MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2025

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

ABSENT: Candice Bennett, Parliamentarian, Commissioner At-Large

OTHERS: Ryan Stewart, Planning Division (PD),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Graham Owens, PD, DPD
Aaron Klibaner, PD, DPD
Robert Pikora, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Kyle Kelly, FCDOT
Thomas Burke, FCDOT
Sharon Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), DPD,
Nicholas Cicero, ZED, DPD
Ciarra Downing, ZED, DPD
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission, Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Teresa Desantis, 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 shared reflections from attending the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Economic Initiatives Committee meeting, which focused on the impacts of recent federal funding cuts and the local response. He emphasized the severe economic and emotional consequences for individuals, particularly federal employees and contractors, many of whom faced job loss and uncertainty, as well as personal and unjust attacks on those who had dedicated their careers to public service.

He outlined the broader risks to Fairfax County and Virginia, noting that over 3,800 Fairfax-based federal contractors, who had received $41 billion in contracts in fiscal year 2024, and 80

nonprofits, awarded nearly $5 million in federal grants, were all potentially affected. He also highlighted that the federal building footprint in Fairfax spans 6 million square feet, underscoring the magnitude of the situation.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner brought the issue closer to home by noting that the county's renowned Urban Search and Rescue team was primarily funded by United States Agency for Internation Development, which now faced significant funding risks.

Despite the challenges, he praised the county's swift and effective response, recalling how Fairfax mobilized quickly during the pandemic to provide critical health and economic support to residents. He commended the collaboration between local government and federal representatives, especially Congressman Don Beyer, who organized an assistance event offering unemployment aid, housing support, mental health resources, food assistance, and information on workers' rights. The event drew over 1,000 attendees, demonstrating the widespread need.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner encouraged the public to view the meeting video, expressing admiration for how Fairfax County and its partners were working to mitigate current impacts and prepare for future challenges. He concluded by noting that the county's ability to respond efficiently, effectively, and empathetically in times of crisis reflected true resiliency.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included Commission Business, two decision only, one deferral, and four public hearings.

//

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, 2025.)
(Originally to be heard on 02/12/2025 cancelled due to weather)

Commissioner Clarke MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF A PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE TO THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2024-III-1P, AS SHOWN ON THE HANDOUT DATED MARCH 12, 2025.

Commissioner Spain seconded the motion.

Prior to the vote there was a discussion between Graham Owens, PD, DPD; and Commissioner Carter regarding the following:

- Requested assurance from staff that these concerns could be effectively addressed during the rezoning process, since they were not thoroughly detailed in the current plan materials;

- Staff acknowledged the importance of stormwater and environmental issues, even though the site did not drain directly into the Occoquan Reservoir and was not within the Water Supply Protection Overlay District;
- Explanation that improvements were made to the stormwater language in the plan, including a new goal added through collaboration with Commissioner Clarke;
- Explanation that cluster developments may be needed to protect trees along Old Ox Road and Hooes Road, and that lot sizes may be needed to be adjusted accordingly; and
- Clarification that 23 units was the planned maximum, but the final number could be reduced at the rezoning stage to meet environmental goals and site constraints.

The Commission then proceeded with the vote which carried by 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Clarke expressed his gratitude to staff.

//

PA 2023-00009 (SSPA 2023-II-1F) - AT&T OAKTON
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on February 26, 2025.)

Prior to the application being called Commissioners Clarke and Sargeant both recused themselves from the application, due to them not being present during the public hearing.

Commissioner Hancock requested that Ryan Stewart, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), give a brief presentation on the changes and considerations made since the February 26, 2025, meeting.

Area-Wide Recommendations – Flint Hill Suburban Center

- Active Transportation:
  - Added language emphasizing the importance of safe, comfortable pedestrian and bicycle facilities;
  - New language prioritizes linear park connectivity for access to open space and recreation;
  - Recommendation for accessibility ramps to align parallel to roads for safety; and
  - Updated transit guidance which called for safe access and mobility options.

- Vehicular Transportation:
  - Edited language to broaden options for intersection improvements during rezoning;
  - Added new bullet to explore safety and congestion improvements between Blake Lane and Hunter Mill Road; and
  - Included recommendation for traffic calming and bike/pedestrian safety improvements along Blake Lane.

- Stormwater Management:
  - New bullet modeled after Reston Plan language, setting clearer stormwater targets at the suburban center level.

Land Unit and Core Area Recommendations

- Density and FAR Changes:
  - Reduced maximum FAR from 1.0 to 0.88 across the site; and
  - Noted that FAR would be averaged across the site, with higher intensity development along Chain Bridge Road, tapering to lower intensity toward the east for compatibility with adjacent townhomes.

- Land Use and Design Enhancements:
  - Added language to promote placemaking, including architectural treatments, active ground-level uses, and social gathering spaces;
  - Retained 120,000 sq. ft. cap on non-residential uses, expanded to include retail and community uses;
  - Emphasized tree canopy preservation, with a focus on oak trees along Chain Bridge Road and Jermantown Roads as part of the site's gateway character; and
  - Modified compact development language that called for replacement vegetation consistent with existing tree species.

Parks and Open Space

- Recommended a consolidated "common green" linked to Boris Street Park via a linear park;
- The linear park should support active and passive recreation; and
- Encouraged expansion or improvement of Boris Street Park.

Stormwater and Environmental Features

- Acknowledged the goal to preserve the hydrologic feature in the southwestern portion of the site near White Granite Drive.

Site-Specific Transportation

- Reinforced the necessity for safe and comfortable pedestrian and bike routes, particularly along:
  - Chain Bridge Road
  - Jermantown Road
  - White Granite Drive
  - Flagpole Lane
- Included shared-use path expectations for these frontages;
- Added guidance on street design to accommodate the evolving traffic pattern; and
- Introduced recommendation for a transportation demand management (TDM) program, with examples for implementation.

Map and Figure Revisions

- Adjusted maps reflect the removal of the planned interchange at Jermantown Road and Chain Bridge Road.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stewart;; Graham Owens, PD, DPD; Robert Pikora, FCDOT; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Asked whether the upcoming transportation study for the site plan included a holistic view, specifically including recently approved zoning cases across Chain Bridge Road, ;
- Staff confirmed that those rezonings would be factored into the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) during the rezoning phase;
- Clarified that cumulative traffic impacts and potential mitigations would be evaluated during the site plan phase;
- concerns about housing policy, explaining that higher-density and affordable housing was a county-wide priority supported by all supervisors, not driven by a single district or individual;
- Staff confirmed that under the current language, the 0.88 floor area ratio (FAR) was exclusive of Affordable Dwelling Units and Workforce Dwelling Units, which was consistent with typical plan interpretation unless otherwise stated;
- Staff responded that the western side of the site was the most appropriate location for retail due to development form and compatibility with surrounding areas; and
- Confirmed that retail could be shifted within that general area, but it was not intended for the eastern side, which would avoid impact on adjacent townhomes.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE TEXT FOR PLAN AMENDMENT SSPA 2023-II-1F, DATED MARCH 11, 2025.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioners Cortina seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting. Commissioners Clarke and Sargeant recused themselves from the application.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALSO VOTED TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING FOLLOW-ON MOTION:

TO DIRECT FCDOT TO CONDUCT AN OAKTON CONGESTION AND SAFETY STUDY SPANNING APPROXIMATELY ONE MILE FROM THE INTERSECTION OF CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD AND JERMANTOWN ROAD, STAYING NORTH OF I-66. THE STUDY SHOULD CONSIDER ENHANCED, MODIFIED, AND/OR NEW CONNECTIONS TO CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD FROM THE OAKTON NEIGHBORHOODS AS WELL AS EVALUATE THE CONNECTIVITY AND QUALITY OF THE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE NETWORK. THE STUDY SHOULD RECOMMEND NEAR-TERM AND LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENTS ALONG WITH POTENTIAL PRIVATE AND PUBLIC FUNDING OPTIONS THAT THE COUNTY CAN PURSUE.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioners Cortina and Spain seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting. Commissioners Clarke and Sargeant recused themselves from the application.

Commissioner Hancock reflected on the extensive nature of the process, thanking the community for their engagement and feedback, which helped improve the proposal. He expressed appreciation to county staff Ryan Stewart, Graham Owen, Robert Pikora, and Michael Garcia for

their professionalism and support, noting the many late afternoons, evenings, and weekend discussions that contributed to making the plan more responsive to community needs.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner followed by commending Commissioner Hancock for his leadership on what he described as one of the most complex applications the Planning Commission had dealt with. He praised Hancock's diligence, thoughtful responsiveness, and commitment to listening to both public and Commission input, expressing appreciation for his steady and effective guidance throughout the process.

//

Commissioner Hancock announced that Commissioners were emailed copies of the draft minutes for Planning Commission meetings held in November and December 2024. Commissioner Hancock also announced his intent to move for approval of the November and December meeting minutes during the Planning Commission meeting on March 19, 2025.

//

PA 2023-00006 (SSPA 2023-IV-2S) – FRANCONIA TRIANGLE (S-9 BEULAH COMMUNITY PLANNING SECTOR RECOMMENDATION AREA #3) STUDY

Commissioner Landgraf MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PLAN AMENDMENT SSPA 2023-IV-2S TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 9, 2025.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. FDPA 78-C-118-24– CARRIE S. WELCH, TRUSTEE OF THE WELCH FAMILY TRUST DATED JUNE 12, 2023, AND TIMOTHY S. WELCH, TRUSTEE OF THE WELCH FAMILY TRUST DATED JUNE 12, 2023
2. SEA 2005-SU-007-04 – KOREAN CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
3. SE 2022-SU-00004 – LEAVING THE JAR
4. PA 2023-00036 (SSPA 2023-II-2V) 2022-SU-0000 – HUNTERS BRANCH OFFICE COMPLEX

This order was accepted without objection.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

FDPA 78-C-118-24– CARRIE S. WELCH, TRUSTEE OF THE WELCH FAMILY TRUST DATED JUNE 12, 2023, AND TIMOTHY S. WELCH, TRUSTEE OF THE WELCH FAMILY TRUST DATED JUNE 12, 2023 - Appl. to amend the final development plan for RZ 78-C-118 to permit an addition 10.0 ft. from the rear lot line with stairs 6.8 ft. from the rear lot line and associated changes to development conditions. Located at 13133 Rounding Run Cir. on approx. 8,984 sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-2. Tax Map 35-2 ((8)) (13) 11. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Carrie S. Welch, the applicant, reaffirmed the affidavit dated September 17, 2024.

Sharon Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), introduced Nicholas Cicero, ZED, DPD, who presented the staff report, a copy is in the date file. He stated that staff recommended approval of FDPA 78-C-118-24.

Ms. Welch declined to give a presentation on the application.

Commissioner Spain had one question for the applicant, Ms. Welch. She asked whether she had received any feedback or comments from her neighbors regarding the construction of the screened-in porch and steps. Ms. Welch responded that her neighbors had been aware of the project and had been supportive throughout the process. She stated that no negative feedback had been received and mentioned that some neighbors had even offered to help with the project.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Spain for actions on this proposed application.

Ms. Welch affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated February 27, 2025.

Commissioner Spain MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 78-C-118-24, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED FEBRUARY 27, 2025.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

//

SEA 2005-SU-007-04 – KOREAN CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH - Appl. to amend SE 2005-SU-007 previously approved for a private school and child care center to allow an increase in daily enrollment of the school from 100 students to 300 students, and the

child care from 100 children to 200 children and permit other modifications to the development conditions. Located on approx. 84.31 ac. of land zoned R-C and WS. Tax Map 64-1 ((1)) 8, 9, 25, 26 and 27; 64-1 ((3)) 16 and 17; 64-2 ((3)) 18; 64-2 ((5)) 1, 2 and 3. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Andrew Gregg, Applicant's Agent, Bean, Kinney & Korman, P.C., reaffirmed the affidavit dated December 26 [sic], 2024.

Commissioner Spain 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 Spain for action on this application.

Prior to the motion Commissioner Spain requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the development conditions dated January 24, 2025. The Applicant's agent affirmed agreement to the reference conditions.

//

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

- APPROVAL OF SEA 2005-SU-007-04, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JANUARY 24, 2025;

- REAFFIRMATION OF A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENTS ALONG ALL PROPERTY BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE SEA PLAT;

- REAFFIRMATION OF A WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG ALL PROPERTY BOUNDARIES OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE SEA PLAT; AND

-

- REAFFIRMATION OF A WAIVER OF THE SERVICE DRIVE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL (PFM) IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE SEA PLAT.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

//

SE 2022-SU-00004 – LEAVING THE JAR - SE Appl. to permit a congregate living facility. Located on approx. 5.63 ac. of land zoned R-C and WS. Sully District. Tax Map 64-3 ((1)) 22A. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Michael D. Van Atta, Applicant's Agent, McGuire Woods LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 28, 2025.

Ciarra Downing, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that the staff recommended adoption of the special exception SE 2022-SU-00004.

There was a discussion between Ms. Downing; Mr. Van Atta; Manal M. Moussa, Title Owner; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the existing driveway on the property had accommodated approximately eight vehicles;
- Clarification that this number of parking spaces had exceeded the minimum requirement for a congregate living facility;
- Explanation that the facility had been planned to house ten resident participants along with two permanent resident employees, making up the total of twelve individuals;
- Clarification that the resident participants had not been expected to own a personal vehicle, so parking demand would have been limited primarily to staff and occasional visitors;
- Explanation that the property had already been equipped with an electric vehicle (EV) charging station, as the applicant had driven an EV;
- Clarification that the age range of the resident participants had generally fallen between 12 and 17 years old;
- Explanation that the applicant had conducted outreach by going door to door and speaking directly with neighbors;
- Clarification that a letter was prepared and distributed during those visits to explain the intended use of the property;
- Explanation that some neighbors were present in support at the meeting and that no opposition had been received;
- Explanation that residents had come from various referral sources, including the FBI, local law enforcement, and other nonprofit organizations;
- Clarification that residents were typically one step removed from their traumatic experiences, having already spent time in another supportive environment;
- Explanation on the thorough evaluation process that had been used to assess whether potential participants were ready to enter the program;

- Explanation that the healing process had varied by individual, and the program had aimed to ensure that participants were prepared to engage in a peer-based recovery setting;
- Clarification that several examinations had been conducted before enrollment;
- Explanation that the program had generally been designed to last two years, with some flexibility based on individual progress;
- Clarification that the goal had been to help residents transition into more permanent housing and achieve greater stability;
- Explanation that guardianship of the minors depended on the source of the referral;
- Explanation that if the county was responsible for placing the child, then guardianship would fall under the case management of the county or an assigned case manager;
- Clarification that if the referral came through the FBI, there would be a formal agreement in place outlining who was responsible for the minor while in the program;
- Clarification that guardianship was determined on a case-by-case basis;
- Explanation that their ability to carry out this work was due to ' God ' s grace and the dedication of many volunteers who selflessly contributed their time and effort to support awareness, protection, and rehabilitation efforts;
- Clarification that the property would have gated access for controlled entry;
- Explanation that security cameras would be installed on-site;
- Explanation that staff would be equipped with walkie-talkies which maintained communication across the property; and
- Explanation that a range of security measures would be in place to ensure both supervision and a sense of safety for all residents.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Kenneth W. Dobberton, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Introduced himself as a retired U.S. Army Colonel and stated he was likely the closest resident to the proposed facility, residing on Brim Lane with his wife, Branca;
- Stated that he had lived adjacent to the applicant's property for the past four years, the entire time the applicants had resided there;
- Expressed full support for the program and its mission;
- Addressed potential concerns about impact, stating that using the existing facility for 10 residents would have a minimal effect on traffic, air quality, water, and the surrounding area, especially given that Brim Lane was a dead-end road;
- Stated the immeasurable long-term positive impact the program could have on the lives of children and young adults recovering from traumatic experiences; and
- Reaffirmed his support for both the applicants and the program, praising them as wonderful people running a meaningful initiative.

Christine Malati, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Introduced herself as a pharmacist with USAID and a long-time acquaintance of the applicant;
- Shared that she had lived with the applicant 25 years ago in Fairfax and witnessed her ability to foster healing and community;

- Praised the applicant's humanitarian work in countries like Kenya, Zambia, and the Congo, noting her leadership and impact;
- Highlighted the applicant's role in managing U.S. government funds under the PEPFAR program and spearheading an HIV prevention initiative for women in Kenya; and
- Expressed strong support for the proposed residence and commended the applicant's continued commitment to service through the Living the Jar program.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Spain for actions on this proposed application.

Prior to the motion Commissioner Spain requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the development conditions dated March 10, 2025. The Applicant's agent affirmed agreement to the reference conditions.

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

- APPROVAL OF SE-2022-SU-00004, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS, DATED MARCH 10, 2025;
- MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS PURSUANT TO SECT. 5108.5 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING LANDSCAPING AS SHOWN ON THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION PLAT; AND
- WAIVER OF THE LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENT PURSUANT TO SECT. 6101 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE.

The Commission seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

//

PA 2023-00036 (SSPA 2023-II-2V) – HUNTERS BRANCH OFFICE COMPLEX - Concerns approx. 14 ac. generally located at 9300 and 9302 Route 29, Fairfax, VA, northwest of the intersection of Nutley Street and Route 29; Tax Map #48-4 ((1)) 1E and 1G in the Providence Supervisor District. The area is planned for mixed-use development to include multifamily residential units as well as office uses up to .50 FAR. The amendment will consider residential mixed-use at an intensity up to 1.31 FAR. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Aaron Klibaner, 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 Plan Amendment, SSPA 2023-II-2V.

Scott Adams, Applicant's Agent, for the Nominator, gave a presentation on the subject plan amendment.

There was a discussion between Mr. Owens; Mr. Adams; Kyle Kelly, Fairfax County Department of Transportation; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that creating urban park space on the site had been challenging, primarily due to steep grades and environmental constraints;
- Clarification that the Option B concept plan that had been submitted had included environmental features like the Hunter's Branch tributary, Environmental Quality Corridors, floodplains, and Resource Protection Areas;
- Clarification that those sensitive areas would be preserved for passive recreation use;
- Clarification that the concept plan had also included designated areas for active urban park space throughout the site;
- Explanation of the site's limitations due to the extent of protected land, the decision to retain the existing parking garage, and issues such as noise along road frontages;
- Clarification that fitting urban parks onto the site had represented a trade-off between the higher-density Option A and the more limited Option B, which had made meeting urban park space goals more achievable;
- Explanation that the standard had typically included both time and distance;
- Explanation that the assumption had generally been that the average person could walk a half-mile in 5 to 10 minutes;
- Clarification that this assumption might not have applied to everyone and shared that the issue had come up in other applications;
- Clarification that this might have been an area worth revisiting in a future policy plan update to reflect more inclusive and realistic mobility expectations;
- Clarification that access to the site had generally been available via Hunters Glen Way, with the primary issue being a few missing sidewalk segments along the site frontage;
- Explanation that staff had focused on addressing those sidewalk gaps during the planning process, especially in preparation for a future rezoning application;
- Clarification that the concept plan had demonstrated a commitment to establishing a continuous sidewalk network from the site to the Metro station;
- Clarification that Hunters Glen Way had been the most direct pedestrian route to Metro from the site;
- Explanation that residents in surrounding neighborhoods, such as Briarwood and communities to the south or southeast, might also have used Nutley Street as an alternate route, which had offered another access point to Metro just north of the site;
- Explanation that staff's review of the nomination had prioritized improvements to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along Nutley Street and Route 29;
- Explanation that the goal had been to ensure safe, low-stress access to key destinations like the Pan Am Shopping Center and Vienna Metro Station;

- Clarification that these efforts had aimed to align with Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) guidance and enhanced the area's pedestrian and bicycle comfort and safety;
- Explanation that the Pan Am Shopping Center amendment had been considered by the Planning Commission about two years earlier;
- Explanation that during that process, the intersection of Nutley Street and Route 29 had been a key focus due to operational and safety concerns;
- Clarification that there had been deficiencies in the pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along each frontage, specifically pointing out the absence of a pedestrian crossing on the west side of the intersection;
- Explanation that efforts had been made to ensure multiple routes of access from Pan Am to the Metro and surrounding areas;
- Clarification that the same considerations had been applied in depth to the current amendment, particularly through the transportation impact analysis;
- Clarification that one of the major focused area had been evaluating the potential of adding a fourth leg to the intersection's crosswalk and assessing its effect on traffic flow.
- Explanation of the importance of balancing all transportation modes, given the intersection's known congestion and history of backups;
- Clarification that several options had been evaluated for the Route 29 and Nutley Street intersection, particularly concerning lane restriping;
- Explanation that one proposed change had been to convert the inner right-turn lane on southbound Nutley Street into a through lane;
- Explanation that this change had been studied to assess its potential for facilitating the addition of a pedestrian crosswalk on the west side of the intersection, which had previously lacked one;
- Clarification that the impact of the proposed restriping on intersection performance had been minimal under various traffic scenarios when compared to existing conditions.
- Explanation that the projected traffic impact from the proposed development had been minimal;
- Clarification that the multifamily option under consideration had been expected to generate approximately 300 new vehicle trips;
- Clarification that the development had not necessitated the widening of Route 29 from four to six lanes;
- Explanation that the proposal had included approximately 5,000 square feet of general non-residential use, intended to be located on the first floor of the multifamily building;
- Explanation that discussions up to that point had focused on uses that would directly serve the building's residents;
- Clarification that public or community-serving uses, such as county facilities, had not yet been explored in depth;
- Explanation that in other parts of the country, neighborhood and community services had sometimes identified a necessity for facilities like community centers, which could have been considered in future planning;
- Explanation that the 5,000 square feet of non-residential space had originated from discussions with the Supervisor's office and others about potentially dedicating that area for county-run or community space;

- Clarification that placemaking had been a key focus throughout the planning process;
- Explanation of the site's challenges for traditional commercial use, noting that a long-term vacant office building on the property had highlighted those difficulties;
- Explanation that visibility into the developable portion of the site had been limited due to a stream valley running along the frontage, which had complicated efforts to attract commercial tenants;
- Clarification that the plan at the time had envisioned approximately 1,700 square feet of commercial space, potentially for a coffee shop or sandwich shop;
- Clarification that this space had been designed to be connected to a plaza and open space area, creating a small neighborhood gathering place intended to serve both commercial and placemaking functions;
- Clarification that these concepts had been thoughtfully incorporated into the ongoing concurrent zoning process;
- Clarification that nothing would have precluded the multifamily buildings from being converted to condominiums in the future;
- Explanation that the current proposal leaned toward multifamily rental housing, as it had been determined to be the most economically viable option for the project to proceed.
- Explanation that the open space on site had met the required urban park generation amount, even without including the Resource Protection Area (RPA);
- Clarification that the concern had not been with the quantity of open space, but rather its location;
- Explanation that staff ultimately believed the plan had achieved a workable balance between active urban park space and passive open space areas;
- Explanation that the 1,700 square feet had been intentionally modest, envisioned as a neighborhood-serving, walk-up style retail space rather than one with extensive indoor seating;
- Clarification that the concept had been modeled after similar uses, such as standalone coffee shops at Mosaic and The Boro, although this version had been planned to be attached to the building or garage;
- Explanation that the retail space had been located next to a large public park area, enhancing its appeal as a gathering place;
- Clarification that while 1,700 square feet had been the proposed minimum, the project design had allowed for expansion if a future tenant had required more space—up to approximately 2,500 square feet;
- Explanation that the team had spoken with retail brokers to assess the then-current market and determine what uses would have been viable for the site;
- Clarification that the developer, Insight, had had experience with numerous projects across the D.C.-Maryland-Virginia (DMV) region and had possessed a strong understanding of how to successfully lease and activate retail space;
- Explanation that lighting in those areas had been planned to be consistent with Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) standards, including pedestrian-level and taller pole lighting;
- Clarification that interior site lighting had not yet been fully developed but could have been addressed in more detail during rezoning;

- Explanation that consideration had been given to maintaining visual and design cohesion with adjacent areas;
- Clarification that when the plan amendment had originally been authorized, it had been placed in Tier 3;
- Explanation that when Scott and the Insight Group had taken over the nomination, they had introduced the two development options as part of their effort to move the nomination from inactive to active status;
- Explanation that the client had initially preferred to pursue multifamily development, as it had aligned with their expertise;
- Explanation that both economic and planning considerations had ultimately led them to move forward with Option B;
- Clarification of broader economic challenges that had been affecting multifamily developers, including rising labor and material costs, increased interest rates, and limited access to equity and capital;
- Explanation that financing multifamily projects had become more difficult under those market conditions;
- Explanation that stacked townhomes, particularly two-over-two products, had seen strong demand and had been easier to finance;
- Clarification of incorporating multiple housing types, the development had been able to leverage the more financeable two-over-two units to help support and offset the cost of delivering the multifamily component;
- Concern over the approximately 300-unit difference between Option A and Option B;
- Concern that despite an opportunity to increase density, the applicant indicated it was not financially feasible;
- Explanation that the real choice had not been between 800 units of multifamily and a mixed product, but between a feasible combination of 400 multifamily units and 76 two-over-twos—or no development at all;
- Explanation that the project had not been able to move forward with Option A alone due to financial constraints;
- Clarification that while planning for density had been important, execution had depended on market and financing realities;
- Clarification that their approach had been shaped by a commitment to actually delivering housing and ensuring the development could move forward, not just meet theoretical density targets;
- Explanation that the county's housing supply issue had involved not only rental units but also a significant necessity for for-sale housing;
- Clarification that the site had been seen as a desirable location for entry-level for-sale units, such as the two-over-two townhomes;
- Explanation that during community outreach, staff had heard clear interest and support for that type of homeownership option;
- Clarification that the community feedback had helped drive the decision-making around the proposed development;
- Concerns over receiving nominations that had not aligned with the county's policy goals for increased density in Transit Station Areas (TSAs);

- Explanation that they had been in discussions with a two-over-two builder for the project; and
- Clarification that the issue of unit size consistency had been something they could have addressed with the builder as part of the final design process.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Naveed Easton, 3050 Hickory Grove Court, Fairfax, representing YIMBYs of NoVA. A copy of Mr. Easton 's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Linda Smyth, representing Briarwood Citizen Organization, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Expressed support for converting the long-vacant office buildings across from her neighborhood into residential use, noting it had made sense given current conditions;
- Acknowledged that the proposed development would have increased traffic compared to the then-current low volumes but supported it with the condition that a robust Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program be included;
- Urged the use of up-to-date traffic data, as existing figures had been based on outdated sources or collected during unusual circumstances;
- Raised pedestrian safety concerns along Nutley Street, especially near Hermosa Drive, due to poor lighting and visibility. Shared personal experiences of near misses with unseen pedestrians; and
- Requested that the developer address sidewalk and lighting improvements as part of the project, emphasizing that the site's control of the frontage had presented a timely opportunity to fix long-standing issues.

Aman Ardalan, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Described the existing office buildings and garages as underused, stating he had rarely seen activity there;
- Highlighted the region's housing crisis and shared his personal struggles with affordability, including a recent rent increase;
- Urged approval of the project, calling it a smart way to add needed housing near Metro; and
- Requested one change: to add a crosswalk at Saintsbury Drive and Hunters Glen to improve access to the Metro.

Allen Gina, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Thanked the law firm representing the applicant for their commitment to lighting improvements, referencing a February 27th community meeting where that commitment had been made and later reaffirmed;

- Praised the professionalism and responsiveness of the applicant team, noting their willingness to answer every question and to remain until the end of the meeting; and
- Commended their dedication to public service and concluded by thanking them for their contribution to the community.

Omar Tisza, supported the amendment and stated the following:

- Expressed concern about the ongoing housing crisis and lack of supply;
- Emphasized that homeownership had been essential not only for wealth creation but also for establishing a sense of belonging and stability;
- Stated that the American dream had felt increasingly out of reach, especially for renters who had been unsure of how long they could continue to afford rising costs;
- Argued that without an increase in housing supply, standards of living would have declined and more people would have fallen into poverty;
- Urged the Planning Commission to carefully consider whether public facilities like a school or firehouse had been more essential than additional housing, suggesting that housing should have taken priority;
- Shared that he had lived in a complex owned by a foreign company, noting that his rent payments had left the local economy and reinforcing the necessity to consider local impact and ownership opportunities;
- Asked the Commission to also weigh the constraints and aspirations of residents, not just those of the developer; and
- Expressed support for the previously mentioned pedestrian safety improvements.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey asked the speaker to clarify whether he supported or opposed the applicant's proposal. The speaker, Mr. Tisza, responded that he believed it was important to have more options for homeownership rather than relying solely on rental multifamily housing. He added that, since the Planning Commission was the decision-making body, he simply wanted to make his opinion known.

Commissioner Cortina asked whether VDOT-required tall streetlights were necessary along the Nutley Street frontage or if shorter, pedestrian-scale lighting could have been used on the private side of the trail. Bob Pakora from FCDOT responded that VDOT had specific spacing and height requirements for roadway lighting. He noted that while some lights may have already been in place, they were likely not operational. He added that the applicant had been willing to address lighting through the site plan and rezoning process. The taller lights, while required for roadway safety, would also have provided some benefit to adjacent sidewalks and trails.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hancock for actions on this proposed application.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2023-II-2V AS SHOWN ON PAGES 28-32 OF THE STAFF

REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 19, 2025, WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL SITE-SPECIFIC BULLET:

- STREETLIGHTS SHOULD BE INSTALLED ALONG BOTH SIDES OF NUTLEY STREET AND THE NORTH SIDE OF ROUTE 29 TO ENHANCE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND VISIBILITY.

Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioner Bennett was absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.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: July 23, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 29 day of July 2025, by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal