oakton Road into the subject property, but indicated that the provisions for mitigating peak-hour traffic were not adequate. Ms. Merritt said that she favored utilizing Jermantown Road as the exclusive access to the site. She also expressed concern regarding the enforceability of the applicant's traffic mitigation provisions and the effectiveness of the traffic signage that would be installed along Oakton Road. In addition, she stated that the extended right-turn lanes from Oakton Road into the site would not be sufficient to accommodate the increased traffic volumes during peak traffic periods or during events at the school facility on the site. Referring to the memorandum from VDOT dated June 20, 2018 contained in Attachment 5 of the second staff report addendum dated June 26, 2018, Ms. Merritt pointed out that the outstanding issues regarding pedestrian circulation and trails had not been adequately addressed.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Chaitanya Dahagam, 3497 Sweetberry Court, Oakton, spoke in opposition to the subject applications. He aligned himself concerns from previous speakers regarding the impact that utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the site would incur on the surrounding community, adding that the modifications depicted in the proposal would establish a precedent for subsequent modifications. Mr. Dahagam also said that the character of Oakton Road was rural and could not accommodate the traffic generated by an additional access to the site, adding that he favored alternative methods for improving the existing ingress/egress located along Jermantown Road. In addition, he echoed remarks from previous speakers regarding the possible safety hazards that utilizing Oakton Road as an access to the subject property would incur, noting the limited sight lines of that road. Mr. Dahagam then expressed concern regarding the ability of school buses to safely navigate Oakton Road. He added that he favored subsequent coordination between the applicant and the community to address their outstanding concerns.

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

- The condition of Oakton Road was adequate to accommodate the proposed right in/right out access to the subject property;

- The existing residential communities that were accessed from Oakton Road utilized both right-turn and left-turn lanes for ingress/egress;
- The existing condition of Oakton Road at the intersection with Jermantown Road included four lanes, which tapered to two towards the east of the site;
- The impact on areas to the east of the site and the existing impacts generated by existing residential development in the area were beyond the scope of the subject applications;
- The impact of traffic generated the planned widening of I-66 and the possible widening of Jermantown Road was beyond the scope of the proposal;
- The existing traffic on Oakton Road that was generated by the private school facility would not be significantly impacted by the proposal;
- The installation of an additional right-turn lane from Oakton Road into the subject property was sufficient to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposal and the absence of a left-turn lane ensured efficient traffic flow;
- The concerns regarding the safety impacts of an expanded parking lot on the southern portion of the site were not supported by data, but the applicant did not object to the installation of security cameras to address those concerns;
- The expanded parking lot on the southern portion of the site would primarily serve vehicles attending athletic events at the facility; and
- The proposal would accommodate enhanced educational facilities that had been previously approved for the subject property.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner commended the citizens who had spoken at the public hearing and encouraged further coordination with the applicant to address their concerns.

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

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So we've heard a lot this evening and I think it's appropriate that we take time to digest what we've heard. And for that purpose, I'M GOING TO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SEA 99-P-046-02 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 12TH, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN OR ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer this application decision only to a date certain of July 12th, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: We got to move the Board date too.

Chairman Murphy: Board date?

Commissioner Migliaccio: I think – is there a Board date attached to it?

Commissioner Hart: July 10th.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Recommend they move their...

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: I ALSO MOVE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD – THAT THEY MOVE THEIR HEARING OF THIS – ON THIS APPLICATION FROM JULY 10TH TO A FUTURE DATE THAT THEY WILL DETERMINE.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to move the Board date, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 1:19 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 Caporaletti

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

