MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 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 7:37 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

Commissioner Migliaccio announced that the Planning Commission's Land Use Process Review Committee had met the previous night to discuss the County's ongoing efforts regarding the zMod program. He then announced that the next Committee meeting was scheduled for January 2019 on a date to be determined.

//

Commissioner Sargeant announced that the Planning Commission's Schools Committee would meet on Wednesday, December 5, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035, to continue discussion on developing recommendations on the County's education policies in concert with Fairfax County Public Schools. He noted that the meeting was open to the public.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that, at its meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, the Board of Supervisors had appointed Barbara Byron as Director of the new department that would result from the planned merge of the Department of Planning and Zoning and the Office of Community

Revitalization. On behalf of the Commission, Chairman Murphy expressed support for Ms. Byron in her new role.

//

Chairman Murphy stated that Fred Selden, the existing Director of the Department of Planning, was scheduled to retire in 2019. On behalf of the Commission, Chairman Murphy thanked Mr. Selden for his service.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that, at its meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, the Board of Supervisor had repointed the following Commissioners to a four-year term:

- Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District;
- Timothy J. Sargeant, At-Large; and
- Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District.

//

RZ 2018-MV-012/2232-V18-1 – FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, CAP, BDCD

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Clarke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. WE WOULD LIKE TO DEFER THE WOODLAWN FIRE STATION, RZ 2018-MV-012, THERE WAS AN ISSUE WITH THE AFFIDAVIT, AND WE WOULD LIKE TO DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL DECEMBER THE 5TH.

Commissioner Sargeant: Is that a motion?

Chairman Murphy: Is that a motion?

Commissioner Clarke: That is my motion. Yes, sir.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of the motion? All of those in favor of the motion to defer the public hearing on RZ 2018-MV-012 and 2232-V18-1, the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, to a date certain of December 5th, 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)

//

2232-M18-12 – FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, Bren Mar Park 5415 Colliers Lane, Alexandria, VA 22312

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. We have a feature shown in the Mason District related to Fairfax County Park Authority, Planning and District – Planning and Development Division, related to the Bren Mar Park improvements. It's a proposed – it's additional acre of land. Proposed facilities include an off-leash dog area, one additional picnic shelter, playground, meadow open play, and additional parking. And, Mr. Chairman, I concur with the staff's conclusion on this case that the proposed improvements to the Bren Mar Park Master Plan Revision and Master Plan Administrative Update, located at 5415 Colliers Lane, satisfies the criteria of location, character, and extent, as specified in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2232, as amended. Therefore Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND THE SUBJECT APPLICATION 2232-M18-12, A FEATURE SHOWN, SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Cortina: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mrs. Cortina. Is there a discussion of that motion? All of those in favor of the motion to concur with the featured shown determination in 2232-M18-12, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PCA 2002-LE-005 – ALWADI, LLC

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Migliaccio: Secondly, I have a deferral at the applicant's request. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER INDEFINITELY THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PCA 2002-LE-005, ALWADI, LLC.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion? All of those in favor of the motion to defer indefinitely PCA 2002-LE-005 ALWADI, LLC, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2017-PR-011 – MARTIN-LEPPERT-SIPES POST 9274, VFW & A/K/A FALLS CHURCH VFW CLUB & FRAT. ORDER OF POLICE NOVA LODGE 35, INC.
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on October 11, 2018.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for action this evening the application, SE 2017-PR-011, the Martin-Leppert-Sipes Post 9274 VFW and the Fraternal Order of Police Nova Lodge 35 application for an SE. We have – convened the public hearing on this matter on October 11th, I had a number of commenters present their views to us. Subsequently, we deferred action a number of times to allow time to work through various issues that were raised in the public hearing. Because of the – those issues and because of the, I think, apparent inability for us to bring final resolution, I wanted to give the board – or ask staff to give the Commission a brief review of the application so that we have that foundation. In particular, focus on two matters that, I believe, remain unresolved. So, if the Commission will bear with us I'd like to ask staff, if you would, could you summarize why this application is before us?

Cathy Lewis, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Thank you, Cathy Lewis, Department of Planning and Zoning. The application you have before you is a special exception for two public benefit associations, private clubs. And what had happened was the back parcel, which is zone C-3 – the VFW had sold it to another private club/public benefit association, the Fraternal Order of Police. And the Fraternal Order of Police was not operating with the proper zoning permission. All of this generated zoning violations and this special exception was the vehicle to resolve those issues. With regard to the number of events that we have been talking about in the hearings – and I think were the subject of Mr. Baskin's letter – what staff has no concern about the number events, except that when the number of events – non-member events hits a certain point, the use is – becomes something else. It no longer is a

private club/public benefit association, which is permitted by special exception in the R-4 district. At a certain point it becomes a live music venue. It becomes a banquet hall. It becomes some sort of commercial recreation. That is why we are looking to limit the number of non-member events to make it ancillary to the main use and not have it overtake the main use, which is a public benefit association. The concern here is purely land use – the impacts on the adjacent neighbors, what is expected in a residential district. The live music is not something that is permitted in a residential district and it's not something that the neighbors should expect to live next to. So, what we're trying to do is strike a balance here so that the VFW can continue to rent out their facilities to a limited extent, but also I would not that we have amended the conditions such that the VFW can continue to allow other public benefit associations to utilize their facilities without limit. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And then, Ms. Lewis, is there a broader county interest involved here?

Cathy Lewis: I'm sorry?

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Is there a broader county interest involved here?

Ms. Lewis: Yes, there is. Again, it has to do with the definitions of the use and making sure that the use, the public benefit association, remains that – that it doesn't become something different. And we have lot of these groups around the county and they all have similar issues. They have a shrinking membership and they have expensive facilities and, you know, they're trying their best to keep going. But at a certain point, in terms of trying to generate revenue to maintain their facilities, to do their good works, they stray into a category of different land use and not something that is permitted in a residential district. And we have on right now that is ongoing in the Dranesville District. We had these same issues with the Kena Temple, which is now sold off and gone, but we did face those issues with the number of non-member events that they had and the impacts they had on the surrounding neighbors.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Are the conditions – and this will be the last question I ask of staff – but the conditions also speak to operating hours? With I believe, on a Friday and Saturday the upper limit on operating hours is 11:30?

Ms. Lewis: That's correct. Originally, the conditions had – we had recommended conditions that said 24 non-member events and that the hours would be midnight when we were discussing with you increasing that number, we felt – well, that could be balanced out if we had those events close down earlier in the weekend, such that we recommended 11:30. And, as you may recall, we had originally said that we would prefer 11:00 because that would be uniform with what the noise ordinance is, but we compromised at 11:30.

Niedzielski-Eichner: Alright. Thank you. And is the applicant's representative here this evening? Good evening.

William M. Baskin, Jr., Applicant's Agent, Baskin, Jackson & Lasso, PC: Good evening.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Normally, at this point when I'm…

Chairman Murphy: Can I ask…Mr. Baskin please identify yourself for the record.

Mr. Baskin: Yes sir. Bill Baskin, council to the applicants.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you and Mr. Baskin, I would ask you if you've had a chance to review the development conditions proposed – the November 26th conditions.

Mr. Baskin: Yes sir, I have.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And do you – are you able to affirm for your client, or for the applicant, that you agree with those development conditions?

Mr. Baskin: With two exceptions.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And what are those exceptions?

Mr. Baskin: Well Condition 7 – the staff proposed conditions put a limit of 36 on certain events that are held there. I had submitted and transmitted, I think, to all of the members of the Commission, a substitute Condition 7 that, number one, provided for a higher number, 72, but also, I think, provides a more clear and cogent description of the activities to be – that can be conducted. I have in discussions – excuse me, discussions with you and my clients this evening have the authority to pair back the – in an effort to compromise, can pare back the number of conditions to 52. And I would urge that the Planning Commission adopt and recommend our number and our Condition 7.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: And the second issue?

Mr. Baskin: The second was in Condition Number 9. The original conditions proposed by staff called for 12:00 p.m. closing on weekends, which I think the VFW for many years had a 1:00 p.m. closing on Saturdays, but they were okay with the 12:00 p.m. And then, just in the last two weeks, there came this unsolicited change to move it to 11:30. I don't think there is any justification for that – that, I think, puts even further limits on our client's – my client's ability to rent out their facility and raise funds. Okay, and – go ahead.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: So, I want to be sure that, for the record, Mr. Baskin, that your – the applicant is – agrees with the conditions 7 and – I mean, with the exception of the condition 7 and…

Mr. Baskin: Nine.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Nine. And you, you've proposed alternatives for those two.

Mr. Baskin: Right.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: But otherwise, the remaining conditions the applicant's proposed…

Mr. Baskin: The remaining issues we're okay with.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: If I may, this is very confusing to me in the computer. We have eight different sets of either revised development conditions, revised development conditions, revised development conditions, final development conditions, proposed revised, and four of those sets are all dated the 26th, and I just want to make sure that when we're talking about the development conditions dated the 26th, we identify which of the sets of the 26th that we're talking about. I think that – and maybe I'm wrong – but, 6th of 8 in the sequence is staff's current version and either the 7th or the 8th, I'm not sure which one, is Mr. Baskin's version except that that might use 52 instead of 72 for Development Condition 7. But we're talking about development conditions that are dated the 26th and I don't know that, five years from now, somebody looking at this list of slightly different documents is going to know which of the versions we're talking about.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: The different documents that you're referencing, are those from Mr. Baskin and not the staff generated?

Commissioner Hart: It's hard to tell, and they're all in the same font and I don't know what happened.

Jay Rodenbeck, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: I can respond here in that we had two sets of amended conditions that went to you. One set, the first set, November the 13th and then the second set, November the 26th. And, as I understand it, Mr. Basking edited and amended the latest set of amended conditions from staff that are also dated November the 26th. The reason you see four is because there is one set that are marked up with the changes and one set that are clean from each of us. And the way you can tell the difference is primarily with Condition Number 7 regarding the number of private events. Because we proposed 36 private events and the applicant, I believe, proposes 72. So, that would be the principal way you could tell the difference between the two sets of development conditions.

Commissioner Hart: Let me ask you this way. I just want to make sure that Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner's question to Mr. Baskin, when we're talking about the conditions of the 26th, we're talking about set number 6 out of 8 in the list that we have. That's staff's. The sixth one down the list is staff's final version of it. Of all the ones that are dated the 26th, it's the 6th out of 8, if that's from the top.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: That's correct. It's the third one up from the bottom. And that's on our board docs. It's not what we have in front of us. It's the issue here for those who are confused by this conversation.

Kimberly Bassarab, Assistant Director of the Planning Commission: It says 11-26-18, Final Development Conditions in your board book.

Commissioner Hart: Three up from the bottom. Is that…

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: That's correct.

Commissioner Hart: Yeah. That's my…I'm sorry it's such a long question, but it's very confusing.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: No, I can see where the confusion is arisen. I – I'm going to move this. I have the greatest respect for both our vets who have served to protect us overseas and our police officers who protect us here at home. In addition to the – in addition, these buildings play an important role in supporting their members, but also they do work – good work for the community and their own members. And the premises are located in – and if they were located in an industrial complex, I'd say let be as they have historically operated, which is without and constraints or limits on what kind of activities they engage in at that site. But, in fact, these on site facilities affect homes and townhomes and we have an obligations to protect their neighbors, as well as help regulate the uses of these facilities consistent with our zoning and Comprehensive Plan requirements. Further, the applicant is seeking a special exception to operate in an R-4 district, which – you know, has its own set of implications. In my view, the development conditions before us this evening – and this is the third up from the bottom of 11-26-18, Final Development Conditions, these development conditions represent a constructive result of balancing these two respective interests. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I DO WANT TO THEN MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2017-PR-011, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2018. I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING:

- APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION TO THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO THAT SHOWN ON THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION PLAT;

- APPROVAL OF A WAIVER TO THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE SOUTHERN PROPERTY BOUNDARY;

- APPROVAL OF A WAIVER TO THE PERIPHERAL PARKING LOT LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS;

- APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION REQUESTS FOR SECTION 17-0201(2) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR A MAJOR PAVED TRAIL ALONG SHREVE ROAD;

- APPROVAL OF A WAIVER FROM THE BICYCLE MASTER PLAN OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE DELINEATED BIKE LANE ALONG SHREVE ROAD.

Chairman Murphy: Alright, let's vote first on the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Is there a second to the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-PR-011subject to the development conditions as stated by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Second yeah. Is there a discussion of the motion? Yes, Ms. Hurley.

Commissioners Hurley: I will vote in support of the motion. I think that its overall a good idea, but I'd like to have on the record that I agree with the applicant instead of the staff regarding these development conditions. The change from midnight to 11:30 seems rather arbitrary and capricious. And going from the number from 36 to 72 – the neighbors have not been complaining about the noise, as long as the doors are shut, etcetera, etcetera. And so I will support the motion, but I will note I also support the applicant's choice on those two development conditions.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Ms. Cortina.

Commissioner Cortina: Thank you, Chairman. I would also like to agree with Commissioner Hurley on that matter. The facility has been there 60 years. They've been operating and it seems to me this concept of the agent of change, which is popular in the UK, and that says that the people who have moved in after the existing facility are the ones that, you know, need to accommodate it to some degree more than the ordinary. So, I would agree with the applicant on both of those items about the events and the hours. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: I was not here for the public hearing so I'm going to abstain from the vote.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Yes, Mr. Tanner.

Commissioner Tanner: I don't think I could say it better than Commissioner Cortina or Commissioner Hurley says, want to say for the record I also agree with the applicant's recommendation for 7 and 9.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Do those of you who disagree with the motion have an alternative motion to put forward?

Commissioner Sargeant: We have a motion.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: If there is this kind of disagreement – this is a policy decision, and I'm just asking, if the Commissioners feel strongly enough do you have an alternative motion?

Chairman Murphy: Is that? Mrs. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: Based with that, I MOVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN MOTION THAT CHANGES DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS 7 AND 9 TO GO TO THE MIDNIGHT HOUR AND THE – 72 VICE 36 EVENTS PER YEAR.

Commissioner Hart: They all (inaudible) 52, so….

Commissioner Hurley: The one – I don't want to get hung up. I'm sorry – TO GO WITH THE APPLICANT'S DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS 7 AND 9, VICE THE STAFF'S.

Mr. Chairman, is that being offered as a FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, an alternate motion.

Commissioner Hart: We need to amend the main motion.

Chairman Murphy: Amend motion. Seconded by Ms. Cortina. Is there a discussion of the amendment?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: I'm confused, is it 72? Except Mr. Baskin said 52, but the condition he – that's typed up is 72. Which is it?

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: He offered this evening 52.

Commissioner Hart: I know, but her motion was to do the

Commissioner Hurley: I modified my motion to whatever the applicant is…

Commissioner Hart: So, if his is 52 – you said 52 and midnight?

Commissioner Hurley: 52.

Commissioner Hart: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: All of those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioner Ulfelder: Nay.

Chairman Murphy: Motion carries. Mr. Ulfelder votes no. and Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner votes no.

Commissioner Hart: So, we're back to the main motion.

Chairman Murphy: I'll go back to the main motion. All of those in favor of the main motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-PR-011, as revised by the alternate motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

Commissioner Ulfelder: Nay

Chairman Murphy: Votes nay. Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner votes no.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Yes. I vote yes.

Chairman Murphy: Voted yes. So, Mr. Ulfelder is the only one that votes no and two abstentions. One abstention, Ms. Strandlie abstains twice. Okay. All right, now all of those in favor of the motion on the modifications, as articulated by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

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

The main motion carried by a vote of 10-1-1. Commissioner Ulfelder voted in opposition. Commissioner Strandlie abstained from the vote.

The amendment to the main motion carried by a vote of 9-2-1. Commissioners Ulfelder and Niedzielski-Eichner voted in opposition. Commissioner Strandlie abstained from the vote.

The motion to recommend approval of the waivers and modifications carried by a vote of 11-0-1. Commissioner Strandlie abstained from the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PRCA C-020 – STANLEY MARTIN COMPANIES, LLC (Decision Only)
(The public hearing on this application was held on November 15, 2018.)

Prior to going on verbatim, Commissioner Carter provided a summary of the subject application wherein he reviewed the issues related to the dimensions of the garages of the dwelling units within the proposed development, the provisions for providing safe access for emergency vehicles, and the adequacy of the parking provisions for the development and the surrounding area. He then explained the applicant's efforts to address those issues, which were reflected in the revised development conditions dated November 28, 2018, a copy of which is in the date file.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Carter: This is PRCA C-020, Tall Oaks Residential by the Stanley Martin Communities, LLC. And just to repeat, the proposed Tall Oaks residential development was approved in 2016. The project includes 156 dwelling units, including townhouses, multi-family units, two over two units, an office building, and a small retail building. An existing assistant living project is located adjacent to the proposed development. In response to the testimony at the public hearing, the applicant has revised the plan and conditions to improve the parking and access. With those revisions, the proposed project will establish a community with a variety of housing types for a range of incomes, retail and office uses, a connected system of streets, sidewalks and trails that will provide access to the land uses and to nearby natural resources, and a variety of open spaces, including a central green that will serve as a focus of community life. Again, PRCA C-020 Stanley Martin Companies, LLC. Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm for the record agreement to the proposed PRCA conditions dated November 28th, 2018.

Danielle Stevens, Applicant's Agent, Cooley LLP: My name is Danielle Stevens, here on behalf of the applicant, and we agree to the conditions.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you.

Commissioner Carter: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PRCA C-020, SUBJECT TO THE PRCA CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED NOVEMBER 28th, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All of those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PRCA C-020, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: And finally, I move…

Chairman Murphy: Hold on.

Commissioner Hurley: Abstain from this vote.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, one abstention, Ms. Hurley. Go ahead.

Commissioner Carter: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REAFFIRMATION OF THE PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS CONTAINED IN THE HANDOUT DISTRIBUTED TO YOU THIS EVENING.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstention.

Commissioner Carter: That's it.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

Each motion carried by a vote of 11-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained from the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ 2018-PR-011/SEA 78-D-075-03 – CROWN TYSONS PROPERTIES, LLC

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: I missed an action that we need to take this evening, which is to defer an application for public hearing. So, I MOVE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT RZ 2018-PR-011, SEA 78-D-075-03, CROWN TYSONS PROPERTIES, LLC, TO – A PUBLIC HEARING FOR – DATED FEBRUARY 6TH, 2019.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All of those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on RZ 2018-PR-011. No?

Commissioner Hart: Not decision only. It's the whole public hearing.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, public hearing. I'm sorry. Yes – defer the public hearing of RZ 2018-PR-011 and SEA 78-D-075-03, to a date certain of February 6th, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. RZ/FDP 2017-MV-024 – EASTWOOD PROPERTIES, INC.
2. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – ARTICLES 2 AND 20 COMMONLY ACCEPTED PETS
3. SE 2018-MV-004 – GOBI GOPINATH

This order was accepted without objection.

//

RZ/FDP 2017-MV-024 – EASTWOOD PROPERTIES, INC. – Appls. to rezone from R-2 and HC to PDH-16 and HC to permit residential development with an overall density of 12.6 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the E. side of Skyview Dr. approx. 600 ft. N. of its intersection with Richmond Hwy. on approx. 38,134 sq. ft. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential 13 du/ac. Tax Map 101-3 ((10)) 6A and 7A. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Lori Greenlief, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated October 23, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Harold Ellis, 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 RZ/FDP 2017-MV-024.

There was a discussion between Mr. Ellis and multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The applicant's request for a waiver of open space requirements and staff's support of that request; and
- The size and dimensions of the garages for the proposed dwelling units.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject applications.

Ms. Greenlief gave a presentation on the subject applications.

There was a discussion between Ms. Greenlief and multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The layout of the streets within the proposed development;
- The applicant's commitments for tree preservation and open space;
- The merit of the applicant's requested waiver of the open space requirements;
- The location of ingress/egress points within the proposed development; and
- The history of development in the surrounding area.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the subject applications.

There being no listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Craig Bauer, 47140 Hanrahan Place, Alexandria, spoke in support of the proposal and indicated that the subject applications also had the support of the Skyview Park Homeowners Association. (A copy of Mr. Bauer's statement is in the date file).

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for a rebuttal statement from Ms. Greenlief, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Clarke for action on these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Clarke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And again, I want to thank the applicant for bringing a quality development to our community and, as we've heard, the support from the HOA. As well as a year ago, tonight, the NVCCA also wrote a resolution in support of this application. So, thank you and it's great to see it come to fruition. So, with all of the hard work Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the applicant if they would come forward please to confirm. And do you confirm the – for the record – the agreement of the proposed development conditions dated November 14th, 2018, for FDP 2017-MV-024?

Lori Greenleaf: Yes, on behalf of the applicant, we agree with that condition.

Commissioner Clarke: Good. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, tonight I'd like to move forward with – with a motion, if we may. And, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ 2017-MV-024, SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS DATED NOVEMBER 8th, 2018. I ALSO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP 2017-MV-024, SUBJECT TO

THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONDITIONS DATED NOVEMBER 14th, 2018, AND SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ 2017-MV-024.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

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

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me, due to my inability to fully engage in deliberations on this non-exempt application, without exposing the County to potential liability, I will abstain.

Chairman Murphy: This is not, this not a non-exempt app. I don't believe.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: It is. It is a non-exempt.

Chairman Murphy: It is a non-exempt application?

Harold Ellis, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: The application is exempt from the…

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Oh, then I will be able to vote on this. I read this to be non-exempt and I heard non-exempt earlier, so I apologize.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. All of those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Clarke: Also Mr. Chairman, I ALSO MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS:

- ONE, WAIVER OF THE MINIMUM DISTRICT SIZE REQUIREMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 9-610 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE; AND

- TWO, WAIVER OF THE OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 9-612 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion of that motion? All of 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 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – ARTICLES 2 AND 20 COMMONLY ACCEPTED PETS – An amendment to Chapter 112 (the Zoning Ordinance) of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: revise the definition of Commonly Accepted Pets, as set forth in Part 3 of Article 20, by adding hedgehogs, chinchillas, and hermit crabs to the list of commonly accepted pets; by revising Section 2-512 to include all domestic fowl two months in age in the maximum number permitted on a lot; and by replacing the incorrect term "non-poisonous" with "not venomous to people," with respect to spiders and snakes. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Casey Judge, 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 adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding Articles 2 and 20 (Commonly Accepted Pets).

There was a discussion between Ms. Judge and multiple Commission members on the following issues:

- The opposition voiced by animal rights organizations for the keeping of hedgehogs and chinchillas as pets;
- The public opposition that had been expressed for the proposed amendment;
- The opposition to the amendment that had been expressed by the Animal Services Advisory Commission; and
- The criteria for what constituted an exotic animal for the County and the state of Virginia.

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

Mark Spisak, 2031 Virginia Avenue, McLean, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment due to concerns regarding the unsuitability of keeping hedgehogs as pets, the potential environmental impact that would be incurred by the presence of exotic pets, the negative impact on the exotic animals being kept as pets, and the ability for local animal control services to manage such pets. (A copy of Mr. Spisak's statement is in the date file).

A discussion ensued between Mr. Spisak and multiple Commissioners regarding the existing County policies for commonly accepted pets, the reasons for opposing further modifications, and the availability of information on the keeping of hedgehogs as pets.

Phillip Church, 9204 Leamington Court, Fairfax, representing the Fairfax County Animal Advisory Commission, voiced opposition to the proposed amendment, aligning himself with the concerns expressed by Mr. Spisak. (A copy of Mr. Church's statement is in the date file).

A discussion ensued between Mr. Church; Ms. Judge; Andrew Hushour, Zoning Administration Division, DPZ; John Burton, Office of the County Attorney; and multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The ability of responsible pet owners to care for hedgehogs;
- The existing County and state policies for permitting exotic animals as pets;
- The animals that were prohibited under those policies;
- The existing process for permitting the keeping of exotic pets;
- The revised process for permitting the keeping of exotic pets, as proposed by the amendment;
- The health risks associated with the keeping of certain exotic animals as pets;
- The number of inquiries staff had received on the keeping of hedgehogs as pets;
- The County's previous efforts at regulating exotic pets;
- The challenges associated with the keeping of certain pets; and
- The impact of exotic pets on the surrounding environment and local ecosystem.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the proposed amendment.

There being no more listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Karen Diviney, 13716 Balmoral Greens Avenue, Clifton, voiced opposition to the proposed amendment, aligning herself with the comments expressed by Mr. Church and Mr. Spisak. She also reiterated concerns regarding the ability of local animal service providers to ensure adequate care for exotic pets.

A discussion ensued between Ms. Diviney and Commissioner Ulfelder regarding the types of exotic pets that incurred significant challenges to local animal service providers.

Jayesh Edwards, 6317 Hunting Ridge Lane, McLean, spoke in support of the proposed amendment because the concerns expressed by previous speakers regarding the keeping of hedgehogs as pets were not warranted.

A discussion ensued between Mr. Edwards, Ms. Judge, multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The health hazards associated with the keeping of exotic pets;
- The number of cases that had been reported for diseases attributed to such pets;
- The keeping of reptiles as pets;
- The federal laws regulating the importation of exotic animals; and
- The operation of local animal breeders.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the proposed amendment.

Mike Bober, 7937 Bolling Drive, Alexandria, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, voiced support for the proposed amendment, echoing remarks from Mr. Edwards. He then addressed the concerns voiced by previous speakers regarding the environmental and health impact of hedgehogs. In addition, he requested the language of the proposed amendment be modified in the following manner:

- Modify the phrase in Line 10 from "not venomous to people" to "not clinically venomous to people" or "clinically non-venomous to people."

A discussion ensued between Ms. Judge and Commissioner Hurley regarding staff's support of the requested modification to Line 10, as articulated by Mr. Bober, wherein Ms. Judge stated that staff did not oppose such a modification.

A discussion ensued between Mr. Bober and Commissioner Tanner regarding the keeping of chinchillas as pets.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the proposed amendment.

There being no further speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Ms. Judge, who declined.

A discussion ensued between Ms. Judge, Mr. Hushour, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following issues:

- The impact the amendments would incur on the process for permitting hedgehogs as pets;
- The types of pets that incurred significant land use impacts;
- The impact of exotic pets that were primarily cared for indoors;
- The existing requirements for permitting pets through the special permitting process;
- The possible inclusion of best practices provisions within the proposed amendment;
- The applicability and references of existing animal welfare laws within the amendment;
- The process for obtaining an exotic pet, such as a hedgehog; and
- The process for mitigating potential health hazards associated with certain exotic pets.

The discussion resulted in no changes to the proposed amendment.

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

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Cortina: So, considering all of the input I've had from fellow Commissioners – the testimony – I think I'd like to defer at this time. We have discussed many of the same issues, Ms. Jones and myself here – I mean Ms. Judge, I'm sorry – and we talked about, in particular, some of the issues around hand washing and communicable diseases and clearly, if someone has an issue with an immune deficiency, or young children and these are so cute…

Chairman Murphy: Excuse me.

Commissioner Cortina: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Before you go on, public hearing is closed.

Commissioner Cortina: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead. That's okay. Go ahead.

Commissioner Cortina: Thank you. Well, that they are so cute and cuddly – and you might not think that you would want, you know, need to wash your hands. Or that you might not let small children play with them, things like that. And so, you know, I had similar concerns about this, as well as the abandonment rate and the fact that they are this internet craze. And, you know, is this really what we want to get into – a cycle anytime there is a cute critter that someone finds in the wild and then they breed it in the US. And eventually, it turns into something that we expand our list, in which I would not like to see any – any furtherance of that. But in the case here that we have different testimony, as well as the – the possibility that we could work with industry, some language, and some tips sheets perhaps. And, I think, we also might want to figure out if we'd like to have some follow-on motions for the animal control folks or the animal shelter to keep abandonment stats and come back to us next – next year. I'm going to put that together and defer at this time. So with that, I'd like to, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE – I'm sorry – I MOVE TO DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING COMMONLY ACCEPTED PETS TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 6th, 2018, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

Commissioner Strandlie: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded Mrs. Strandlie. Is there a discussion on the motion? All of those in favor of the motion to defer decision on Zoning Ordinance Amendment Articles 2 and 20, Commonly Accepted Pets, to a date certain of December 6th, with the record remaining open for written comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much and thank you all for coming and testifying.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2018-MV-004 – GOBI GOPINATH – Appl. under Sect. 3-204 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a private school of general education with a total enrollment of up to – 24 students. Located at 8728 Lukens Ln., Alexandria, 22309 on approx. 1.42 ac. of land zoned R-2 and HC. Tax Map 110-1 ((1)) 44. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Gobi Gopinath, Applicant/Title Owner, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 16, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Jay Rodenbeck, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended denial of application SE 2018-MV-004 because the proposed private school facility was not in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance or in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan and did not include adequate buffering provisions to mitigate the impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood.

There was a discussion between Mr. Rodenbeck; Catherine Lewis, ZED, DPZ; multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The compatibility of the proposed private school with the surrounding development;
- The impact of the proposed school on the neighboring residential communities;
- The absence of transitional screening along the parking area on the site;
- The applicant's inability to comply with the necessary barrier requirements;
- The County's transitional screening requirements for private school facilities;
- The County's standards for permitting a private school facility within an existing residential neighborhood;
- The visual impact of the proposed private school facility on the surrounding area;
- The portion of the property that would be paved to accommodate parking areas;
- The existing structures, driveways, and parking provisions on the site;
- The modifications necessary for the driveway and parking provisions to permit a private school facility on the site;
- The anticipated traffic impact of the proposed private school facility;
- The daily operation and services that would be provided at the private school facility;
- The building code requirements necessary to accommodate the services and operations of the proposed facility;
- The number of students that would be permitted at the proposed private school facility and the support staff that would be required for the facility;
- The applicant's provisions for the outdoor recreation area;
- The grade level of the students that the proposed private school facility would serve;

- The adequacy of the applicant's parking provisions for the site; and
- The proximity of the proposed facility to the neighboring Resource Protection Area (RPA).

The discussion resulted in no modifications to the subject application.

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:49 p.m. and reconvened at 10:03 p.m.

//

Mr. Gopinath gave a presentation on the subject application wherein he responded to staff's recommendation of denial by highlighting the following:

- The significant support the proposal had received from the surrounding community;
- The limited options for development on the site;
- The extent to which a private school facility provided transitional development between the existing residential community and the nearby commercial development;
- The proposed facility's compatibility with the guidelines prescribed by EMBARK Richmond Highway for the area;
- The lack of concerns expressed by the Fairfax County Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Transportation on the impact of the proposal;
- The extent to which planned improvements to the surrounding road networks addressed the traffic impact of the proposal;
- The use of staggered pick-up/drop-off schedules to mitigate the traffic impact of the proposed facility;
- The services of the facility did not include commercial day care operations;
- The parking provisions operated in conjunction with the pick-up/drop-off procedures to limit the traffic impact of the facility;
- The outdoor activities of the private school would be managed to limit the noise impact of the facility;
- The character of the proposed facility was compatible with the surrounding area, which included an existing fire station; and
- The design of the proposed facility compared to the existing structure on the site.

There was a discussion between Mr. Gopinath, Mr. Rodenbeck, Ms. Lewis, and multiple Commissioners on the following issues:

- The design and impact of the parking areas on the site;
- The usage of the driveway during the operation of the proposed private school facility;
- The compatibility of the facility with the residential character of the surrounding community;
- The hours of operation and traffic impact of the proposed facility;
- The planned improvements to the road network around the subject property;

- The extent to which the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association (MVCCA) supported the subject application;
- The additional requirements for a private school facility prescribed by the County and the state of Virginia;
- The County's existing outdoor space requirements for a private school facility;
- The applicant's provisions for mitigating the noise impact of the facility;
- The applicant's efforts to address staff's concerns on the barrier and setback requirements;
- The impact of the RPA on the operation of the proposed facility;
- The applicant's utilization of the outdoor play area during the facility's operation;
- The existing residential development around the subject property;
- The applicant's outreach efforts to residents of the surrounding community;
- The existing property values of the surrounding area;
- The recommended development for the area prescribed by EMBARK Richmond Highway;
- The location of transit stops in the areas around the subject property;
- The accessibility of the site by mass transit services;
- The operational procedures and education standards that would be utilized at the proposed facility;
- The applicant's efforts to receive approval from the state of Virginia to provide educational services at the proposed facility;
- The applicant's efforts to abide by the standards for a private school facility, as prescribed by the County;
- The extent to which the existing dwelling unit would be modified under the proposal;
- The amount of support for the proposal that the applicant had received;
- The applicant's support of the development conditions dated October 17, 2018, as shown in Appendix 1 of the staff report;
- The potential health and safety issues that would occur during the operation of the proposed facility;
- The process for delivering and serving food to the students at the proposed facility;
- The extent to which the applicant had coordinated with the Fairfax County School Board on the subject application; and
- The existing educational facilities in the surrounding area.

The discussion resulted in Mr. Gopinath requesting the following change to the development condition:

- Removal of the requirements articulated in the development conditions that the applicant provide the recommended road and sidewalk improvements to Lukens Lane.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker.

Douglas Jones, 8729 Lukens Lane, Alexandria, spoke in opposition to the subject application because of the following issues:

- The character of the proposed private school facility was incompatible with the existing residential development in the area;
- The proposed facility would generate a significant noise impact;
- The proposed facility would incur a negatively impact on property values in the area;
- The operation of a school facility would generate a significant traffic impact on Lukens Lane; and
- The use of a private school facility was inconsistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan for the site.

A discussion ensued between Mr. Rodenbeck, Mr. Jones, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following issues:

- The operation of the existing fire station located near the site;
- The impact of the nearby fire station facility on Lukens Lane;
- The review of the application conducted by the MVCCA; and
- The extent to which the MVCCA supported the proposal.

Paul Whitridge, 9411 Ferry Landing Court, Alexandria, spoke in opposition to the subject application because of the following reasons:

- The impact of the noise generated by the operation of a private school facility on neighboring properties;
- The impact that modifying the existing dwelling unit on the site would incur on the local environment;
- The lack of sufficient buffering along the border of the site;
- The traffic impact that the proposed facility would incur on Lukens Lane; and
- The character compatibility of the proposed facility with the surrounding residential community.

(A copy of Mr. Whitridge's statement is in the date file.)

A discussion ensued between Mr. Whitridge, Ms. Lewis, and Commissioner Hart regarding the following issues:

- The existing condition of the subject property;
- The activities that had occurred on the site since it was purchased by the applicant;
- The impact on the neighboring RPA since the applicant's purchase of the site;
- The coordination that had occurred between staff and residents of the community surrounding the subject property; and
- The process for permitting modifications to the RPA.

Geoff Sykes, 4801 Old Mill Road, Alexandria, spoke in support of the subject application for the following reasons:

- The positive impact that a private school facility would incur on the character of the surrounding community;
- The positive impact that the facility would incur on the education services afforded to local students; and
- The improvements that the subject application would permit to the existing structure on the site.

Daniele Florence, 8733 Oak Leaf Drive, Alexandria, voiced support for the subject applications, aligning herself with remarks from Mr. Sykes regarding the positive impact that the proposed private school facility would incur on the surrounding neighborhood.

There being no more listed speakers, Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Paul MacDonald, 8801 Lukens Lane, Alexandria, spoke in opposition to the subject application for the following reasons:

- The proposal did not include adequate commitments to road improvements in the surrounding area;
- The operation of a private school facility was not consistent with the character of the surrounding area;
- The presence of safety hazards along Lukens Lane; and
- The inability of the existing structure on the site to accommodate the operations of a private school facility.

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

- The applicant would coordinate with the County to complete a grading plan for the site that minimized disturbances to the RPA; and
- The applicant would implement landscaping improvements to enhance the visual impact and stormwater drainage features on the site.

There was a discussion between Mr. Gopinath, Mr. Rodenbeck, Ms. Lewis, and Commissioner Hart on the following issues:

- The applicant's efforts to finalize a grading plan for the site were ongoing and had not been completed prior to the public hearing;
- The applicant had been subject to a Notice of Violation by the County during the ongoing grading efforts at the site;
- The efforts by staff to evaluate the applicant's grading plan;
- The extent to which the subject application permitted modifications to the site; and
- The existing stormwater drainage issues on the site.

Commissioner Clarke announced his intent to defer the decision only for the subject application at the conclusion of the public hearing.

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 Clarke for action on this case.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Clarke: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As stated and Mr. Gobi, the applicant, thank you very much for appearing tonight with you plans and ambitions. And Jay, Mr. Rodenbeck, thank you very much. I'd like to go forward with move of the motion, sir, to defer. I MOVE TO DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2018-MV-004 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JANUARY 9TH, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

Commissioners Hart and Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and Mr. Sargeant. Discussion of the motion? All of those in favor of the motion to defer the decision only on SE 2018-MV-004 to a date certain of January 9th, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Thank you all for sticking around. We appreciate it.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman
James T. Migliaccio, Secretary

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

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: June 26, 2019

Jacob Caporaletti

Jacob Caporaletti, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

Toni Michele Denson
NOTARY PUBLIC
Howard County, Maryland
My Commission Expires 6/14/2022

Toni Michele Denson
NOTARY PUBLIC
Howard County, Maryland
My Commission Expires 6/14/2022