MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2025

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman, Commissioner At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Vice Chairman, Sully District
Jeremy Hancock, Secretary, Providence District
Candice Bennett, Parliamentarian, Commissioner At-Large
Alyssa Batchelor-Causey, Dranesville District
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
Chris Landgraf, Franconia District

ABSENT: John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large
Alis Wang, Mason District

OTHERS: Ryan Stewart, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Cathy Lewis, Zoning Evaluation Department (ZED), DPD
Carl Shumate, ZED, DPD
Graham Owen, PD, DPD
Aaron Klibaner, PD, DPD
Mark Garcia, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Robert Pikora, FCDOT
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission, Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Jordyn Crane, 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, one deferral, and two public hearings.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner welcomed Ms. Jennifer Miller to the Fairfax County leadership team, recognizing her appointment as Deputy County Executive. She was noted for her extensive experience in leadership, strategic planning, and policy development, including her previous role managing operations for the Secretary of the Air Force. The Commission acknowledged her distinguished career in public service and extended best wishes for her success in the new role.

//

Secretary Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FOLLOWING MEETING MINUTES:

- OCTOBER 9, 2024;
- OCTOBER 16, 2024;
- OCTOBER 23, 2024; AND
- OCTOBER 30, 2024;

Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 7-0. Commissioners Carter, Clarke, Sargeant, and Wang were absent from the meeting.

//

Commissioner Spain announced that the Planning Commission's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee would meet on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 7:30 p.m., in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner added that all committee meetings were advertised, open to the public, and would be televised on Channel 16.

//

Commissioner Spain announced that the Schools Committee would meet on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 8:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner added that all committee meetings were advertised, open to the public, and would be televised on Channel 16.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

PA 2024-III-1P (PA-2024-00005) – OX ROAD/HOOES ROAD
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on January 29, 2024.)
(Originally to be heard on 02/12/2025, cancelled due to weather)

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ONLY ON PA 2024-III-1P (PA-2024-00005) TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 12, 2025.

Commissioners Bennett and Hancock seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 7-0. Commissioners Carter, Clarke, Sargeant, and Wang were absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. SEA 85-D-097– THE POTOMAC SCHOOL
2. PA 2023-00009 (SSPA 2023-II-1F) - AT&T OAKTON

This order was accepted without objection.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

SEA-85-D-097-06 - THE POTOMAC SCHOOL - Appl. to amend SE 85-D-097 previously approved for a Private School of General Education to permit modifications to development conditions. Located on approx. 89.99 ac. of land zoned R-1. Tax Map 31-1 ((1)) 5, 7, 10A, 10B, 10C and 12A. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Lori R. Greenlief, Applicant's Agent, McGuire Woods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 23, 2025.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey asked that Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner 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 Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Batchelor-Causey for action on this application.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Batchelor-Causey requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the development conditions dated February 20, 2025.

Ms. Greenlief affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated February 20, 2025.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

- APPROVAL OF SEA-85-D-097-06, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED FEBRUARY 20, 2025; AND

- APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG ALL PROPERTY LINES THAT SHOWN ON THE SEA PLAT.

Commissioners Spain and Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 7-0. Commissioners Carter, Clarke, Sargeant, and Wang were absent from the meeting.

//

PA 2023-00009 (SSPA 2023-II-1F) - AT&T OAKTON - Appl. concerns approx. 33.1 ac. generally located at 3033 Chain Bridge Road, Oakton, VA 22124 (Tax Map 47-2 ((1)) 58). The area is planned for mixed use development up to 0.40 floor-area ratio (FAR) as the AT&T corporate campus. The amendment will consider residential mixed-use up to 1.0 FAR and the creation of a core area for the Flint Hill Suburban Center. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Ryan Stewart, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that the staff recommended adoption of PA 2023-00009.

Mark Looney, Nominator, gave a presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stewart; Mr. Looney; Graham Owen, PD, DPD; Mark Garcia, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); Robert Pikora, FCDOT; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the Board had authorized a 1.0 floor-area ratio (FAR) with conditions for neighborhood compatibility, tree preservation, and maintaining area character;
- Clarification that the process had begun with a site-specific proposal from the landowner, which had served as a foundation for analysis;
- Explanation that an evaluation had been conducted on the potential impacts, including dwelling unit numbers, non-residential space, transportation, public facilities, and overall land use;
- Explanation that staff had consulted with partner agencies such as Transportation, Public Schools, Housing, Park Authority, and Wastewater to assess the plan's feasibility and impacts;
- Clarification that consideration had been given to community input, acknowledging potential development impacts and integrating feedback where possible;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan had set an upper limit, but actual development had been determined at the rezoning stage;
- Explanation that achieving the proposed 1.0 FAR had required meeting various criteria, including open space, parking, street dedication, and mitigation of visual impacts;

- Clarification that rezoning evaluations had ensured compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods, following land use policy guidelines and the proposed plan amendment;
- Explanation that achieving the proposed 1.0 FAR would require meeting various criteria, including open space, parking, street dedication, and mitigation of visual impacts;
- Explanation of the site-specific guidance included in the plan, such as phased development and tree preservation;
- Concerns about maintaining tree canopy along Chambers Road and Jermantown Road, preserving a campus-like atmosphere;
- Clarification of the recommended consolidated open spaces to support diverse activities and maintained a suburban character rather than an urban park setting;
- Clarification of the considerations for building height, tapering, and buffering to ensure appropriate transitions in scale and character within the community;
- Explanation that higher-density development would be placed in the interior of the site to minimize disruption to surrounding areas;
- Clarification that the site in question already had an existing Comprehensive Plan designation;
- Explanation that under current guidelines, the site allowed for a 0.4 FAR for office or mixed-use development and an alternative option of 12 to 16 dwelling units per acre for residential development;
- Clarification that the original intent of the plan was for the AT&T site to remain in its current configuration;
- Explanation that the site was currently developed at approximately 0.31 FAR, but it could be increased to 0.4 FAR under existing regulations;
- Clarification that mixed-use development, as originally intended, was meant to be ancillary to office use;
- Explanation that the 12 to 16 dwelling units per acre residential option applied to the remainder of the land, not necessarily the AT&T site;
- Explanation that an office redevelopment at 0.4 FAR could proceed today but would likely require rezoning;
- Explanation that the existing building was over 40 years old and was designed for a single-tenant use with a secured below-grade facility, making it unsuitable for multi-tenant occupancy;
- Explanation that the building's infrastructure had reached the end of its useful life, making redevelopment necessary;
- Clarification that the proposed residential development aligned with adjacent sites and recent rezonings within the area;
- Explanation of the importance of the retail component, which served several functions:
    - Supported transportation efficiency by reducing trips on Blake Lane, Route 123, and Jermantown Road for daily shopping needs;
    - Created a central gathering place for both new residents and the surrounding Oakton community; and
    - Added vibrancy and activity to the site, preventing it from becoming an isolated residential neighborhood.
- Explanation that the proposal was compared to the existing Oakton Shopping Center, which currently served as the primary retail hub but required most residents to travel;

- Explanation that adding retail reduced overall traffic congestion by integrating residential, office, and retail uses within a single development, rather than forcing separate trips to different locations;
- Clarification that 120,000 square feet of retail was the minimum necessary to create synergy among businesses, drawing visitors and ensuring a sustainable retail environment;
- Clarification that small-scale retail alone would not be viable without additional retail synergy;
- Explanation that modern urban planning best practices and smart growth principles emphasize mixed-use development as a key strategy to mitigate suburban traffic challenges;
- Clarification that a traffic analysis would be conducted again at the zoning stage to refine transportation impacts;
- Explanation that the comprehensive transportation analysis examined:
    - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
    - Transit access and service; and
    - Vehicle impacts
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan included transportation recommendations, which would guide the next steps in the rezoning and site plan review process;
- Clarification that the rezoning stage included a separate, more detailed traffic analysis, refining the mitigation measures outlined in the Comprehensive Plan;
- Clarification that the Comprehensive Plan sets a broad framework, analyzing long-term transportation feasibility;
- Explanation that the zoning stage focused on site-specific solutions, refining mitigation strategies and determining the applicant's transportation responsibilities;
- Clarification that the Comprehensive Plan analysis laid the foundation for detailed transportation planning at the rezoning stage;
- Concerns about phasing transportation improvements, ensuring that mitigation measures aligned with development progression;
- Explanation that the zoning stage refined transportation improvements outlined in the Comprehensive Plan;
- Explanation that at the zoning stage, staff identified specific mitigation measures from the broader Comprehensive Plan recommendations that should be implemented;
- Clarification that phasing of transportation improvements was determined based on how development progressed;
- Clarification that in some cases, developers may be able to front-load improvements, depending on development scale and improvement costs;
- Explanation that the zoning-level transportation study determined when specific improvements should be implemented, balancing developer contributions with infrastructure needs;
- Explanation that road diets had been implemented successfully in multiple locations within Fairfax County an example in Reston Town Center, where Bluemont Way was originally a four-lane roadway but was reduced to two lanes about five or six years ago to enhance pedestrian safety;

- Explanation that the key aspect of the proposed road diet was not just the intersection modification, but also the rerouting of left turns to improve traffic flow;
- Explanation that the left turn lanes from southbound Jermantown Road onto Route 123 and eastbound Jermantown Road onto northbound Route 123 would be eliminated;
- Explanation that drivers would be rerouted:
    - Westbound drivers on Jermantown Road turning south on Route 123 would continue past the intersection, turn left on Rosehaven Street, and then right onto Route 123; and
    - Eastbound drivers on Jermantown Road turning north on Route 123 would turn right on Rosehaven Street, then left onto northbound Route 123.
- Explanation that the current offset alignment of travel lanes at the intersection required prioritizing left-turn movements, which reduced efficiency and increased crash risks;
- Explanation that removing left-turn lanes allowed for longer green light cycles for north-south traffic on Route 123 and better east-west movement on Jermantown Road;
- Explanation that the proposed reconfiguration would increase overall intersection capacity and enhanced safety by reducing conflicts;
- Explanation that the proposed reconfiguration followed the quadrant intersection or innovative intersection model;
- Clarification that two quadrant intersections were currently included in the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan:
    - Huntsman Boulevard and Fairfax County Parkway; and
    - Rugby Road and Fairfax County Parkway
- Clarification that these intersections were evaluated as part of the Fairfax County Parkway Long-Range Plan completed in recent years;
- Explanation that quadrant intersections help disperse traffic flow by relocating left-turn movements away from major intersections;
- Explanation that these designs were chosen to reduce bottlenecks while avoiding excessive expansion that could negatively impact pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular safety;
- Explanation that while these intersections were not yet constructed, they had been evaluated and shown to be effective in managing traffic;
- Concern that the proposed quadrant intersection did not account for human behavior and driving habits;
- Explanation that the study analyzed multiple intersection configurations, including keeping traditional left turns. Found that maintaining left turns resulted in long vehicle queues and intersection congestion;
- Clarification that the quadrant intersection was evaluated in coordination with White Granite Drive, Chain Bridge Road, Jermantown Road, and Rosehaven Street to improve flow;
- Explanation that the innovative intersection provided the best overall performance compared to simply adding more lanes or turn lanes;
- Explanation that removing left turns increased efficiency by reallocating signal time to through movements;
- Clarification that Jermantown Road operated on a split-phase signal, meaning one side moves at a time, reducing efficiency. Removing left turns allowed both sides of Jermantown Road to move simultaneously, significantly improving throughput;

- Explanation that instead of 90 seconds allocated to Jermantown Road, only 40 seconds would be needed for through traffic, freeing up 50 seconds for Route 123 and other movements;
- Clarification that this approach created excess capacity at White Granite Drive, improving signal coordination;
- Explanation that the quadrant intersection design maximized efficiency by eliminating conflicting turn movements;
- Clarification that further refinements would be explored during the rezoning stage to ensure optimal signal timing and traffic flow;
- Concerns that drivers may seek alternate routes to avoid the intersection, potentially cutting through adjacent roads such as White Granite Drive;
- Clarification that the Comprehensive Plan amendment itself did not authorize development or immediate implementation of the intersection changes;
- Explanation that the proposed design was selected because it:
    - Moved more traffic efficiently through the intersection than any other option analyzed; and
    - Improved pedestrian and bicycle safety compared to a grade-separated interchange currently included in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Concerns that transportation planning should extend beyond the immediate site to integrate Oakton's long-term vision;
- Clarification that the transportation study analyzed a half-mile radius for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity;
- Clarification that site-specific pedestrian and bicycle improvements were considered in the Comprehensive Plan recommendations;
- Explanation that the plan aimed to connect neighborhoods to the proposed development, ensuring better non-vehicular access;
- Clarification that additional pedestrian and bicycle connectivity was being evaluated beyond the immediate site;
- Clarification that Supervisor Palchik had indicated support for a future county study, pending Board approval;
- Clarification that the future study included comprehensive pedestrian, bicycle, congestion, and safety analysis to address connectivity beyond the immediate development area;
- Clarification that the countywide stormwater management policy was reviewed as part of the staff environmental analysis;
- Explanation that the current framework provided guidance for evaluating stormwater improvements at the rezoning stage;
- Concerns about school capacity;
- Explanation that at the rezoning stage, developers would be expected to proffer financial contributions to the school system, as was standard across the county;
- Concerns about safe routes to Oakton Elementary School, particularly for students living on the east side of Route 123 who were currently prohibited from walking due to unsafe crossing conditions;
- Explanation that a new pedestrian signal at Blake Lane, Oakton Elementary School, and Route 123 had been recommended in the Comprehensive Plan to improve safety;

- Clarification that current school capacity projections indicate sufficient space within the planning horizon;
- Explanation that during the rezoning phase, school capacity analyses would be updated and, if necessary, further mitigation measures would be considered;
- Explanation that the innovative intersection design was not mandated in the Comprehensive Plan language;
- Clarification that the plan includes a general recommendation for an innovative intersection design to improve safety and traffic efficiency;
- Explanation that alternative designs may be considered during the rezoning phase if they achieve the same safety and multimodal transportation goals;
- Explanation that retail refers strictly to commercial uses such as grocery stores and shopping centers;
- Clarification that non-residential encompassed a broader range of uses, including community centers, educational facilities, and daycare centers based on community input;
- Explanation that the 120,000 square feet of non-residential space included a mix of retail and public-serving facilities;
- Explanation that the density of recently approved developments in the area ranged from 14 to 16 dwelling units per acre, with proposed projects yet to be reviewed by the Commission;
- Explanation that 16 dwelling units per acre translated to an approximate FAR of 0.85, while 20 dwelling units per acre would be closer to 1.0 FAR;
- Explanation that larger townhomes in modern developments contributed to higher FAR numbers but did not necessarily result in an increase in bedrooms, household sizes, or the number of residents;
- Clarification that a 16 to 20 dwelling unit per acre plan aligned with a 1.0 FAR under modern development standards and was generally compatible with surrounding properties.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Patricia Montanino, 2920 Gray Street, Oakton, representing Smart Growth for Oakton, opposed the amendment. A copy of Ms. Montanino's statement is in the date file.

Sonya Breehey, 2902 Marshall Street, Falls Church, representing Coalition for Smarter Growth, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Breehey's statement is in the date file.

Lauren Crum and Shelley Deutch, 10665 Oakton Ridge Court, Oakton, representing Greater Oakton Community Association, stated their opinion. A copy of their statement is in the date file.

Douglas Shuster, 11009 Langton Arms Court, Oakton, representing Miller Heights Neighborhood Association, stated his opinion. A copy of Mr. Shuster's statement is in the date file.

Robert Means and Barbara Heard, 10353 Granite Creek Lane, Oakton, representing Options for Oakton, stated their opinion. A copy of their statement is in the date file.

George Lehnigk, 10629 Marbury Road, Oakton, stated his opinion. A copy of Mr. Lehnigk' s statement is in the date file.

Mary Coulombe, 3148 Borge Street., Oakton, stated her opinion. A copy of Ms. Coulombe's statement is in the date file.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested Ms. Coulombe to clarify the source of the quote she referenced regarding desired transportation improvements. Ms. Coulombe stated that the plan amendment included the quoted language, but she believed the solutions proposed within it were inadequate. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested staff to provide a copy of the quoted text for the Commission's review.

Karen Oberst, 10346 Granite Creek Lane, Oakton, representing Flint Hill Manor Homeowners Association, stated the following:

- Opposed the 1.0 FAR increase, calling it a 250% increase over the 0.4 FAR typical in surrounding residential areas;
- Expressed traffic concerns, warning that rerouting vehicles down Rosehaven Street could block emergency services at the nearby fire station;
- Emphasized that rush hour congestion would further exacerbate these issues;
- Argued that Oakton already had sufficient retail, advocating instead for better pedestrian infrastructure to improve walkability; and
- Urged the Commission to prioritize emergency access, reduce traffic congestion, and support existing businesses rather than expanding commercial development.

Peter Montanino, 2920 Gray Street, Oakton, representing Grays Oakton Civic Association, opposed the amendment and stated the following:

- Opposed the proposed 1.0 FAR, stating it was incompatible with the surrounding residential areas and would worsen traffic congestion;
- Criticized government transparency, claiming the Providence District Supervisor ignored community concerns, despite surveys, petitions, and HOA letters from thousands of residents;
- Highlighted traffic concerns, warning that the project would add 13,000 vehicle trips and that shifting an intersection did not fix congestion or address emergency response access;
- Argued that Oakton had sufficient retail, stating the plan favors the developer's request rather than residents' needs; and
- Urged the Planning Commission to delay approval until a comprehensive transportation study was completed and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) approved a mitigation plan.

Theo Stamatis supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Stamatis's statement is in the date file.

Chris L French, 3172 Stratford Ct. Oakton, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. French's statement is in the date file.

Mike Doyle, 1800 Diagonal Road, Ste 600, Alexandria, representing Northern Virginia Families for Safe Streets, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Doyle's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Linda Byrne, 2801 Oakton Manor Court, Oakton, opposed the amendment. A copy of Ms. Byrne's statement is in the date file.

Douglas Stewart, representing the Sierra Club Great Falls Group, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Stewart's statement is in the date file.

Commissioner Cortina praised Mr. Stewart for his dedication to ensuring pedestrian improvements were completed in a Braddock development, highlighting his commitment to accountability and follow-through. She thanked him for actively verifying that developers meet their commitments.

B. David Fisher, 3122 Borge Street, Oakton, representing Flintwood, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Doyle's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

David Harvey, 9525 Canonbury SQ, Oakton, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Harvey's statement is in the date file.

Brooks Stephens, 8621 Dellway Lane, Vienna, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Stephens's statement is in the date file.

Jennifer Pradas, 3140 Borge St, Oakton, stated her opinion. A copy of Ms. Pradas's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Michelle Murdoch and Natalie Lieberman, Gemstone Court, Oakton, representing Arrowood Community Association, stated their opinion. A copy of their statement is in the date file.

Naveed Easton, 3050 Hickory Grove Ct, Fairfax, representing YIMBYs of NoVA, stated his opinion. A copy of Mr. Easton's statement is in the date file.

Michel Kotoff-Rizzo, 3146 Borge Street, Oakton, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Kotoff-Rizzo 's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Monique Baroudi, 2834 Hunter Mill Road, opposed the amendment. A copy of Mr. Stephens's statement is in the date file.

Sunny Singh, 441 Court House Road South West, Vienna, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Singh's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Cindy McCarthy, 2834 Jermantown Road, Oakton, opposed the amendment. A copy of Ms. McCarthy's statement is in the date file.

Jamie Saylor, 1714 Saddle Ridge Court, Vienna, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Singh's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Jim Lemon signed up to provide in person testimony but was not available.

Renee Grebe, representing Nature Forward, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Supported the plan amendment on behalf of Nature Forward and Fairfax Healthy Communities Network;
- Praised redevelopment benefits, including affordable housing, walkability, and revitalizing underused space;
- Highlighted environmental priorities, urging stronger stormwater management and tree canopy protection in the plan;
- Advocated for prohibiting invasive plant species to enhance ecological sustainability;
- Acknowledged transportation concerns but emphasized that rezoning would allow for further analysis and improvements; and
- Encouraged approval of the plan with stronger environmental protections to ensure long-term ecological benefits.

Robert Walker, 10911 Howland Drive, Reston, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Walker's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Adrienne Stefan, 2923 Gray Street, Oakton, stated her opinion. A copy of Ms. Stefan's statement is in the date file.

Anika Rahman, 8242 Tenbrook Dr, representing the Northern Virginia Affordable Housing Alliance, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Supported the plan amendment, representing the Northern Virginia Affordable Housing Alliance (NVAHA);
- Emphasized the urgency for affordable housing in Fairfax County due to rising property and rental prices;
- Highlighted the project's housing impact, noting it would create 850 new homes, including 18% designated as affordable and workforce housing, exceeding the county's 8% policy;
- Aligned the project with county goals, supporting Fairfax County's target of 10,000 new housing units by 2034;

- Recognized additional benefits, including public transit access, bike and pedestrian improvements, stormwater management, and green space preservation;
- Framed the development as a community-building opportunity, fostering connection and inclusivity in Oakton; and
- Urged approval, stating that the project aligns with Fairfax County's housing and environmental priorities for a more vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable community.

Marco J. Brown supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Expressed strong support for the proposed development;
- Acknowledged traffic concerns but argued that fixing traffic should not prevent solving other issues, such as affordable housing and creating vibrant community spaces;
- Advocated for walkability, sharing personal experiences of walking children to school despite unsafe conditions and spending time at local parks;
- Stressed that higher density can help reduce traffic, as fewer cars per person result from mixed-use, walkable communities; and
- Urged approval, stating that Oakton needs more walkable destinations, community gathering spaces, and housing options.

Rachel Hammer opposed the amendment and stated the following:

- Opposed the plan amendment, arguing it benefits the developer (EYA) over the community;
- Criticized EYA's outreach, claiming they misrepresented key changes such as increased density, expanded retail, and reduced open space;
- Raised traffic concerns, stating the plan ignores congestion at key intersections like Hunter Mill Road and Blake Lane;
- Dismissed claims that walking and biking would offset traffic issues; and
- Urged postponing the vote until a comprehensive traffic study and VDOT-approved improvements were completed.

Kamran Eshaghi stated the following:

- Supported the mixed-use development, emphasizing its long-term benefits for all age groups in the community;
- Encouraged adaptability, noting that Oakton had evolved over decades and must continue to grow to stay relevant;
- Compared the project to Mosaic District, calling it a unique opportunity to enhance the area;
- Acknowledged traffic concerns and urged developers to explore innovative traffic solutions, including better internal road circulation to reduce congestion; and
- Encouraged county officials to collaborate with developers to find out-of-the-box solutions for traffic management.

Robert Whitfield stated the following:

- Concerns over traffic impacts, stating that the proposed development would add unacceptable peak-period congestion to Route 123 and Jermantown Rd.;
- Questioned the urgency of approving the Comprehensive Plan before VDOT provides specific traffic recommendations and a full road improvement plan was in place;
- Criticized affordability claims, noting that proposed townhomes priced at $1 million did not align with the concept of affordable housing;
- Advocated for senior housing, stating that age-restricted housing would generate fewer vehicle trips and better serve the aging population; and
- Urged a delay in approval until a comprehensive traffic study was conducted and the carrying capacity of the roads was fully understood.

Laura Pickford, 9769 Oleander Ave, Vienna, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Pickford's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Natalie Harrison supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Harrison's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Joel Fifield, 10413 Emerald Rock Drive, Oakton, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Fifield's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Joshua Booth, 6232 Shackelford Terrace, Alexandria, stated his opinion. A copy of Mr. Booth's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Ting Waymouth, representing Chesapeake Climate Action Network Action, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Waymouth's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Dean Panayides stated his opinion. A copy of Mr. Panavides's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Sofia Fifield, 10413 Emerald Rock Drive, Oakton, supported the amendment. A copy of Ms. Fifield's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Anthony Jacobs supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Jacobs's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stewart and Commissioner Landgraf on the following:

- Explanation that the Fairfax County Park Authority had reviewed the plan amendment but had not yet completed the rezoning review, which would determine specific park space requirements;

- Clarification that the urban parks framework applied to this development, requiring 1.5 acres of park space per 1,000 new residents; and
- Explanation that the 5 acres per 1,000 residents standard referenced by some speakers applies to local parks outside suburban centers, making it not applicable to this development.

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

//

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PLAN AMENDMENT SSPA 2023-II-1F TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MARCH 12, 2025, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Commissioners Cortina and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 7-0. Commissioners Carter, Clarke, Sargeant, and Wang were absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:09 a.m.
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman
Jeremy Hancock, 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 June 11, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 23 day of June 2025, by Nicole Blackwell.

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal