MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2025

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman, Commissioner At-Large
Timothy J. Sargeant, Vice Chairman, Commissioner At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Secretary, Sully District
Alyssa Batchelor-Causey, Dranesville District
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Chris Landgraf, Franconia District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Jeremy Hancock, Providence District
Candice Bennett, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Alis Wang, Mason District

OTHERS: Katelyn Quinn, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department Planning Division
Casey Judge, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Lily Yegazu, ZAD, DPD
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission, Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Satabdi Samaddar, Administration, DCS

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., by Chairman Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included Commission Business, two decisions only and that the Commission would elect officers for 2025 at the conclusion of the decision only.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that the Planning Commission's Policy Plan Committee would meet on Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 7:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035, the agenda for tomorrow's meeting includes two major topics, Recreation and Parks and Health Communities. He noted that the meeting would be televised on Channel 16 and welcomed the public to watch.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

RZ-2023-PR-00018 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, A BODY CORPORATE
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on October 30, 2024.)

Commissioner Bennett disclosed she is currently employed as the Deputy Executive Director of Good Shepherd Housing, which purchased property from a member of the School Board within the past 12 months, and did not receive any financial benefit or detriment from the sale.

//

This application was paused due to technical difficulties and Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner stated that we would be taking up the other decision only for the evening and returning once the other application was concluded.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested that Vice Chairman Sargeant conduct the public hearing for the decision only. Without objection, he relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman Sargeant.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – SPECIAL EVENTS AND FOOD TRUCKS
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on January 8, 2025.)

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested that Lily Yegazu, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), give a brief presentation on the chart outlining examples of public events under the proposed regulations.

- Clarification between the distinctions of events that require a special event permit and those that do not;
- Explanation that events that took place on private property but were open to the public, advertised, or ticketed required an administrative permit; and
- Explanation that community-based events primarily targeting neighborhood residents and their guests typically do not require a permit (e.g., block parties and holiday gatherings).

Examples of events that may require a permit:

- Large-scale public events, including:
    - Concerts, fairs, and festivals;
    - Seasonal sales like pumpkin patches and Christmas tree sales; and
    - Athletic events such as walkathons or marathons that began on private property and extend into public areas.

Examples of events that did not require a permit:

- Private social gatherings, including:
    - Halloween parties and other holiday celebrations;

- Neighborhood block parties; and
- Private events such as weddings or birthday parties held on residential property

There was a discussion between Ms. Yegazu; Casey Judge, ZAD, DPD; and multiple Commissioners on the following issues.

- Clarification that a volunteer-led cleanup event did not fall under the definition of a special event and would not require a permit;
- Clarification that special events like live entertainment, public services, or large scale coordination typically involved additional associated activities;
- Explanation that while some permits may be required from Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for activities affecting roadways, that was separate from a special event permit;
- Clarification that small social gatherings at community swimming pools, such as an ice cream social for grandparents and families, would not require a special event permit;
- Concerns about the distinction between events being open to the public versus open to the general public, questioning whether the definition was sufficiently clear;
- Explanation that the clarification in the definition was intended to distinguish private events like family gatherings and backyard weddings from those requiring a permit;
- Explanation that events not requiring a permit included gatherings where participation was limited like private trick-or-treating in a neighborhood or community pool guest events;
- Explanation that events requiring a permit were those where the general public was explicitly invited, advertised, or ticketed;
- Explanation that the staff would be adding a Frequently Asked Questions to the county's website to cover all the different types of events and ensuring accessibility for the public;
- Clarification that a swim meet was generally not considered a special event, as it was typically not ticketed and was organized by a homeowner's association (HOA) or swim league;
- Explanation that if the event involved ticket sales or was open to the larger public, it might require a permit;
- Explanation that a special event approval for such locations like Fairfax Corner and Mosaic typically occurred during the zoning process, often as part of the development proffers;
- Clarification that farmers markets have a separate permit and specific zoning standards in the ordinance, so they were not classified as special events;
- Explanation that an HOA did not need to be involved for a neighborhood event to occur without a permit;
- Clarification that both small neighborhood gatherings and larger HOA-sponsored events could be held without requiring a special event permit, provided they were not ticketed or widely advertised to the general public;

- Clarification on the distinction between public events and accessory uses of a site in determining whether a special event permit was required;
- Explanation that many land uses inherently included accessory events as part of their approved operations;
- Clarification that some activities listed as not requiring a permit were still technically public but qualified as accessory uses under zoning regulations;
- Clarification that swim clubs were an example where swim meets, and similar events were considered accessory uses and did not require additional permitting;
- Clarification that a religious assembly holding an outdoor service would not be classified as a special event because it aligned with the primary land use approval for that site;
- Clarification on whether cars and coffee gatherings in shopping center parking lots required a permit. Staff stated that they were not familiar with the specific details of such events but would look into the requirements;
- Explanation that if an event took place on private property, was advertised to the general public, and occupied parking spaces, it could potentially require a permit; and
- Explanation that further review would be necessary to determine specific permit requirements.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner provided clarification on the Planning Commission's authority to recommend amendments to advertised Zoning Ordinance language. After consulting with the Office of the County Attorney, he confirmed that state code authorized the Planning Commission to make appropriate changes to proposed ordinances or amendments based on discussions during public hearings.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner emphasized that what qualified as an appropriate change depended on the specific amendment and the Board's authorization. He confirmed that the Commission had the authority to recommend clarifications to proposed text but advised that any recommended changes should be minor and not deeply substantive, ensuring they remain within the intended scope of the amendment. He concluded by reaffirming that it was the Commission's consistent practice to provide the Board of Supervisors with its best recommendations through a follow-on motion.

Commissioner Cortina explained the various ways Zoning Ordinance amendments can be introduced:

- Authorized by the Board of Supervisors;
- Proposed by the Planning Commission via resolution; and
- Added by the Zoning Ordinance Administrator

She clarified that a follow-on motion could serve multiple purposes:

- Requesting the Board to make a recommendation on an amendment; and
- Asking staff to review and refine a proposed change.

Commissioner Cortina emphasized that while a Planning Commission resolution could add an item to the work program, the Board of Supervisors ultimately determines its priority. Even if an amendment was included in the work program, the Board could still assign it a low priority meaning it may not be addressed in the near future.

Commissioner Cortina asked staff whether an amendment was automatically added to the work program when clarification was requested. Staff confirmed that if the Board of Supervisors approved a follow-on motion, the amendment would be automatically added to the work program, as Board approval served as an endorsement for its inclusion. Commissioner Cortina further inquired, if an item was not approved through a follow-on motion, the Commission could still advocate for its inclusion during the work program review process. Staff agreed, confirming that the Commission can recommend amendments for inclusion when the work program was reviewed.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR SPECIAL EVENTS AND FOOD TRUCKS, WITH THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED OPTIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED DECEMBER 12, 2024, WITH A DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE OF MARCH 1, 2025.

Commissioners Landgraff and Spain seconded the motion.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner provided a brief explanation on the importance of this motion.

Commissioner Hancock made the following amendment to the main motion where he MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION OF SPECIAL EVENT AND RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD REVISE THE DEFINITION OF A SPECIAL EVENT TO SPECIFY THAT IT MUST BE OPEN TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC INSTEAD OF OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, AND THAT THE SPECIAL EVENT DEFINITION READ:

> "A TEMPORARY OUTDOOR ACTIVITY HELD ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND OPEN TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, SEASONAL SALES, THE DISPLAY OF GOODS AND MERCHANDISE ASSOCIATED WITH A RETAIL USE, COMMUNITY OR CULTURAL EVENTS, MUSICAL OR ARTS EVENTS, CELEBRATIONS, FESTIVALS, FAIRS, CARNIVALS, AND CIRCUSES."

Commissioner Cortina seconded the amendment to the main motion.

Commissioner Hancock provided a brief explanation on the importance of this motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey made the following amendment to the main motion where she MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO REVISE THE STANDARD IN SUBSECTION 4102.8.I(11)(A)1 FOR A ONE-DAY SPECIAL EVENT TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD THE OPTION THAT A ONE-DAY SPECIAL EVENT MAY BE HELD FOR A MAXIMUM OF TWELVE HOURS.

Commissioner Landgraff seconded the amendment to the main motion.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey provided a brief explanation on the importance of this motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Landgraff made the following amendment to the main motion where he MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO REVISE THE STANDARD IN SUBSECTION 4102.8.I(11)(A)4 FOR THE HOURS OF OPERATION FOR SPECIAL EVENTS TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD THE OPTION THAT NO EVENT MAY OCCUR BEFORE 6:00 A.M. OR AFTER 10:00 PM ON SUNDAY THROUGH THURSDAY, AND AFTER 11:00 PM FRIDAY, SATURDAY, AND BEFORE A FEDERAL HOLIDAY.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey seconded the amendment to the main motion.

Commissioner Landgraff provided a brief explanation on the importance of this motion.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-1. Commissioner Bennett voted in opposition. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Vice Chairman Sargeant stated that the Commission would now vote on the amended motion to the main motion which was accepted by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Hancock stated during the January 8, 2025, public hearing, he emphasized the need to address potential barriers faced by smaller non-profit organizations that may prevent them from hosting events due to application filing costs. Therefore, Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT STAFF TO EXAMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF ALLOWING CERTAIN SMALL-SCALE AND SHORT-TERM SPECIAL EVENTS TO BE PERMITTED EITHER BY RIGHT OR THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT WITHOUT A FEE.

Commissioner Cortina seconded the follow-on motion.

There was a discussion between Ms. Yegazu, Ms. Judge, ZAD, DPD;and multiple Commissioners on the follow-on motion.

- Concerns regarding the impact of the fee on small nonprofits;
- Emphasized that public events inherently involve risk and liability;
- Argued that organizations hosting public events should acknowledge their liability, and the application fee reflects this responsibility;

- Suggested that organizations should also carry liability insurance to protect themselves and the public;
- Concerns that the requirement for small gatherings to obtain a permit could be an unnecessary regulatory burden;
- Concerns about requiring permits for small gatherings that do not significantly impact public safety or welfare:
    - Staff confirmed that one or two people would not be considered a special event; and
    - Explanation that the event scope, rather than a strict minimum attendee count, determines permit requirements.
- Stated that permit triggers were mostly based on additional review requirements from other agencies rather than an exact headcount;
- Key permit triggers included:
    - 100 plus attendees in outdoor spaces which may require temporary toilet facilities per health regulations; and
    - 500 plus attendees which may require crowd control measures and additional public safety oversight.
- Clarification that while attendance plays a role in determining permit needs, the overall scope and potential impact of the event were the primary determining factors;
- Explanation that a process already exists to request a waiver for the permit fee;
- Concern that the Zoning Ordinance was silent on small gatherings, which could lead to uncertainty about whether a permit was required;
- Explanation that if the motion was approved, it would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, who would then decide whether to:
    - Approve the follow-on motion as proposed;
    - Modify or delete certain provisions; and
    - Direct staff to study the issue further and return with a Zoning Ordinance amendment and analysis.
- Explanation if approved, the topic would be added to the Zoning Ordinance work program, where staff would study the issue further and develop recommendations.

The motion carried by a vote of 8-2. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Bennett voted in opposition. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner in lieu of Commissioner Wang stated that the current Zoning Ordinance limits the duration of food truck operation at any one location to no more than four hours per day, excluding setup and breakdown time. This limitation could hinder efforts to attract food trucks to areas that would benefit from their revitalizing presence. Extending the allowable hours of operation could provide more flexibility for food truck operators and enhance their potential to energize and attract activity to key locations. Therefore, he MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT STAFF TO EXAMINE OPTIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALLOWING FOOD TRUCKS TO OPERATE FOR LONGER PERIODS.

Commissioners Batchelor-Causey, Bennett and Landgraff seconded the follow-on motion.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner provided a brief explanation on the importance of this motion.

Commissioners Carter Spain and Landgraff both aligned themselves with the statement made by Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner.

The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner also extended his appreciation to staff members Ms. Yegazu and Ms. Judge for their outstanding work on the project He further thanked his colleagues for their efforts, feedback, and amendments, acknowledging their contributions throughout the process and lastly, he extended appreciation to the Vice Chairman for assisting with the hearing and facilitating discussions on the motion.

//

Chaiman Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair and took up the previous application that was paused due to technical issues.

//

RZ-2023-PR-00018 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, A BODY CORPORATE
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on October 30, 2024.)

Commissioner Hancock requested that John C. McGranahan, Jr., the applicant's agent, give a brief presentation on the changes and considerations made since the deferral of the October 30, 2024, meeting.

- Organized changes into two main categories:
  - Revisions based on Architectural Review Board (ARB) feedback; and
  - Revisions addressing community concerns
- The applicant and the school board attended the December 12, 2024, ARB meeting and received five specific requests from the ARB, which were formalized in a letter dated December 19, 2024;
- All five ARB requests were addressed in the revised proffers:
  - Proffer 4 - Site Access for Heritage Documentation:
    - Revised to grant the Heritage Resources Branch and the ARB permission to access the site before demolition and construction; and
    - Agreed to coordinate a field day for documentation, per ARB Request 4.
  - Proffer 5 - ARB Involvement in Interpretive Historical Exhibit:
    - Revised to include the ARB as a reviewing party for the interpretive historical exhibit, fulfilling ARB Request 5; and
    - Added ethnographic research on local community members and descendants, which would be incorporated into the exhibit per ARB Request 2.
  - Proffer 5 - Preservation of School Entranceway:

- Committed to preserving and relocating the historic entranceway and pediment of the existing school;
- The entranceway would be incorporated into the new building's lobby as part of the interpretive exhibit;
- Acknowledged technical challenges due to the size and structure of the entrance but committed to integrating it into a two-story lobby space; and
- This was the top request from the ARB, and the applicant considered it a valuable and positive change to the project.

- Proffer 6 - Preservation of Federal Works Administration Plaque:
  - The ARB requested that the plaque be included in the on-site interpretive exhibit rather than donated

- Noted that Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) held another community meeting on December 4, 2024, where feedback was received;
- Based on community input, five new proffers were added to address key concerns;
- Newly Added Proffers:

- Proffer 18 – Installation of a Six-Foot Fence to Prevent Cut-Through Pedestrian Traffic:
  - Addressed concerns from residents in the Waystone Core Community that non-community members might cut through townhouse openings and buffer areas to access the ball field via the school's parking lot; and
  - Committed to installing a six-foot fence to prevent this type of unauthorized pedestrian traffic.

- Proffer 19 – $50,000 Contribution Toward Offsite Pedestrian Connection:
  - Community members and Commissioner Hancock identified the importance for a pedestrian connection between Sawtooth Oak Court and Cedar Lane;
  - FCPS acknowledged that while it cannot construct the connection alone, it was committed to supporting the effort;
  - To demonstrate this commitment, a $50,000 contribution was added to help fund the project; and
  - FCPS would continue coordinating with the Supervisor's office to ensure the pedestrian connection was pursued and ultimately built.

- Proffer 20 – Coordination and Communication on School Events:
  - Incorporated a more explicit communication plan with the surrounding community regarding school events; and
  - Included a commitment to coordinate back-to-school nights over multiple evenings, ensuring that different grades have their events on separate nights to reduce traffic congestion.

- Proffer 21 – Community Meeting and Communication During Construction:
  - FCPS already maintained a construction communication plan for capital projects on its website; and

        - To formalize this commitment, the plan was memorialized in the proffers to ensure ongoing engagement with the community throughout construction.

    - Proffer 22 – Lighting Restrictions During Construction:
        - Confirmed that construction lighting would be restricted to minimize impacts on surrounding residential communities; and
        - Ensured that light spillover and disruptions would be kept to a minimum during the construction phase.

- The applicant confirmed that FCPS was committed to ongoing dialogue with the community;
- Explanation that as a public entity, FCPS served the community and valued input;
- Explanation that FCPS followed a structured communication plan for all capital projects, which was available on the FCPS website;
- Explanation of the two key commitments included in the proffer and communication plan:
    - Creation and Maintenance of a Project Webpage:
        - The webpage would provide regular updates on project status; and
        - It would offer community engagement and feedback opportunities.

    - In-Person Community Pre-Construction Meeting:
        - FCPS would host a pre-construction meeting to engage with the community;
        - Residents would have an opportunity to raise concerns, ask questions, and receive project details; and
        - Contact information for the project manager would be provided, ensuring residents knew who to contact with concerns during construction.

- Explanation that FCPS aimed to remain consistent across all capital projects, ensuring that the same level of communication and engagement was maintained for all communities;
- Explanation that by memorializing this commitment in Proffer 21, FCPS was reinforcing its accountability to the community;
- Explanation that Dunn Loring Elementary School's parking plan exceeded the Zoning Ordinance requirement for school staff parking;
- Clarification that the required number of spaces was based on staff projections, which may fluctuate over time;
- Clarification that visitor parking spaces would be designated based on available capacity after accounting for staff parking needs;
- Explanation that FCPS typically designates visitor parking spaces near the school entrance, similar to what Hancock observed at Kilmer Middle School; and
- Clarification that visitor spaces were often painted with visitor parking signage on the asphalt for clarity.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner confirmed receipt of a letter from the Chair of the Fairfax County History Commission and appreciated them taking the time to communicate with the Commissioners.

//

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

- APPROVAL OF RZ-2023-PR-00018 AND THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JANUARY 13, 2025; AND
- APPROVAL OF THE MODIFICATION AND WAIVER OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE LANDSCAPING SHOWN ON THE GDP.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Bennett seconded the motions, which carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Clarke abstained from the vote. Commissioner Wang was absent from the meeting.

//

ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that the Planning Commission would elect new officers for the 2025 term. He explained that Commission officers are elected annually for one-year terms, or until a successor takes office. The ground rules for these elections were as follows:

- There were four officers to be elected, the Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Parliamentarian;
- Officers would be elected by majority vote of the Commissioners who were present and since Commissioner Wang was absent, the majority would be 6 votes of the 10 Commissioners present;
- Voting would occur by a show of hands in support of each candidate and the clerk would report the count;
- All commissioners were eligible to be considered for these positions and if a commissioner was not elected for a position, he or she could be considered for subsequent positions;
- Candidates for all positions would be self-nominated by raising their hand when asked and each candidate would have two minutes to advocate for their candidacy; and
- If there were more than two candidates for a position and if a majority of votes was not secured after the first vote, the candidate with the least number of votes would

drop out to trigger a runoff vote between or among remaining candidates until there was a majority vote for one candidate.

//

CANDIDATES SEEKING ELECTION FOR CHAIRMAN

Since he intended to be a candidate for the role of Chairman, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman Sargeant for the procedure.

Vice Chairman Sargeant called upon Commissioners seeking to be elected Chairman of the Planning Commission to nominate themselves. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner raised his hand to nominate himself for the role.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner made a statement regarding his qualifications, vision, values, and capabilities for the role of Chair.

There being no other nominees, Vice Chairman Sargeant announced that by unanimous consent Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner has been re-elected Planning Commission chair for the calendar year 2025.

At the conclusion of the election, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner resumed the duties of the Chair.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner thanked the Commission for their continued support for his role as Chairman.

//

CANDIDATES SEEKING ELECTION FOR VICE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called upon Commissioners seeking to be elected Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission to nominate themselves. Commissioners Sargeant and Spain raised their hands to nominate themselves for the role. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner then stated that each candidate would have three minutes to make their case to the Commission for their role.

Commissioner Spain made a statement regarding her qualifications, vision, goals, and experience for the role of Vice Chairman.

Commissioner Sargeant made a statement regarding his qualifications, vision, goals, and experience for the role of Vice Chairman.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested that Commissioners supporting Commissioner Spain for the role of Vice Chairman vote. Commissioner Spain received six votes in support of her role as Vice Chairman.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested that Commissioners supporting Commissioner Sargeant for the role of Vice Chairman vote. Commissioner Sargeant received four votes in support of his role as Vice Chairman.

Having received a majority of votes, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that Commissioner Spain had been elected as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for the calendar year 2025.

//

CANDIDATES SEEKING ELECTION FOR SECRETARY

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called upon Commissioners seeking to be elected Secretary of the Planning Commission to nominate themselves. Commissioner Hancock raised his hand to nominate himself for the role.

There being no other nominee, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that by unanimous consent Commissioner Hancock had been elected Planning Commission Secretary for the calendar year 2025.

Commissioner Hancock expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve as Secretary of the Planning Commission. He made a statement on effective leadership being the key to ensuring an efficient and well-functioning Planning Commission. Further stating that his decision to take on this role was driven by a commitment to supporting his colleagues and ensuring a smooth planning process.

//

CANDIDATES SEEKING ELECTION FOR PARLIAMENTARIAN

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called upon Commissioners seeking to be elected Parliamentarian of the Planning Commission to nominate themselves. Commissioner Bennett raised her hand to nominate herself for the role.

There being no other nominee, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that by unanimous consent Commissioner Bennett had been elected Planning Commission Parliamentarian for the calendar year 2025.

Commissioner Bennett made a statement regarding her qualifications, vision, goals, and experience for the role of Parliamentarian. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve as Parliamentarian and thanked the Commission for their consideration and support.

//

Commissioner Hancock expressed his appreciation for Katie Quinn's exceptional work in managing the process, noting that the successful outcome was largely due to the dedication and

expertise of the staff. Additionally, he recognized Catherine Lewis for her efforts on the project, ensuring that her work did not go unnoticed. Before concluding the meeting, Commissioner Hancock reiterated the vital role that staff played in navigating difficult applications and achieving effective solutions.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner took a moment to personally thank Vice Chair Sargeant for his dedicated service and willingness to step into various situations, sometimes on short notice, with effectiveness and professionalism. He acknowledged Commissioner Sargeant's support over the past two years and extended his gratitude both personally and on behalf of the entire Commission.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman
Evelyn S. Spain Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Michelle Jordan
Approved on April 30, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 5 day of May 2025, by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal