MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT WORKSHOP
THURSDAY, MAY 15, 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
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: James Thomas, Springfield District

OTHERS: Kelly Atkinson, Director, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
David Stinson, PD, DPD
Kazi Mohaimin, PD, DPD
Stephen Waller, PD, DPD
Graham Owen, PD, DPD
Clara Johnson, PD, 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.

//

2024-2025 COUNTYWIDE SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner made preliminary comments on the process for the Countywide Site-Specific Plan Amendment (SSPA) and its association with the Comprehensive Plan. The May 2025 SSPA workshops served as the next step in Fairfax County's 2025 Countywide SSPA process. This process allowed landowners and members of the public to nominate specific sites for potential changes to the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan, required by state law, served as the guiding document for land use decisions throughout the county.

At this stage in the process, the Planning Commission was tasked with determining whether nominated sites should be recommended to the Board of Supervisors for further study. Nominations approved for advancement would be added to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and undergo a more detailed review, including extensive engagement with nominators and the community.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that this workshop was the second in a series of three, following the first held on May 1, 2025. The final workshop was scheduled for May 22, 2025. He further stated that nominations would be considered in the following order:

- Nominations were divided into two categories:
    - The first category was a proposed consent package containing nominations recommended by staff for inclusion in the work program and which had not generated significant public concern. Items in the consent package were not discussed individually unless a commissioner, nominator, or member of the public requested they be removed for discussion; and
    - The second category consisted of nominations expected to involve public speakers or commissioner questions and were scheduled for individual discussion and presentations.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that during this session, the Commission would review nominations from the Hunter Mill District as well as the remaining nominations from the Providence District.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner recognized staff from the Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), for an overview of the SSPA process.

Staff provided a draft list of nominations recommended for the consent package, which was displayed in the staff presentation and made available to commissioners. As with the first workshop, the Commission made preliminary motions on each nomination during the session. A final vote on the complete work program was scheduled for June 4, allowing time for the record to remain open until all nominations were reviewed.

To begin the evening, staff delivered an overview presentation outlining the SSPA process, the Planning Commission's role during the screening phase, and the format for reviewing nominations during the workshops.

//

Katrina Newtson, PD, DPD, introduced members of her team, which included David Stinson, PD, DPD, Kazi Mohaimin, PD, DPD, Stephen Waller, PD, DPD, Graham Owen, PD, DPD, Clara Johnson, PD, DPD, and the Planning Director, Kelly Atkinson, PD, DPD, followed by a staff presentation on the SSPA process. Ms. Newtson highlighted the purpose of the workshop and listed the stages of planning review.

During Ms. Newtson's presentation, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner asked Planning Commissioners if they had any questions about any of the stages of the SSPA process.

Commissioner Cortina shared general concerns regarding the number of townhouse developments and the repurposing of existing office buildings within the Hunter Mill district. She inquired whether the repurposing of these buildings would be part of ongoing studies in Reston or Tysons, to which staff confirmed that it would be included in the planning considerations. She emphasized the importance of evaluating proximity to highways, specifically referencing the Dulles Access Road and I-495, citing potential issues such as noise and the loss of mature trees.

Commissioner Cortina further expressed concern that although applicants may claim to preserve impervious surface areas by building on existing asphalt pads, in practice, they often extend development to the edges of their properties. Commissioner Cortina explained that this frequently results in the removal of tree buffers, particularly near highways, either for visibility or aesthetic preferences. She stressed the cumulative environmental impact of these actions and noted the need to be vigilant with each proposal moving forward.

Commissioner Carter expressed support for the four consent items under discussion, particularly aligning with Commissioner Cortina's earlier comments. He noted that although the sites are in close proximity, they vary in density and development approach. He agreed with grouping them as a district for staff study, commending staff's work in that regard.

There being no listed speakers, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers from the audience regarding the nominations in the consent agenda package.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman Spain.

//

CONSENT AGENDA SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT (SSPA) NOMINATIONS

There were no listed speakers on the consent agenda package, no speakers from the audience, no rebuttal from the nominators, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE A PRELIMINARY VOTE TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING SSPA NOMINATIONS BE ADDED TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF IN THE SSPA WHITE PAPER:

HUNTER MILL DISTRICT:

- CPN-2025-III-HM-005: ALEXANDER BELL DRIVE;
- CPN-2025-III-HM-015: 11600 AMERICAN DREAM WAY;
- CPN-2025-III-HM-033: 10690 PARKRIDGE BOULEVARD;
- CPN-2025-III-HM-038: 10800 PARKRIDGE BOULEVARD; AND
- CPN-2025-III-HM-043: 10701 PARKRIDGE BOULEVARD.

PROVIDENCE DISTRICT:

- CPN-2025-II-PR-004: CORPORATE RIDGE;
- CPN-2025-II-PR-025: 7950 JONES BRANCH DRIVE;
- CPN-2025-II-PR-040: 1410-1430 SPRING HILL ROAD; AND
- CPN-2025-I-PR-046: BEYER - GORDON ROAD TRIANGLE.

Commissioners Bennett and Hancock seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that the Planning Commission would review the remaining nominations individually, which were established alphabetically by Supervisor District, and numerically by SSPA number.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that Planning Commissioners would ask staff to introduce a nomination with the staff recommendation followed by a brief presentation from the nominator, who would describe their proposal. Planning Commissioners would present their questions and comments, and members of the public would be able to provide their testimonies both in the auditorium or on the phone. Preliminary motions would be made after the discussion on the nominations within each district.

//

<u>SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS UNDER REVIEW FOR THE HUNTER MILL DISTRICT</u>

<u>CPN-2025-III-HM-013 - 1841 Explorer Street</u> –Located at 1841 Explorer Street. Tax Map Parcel: 17-1((17)) 3. Nomination: Multi-family residential use up to 350 units

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 3 item.

Lee Gleason, Nominator's Agent, Cooley, gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Mr. Gleason, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns about the proposal, noting that although the building footprint remained the same, the number of units had tripled;
- Concerns of the required open space and how that would be addressed with the increase in units;
- Clarification that open space requirements were based on 20% of the property size;
- Explanation that the urban park standards were based on the number of units, meaning the required open space would increase proportionally with unit count;
- Clarification that the 2010 approval had provided double the required open space;
- Concerns that the affordable housing expectations in the Transit Station Area (TSA) would likely increase significantly;
- Concerns about the lack of outdoor open space for children attending the proposed childcare center;
- Explanation that the 2010 approval included an elevated courtyard on the same level as the proposed third-floor childcare center, which would serve as the designated outdoor play area;
- Clarification that as part of the rezoning process, additional off-site open space contributions or mitigation measures could be explored in coordination with staff;
- Clarification that while the bedroom breakdown was not yet available, unit sizes would range from approximately 800 to 1,200 square feet, indicating smaller units;
- Explanation that legal and financial challenges contributed to the difficulties, particularly due to liability concerns during the developer-to-condo-association turnover period, which often resulted in litigation;
- Explanation that these liability concerns made lenders hesitant, making condominium financing more speculative and risky;
- Explanation that for-sale condominiums were significantly more expensive to develop than rental units in the area, making them less viable;
- Explanation that lenders reluctance and associated risks limited the ability to finance condos, impacting their marketability; and
- Explanation that the nomination proposed would be replacing the previously approved condominiums with rental units.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers from the audience and received no response.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination:

> CPN-2025-III-HM-021 – Hunter Mill Road –Located at 1620, 1621, 1624, 1627, 1628, 1630 Hunter Mill Road; 1623, 1627, 1631 Crowell Road; 10700, 10718, 10728, 10736, 10800 Sunset Hills Road. Tax Map Parcels 18-3 ((1)) 4, 5; 18-3 ((2)) 1, 2A, 4, 6; 18-3 ((3)) 2A, 3A, 4A; 18-4 ((1)) 22, 26 B1; 1A, 2, 3. Nomination: Detached residential use at 1.5 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 3 item.

Tim Rizer, Nominator's Agent, G&G LLC., gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Mr. Rizer, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns that the nomination lacked affordable housing, was not located in a TSA, and raised compatibility concerns with the adjacent community;
- Explanation that delaying the nomination could result in the loss of the opportunity to resolve road issues, particularly since two of the three property owners were in poor health;
- Clarification that if the land was developed by-right, the recommended transportation solution would likely not move forward, eliminating a potential resolution;
- Explanation that while the 2017 transportation study had included environmental considerations, a reevaluation would be appropriate due to the time that had passed;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan route and the proposed realignment issues would be addressed during the study phase if the nomination was added to the work program;
- Clarification that the properties in the nomination were not in litigation;
- Explanation that Brookfield, a former contract owner, was engaged in litigation related to the Sunset Hills realignment and a connection to Hunting Crest;
- Clarification that Brookfield no longer had a contract on the property and that the current nomination was being submitted independently;
-

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers from the audience and received no response for the SSPA nomination **CPN-2025-III-HM-021 – Hunter Mill Road.** However, a speaker informed the Commission that he could not put his thoughts together in time but would like to speak to the previous SSPA nomination **CPN-2025-III-HM-013 - 1841 Explorer Street.** Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner allowed him to speak.

Stephen Canner, stated the following:

- Concerns about the proposed building having a large number of future occupants;
- Concern about the potential increase in traffic, specifically the number of cars, given that the area lacked commercial enterprises which normally supported such a residential density; and
- The impact on traffic and infrastructure in a primarily residential area.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination.

> CPN-2025-III-HM-028 – Reston National Golf Course –Located at 11875 Sunrise Valley Drive and 2018 Soapstone Drive. Tax Map Parcels 17-4 ((11)) 4A, 26-2 ((2)) 8, and 26-2 ((5)) 4. Nomination: Mix of residential and publicly accessible park space.

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff did not recommend adding the nomination to the Comprehensive Plan Work Program.

Mark Looney, Nominator's Agent, Cooley, gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Mr. Looney, Katrina Newton, PD, DPD; Clara Johnson, PD, DPD and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification on the distinction between the comprehensive plan process and the rezoning process:
  - The comprehensive plan process answers whether a proposal was a good idea; and
  - The rezoning process addresses how to implement that idea.
- Clarification that the supplicant does not expect staff to develop a plan;
- Explanation that evaluating transportation impacts and mitigation strategies required the involvement of:
  - County Department of Transportation; and
  - Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).
- Clarification that such evaluations could not proceed without public sector guidance on:
  - Scope of analysis;
  - Intersections to study; and
  - Growth assumptions.
- Explanation that meaningful study could not occur without this public agency collaboration, which required the nomination to be on the work program;
- Clarification that staff's recommendation did not indicate a preference for the current use;
- Explanation that it simply reflected prioritization of mixed-use centers and areas near transit stations, which this site was not;

- Concern that this land use does not align with the long-term vision for Reston as a place to live, work, and play;
- Concern that the county might miss an opportunity to increase affordable housing and achieve equity goals by refusing to study the site;
- Explanation that a more detailed site layout was needed from the applicant;
- Explanation that additional internal discussions were required to evaluate the implications of the Planned Residential Community (PRC) zoning district for this project;
- Clarification that the number of proposed dwelling units were still unclear;
- Explanation that only a high-level understanding of transportation impacts had been developed;
- Explanation that the existing golf course generated few vehicle trips, especially in winter, due to its seasonal nature;
- Explanation that the site had limited access points due to the surrounding development;
- Explanation that a future PRC plan would introduce new curb cuts, requiring a more detailed traffic study;
- Explanation that the development and open space areas were flexible and not fixed;
- Clarification that more detailed information would be needed to fully evaluate the proposal;
- Clarification that the current goal was to determine whether studying the proposal was a good idea;
- Explanation that a public-sector partner was essential to guide and validate the study, including issues like transportation and land use;
- Concerns about environmental features like resource protection areas and flood zones;
- Clarification that those factors could be evaluated through a formal study;
- Concerns about how repeated development proposals had fragmented the PRC eroding its integrity;
- Clarification that the golf course was not a membership-based country club, but a fee-based, public access facility;
- Clarification that golf participation had declined for a decade prior to COVID-19, then temporarily increased during the pandemic due to demand for outdoor activities;
- Explanation that industry trends had shifted toward more modern golfing experiences, prompting updates in the PRC plan to potentially:
    - Add a multi-tiered, lighted driving range;
    - Include indoor/outdoor instructional areas;
    - Offer new food and beverage options; and
    - Install lighted holes and practice areas.
- Clarification that if the land remained a golf course, it would need to modernize to compete regionally;
- Explanation that if the golf use was discontinued, approximately 80 acres could be preserved for public uses, potentially including golf if desired;
- Clarification of the nearby golf courses, including:
    - Herndon Golf Course;
    - Westwood Country Club;
    - International Country Club; and
    - Hidden Creek Country Club.

- Explanation that if the applicant returned in 18 months, the expectation would be for them to provide more detailed information and conduct community engagement to further develop the concept;
- Explanation that ongoing evaluations of other Reston plan amendments, especially regarding PRC zoning, could help inform this proposal if it was returned in a future cycle;
- Clarification that the nominator did meet the formal submission requirements, but the application lacked sufficient detail for full evaluation;
- Clarification that the opportunity exists for the nominator to strengthen the proposal before the next SSPA round;
- Explanation on the background on how the PRC zoning district functions;
- The PRC zoning was based on a 1962 master plan:
    - Rezoning occurred in large sectors 100-300 acres, followed by:
    - A development plan defining permitted uses in each sector;
    - A PRC plan like a preliminary site plan; and
    - A site plan for actual construction work.
- Explanation that the majority of the site was currently zoned for private recreation and open space, meaning a golf course or similar use;
- Clarification that under that zoning, the owner could:
    - Reconfigure the golf course via a PRC plan and site plan.
- Explanation that a smaller portion was zoned in 1966 for medium-density residential, allowing up to 20 dwelling units per acre;
- Explanation that this would permit the development of up to 288 stacked townhomes;
- Clarification that a PRC plan covering the whole site could include:
    - Golf course reconfiguration on 152 acres; and
    - Residential development on the 14 acres.
- Explanation that any such PRC plan would go before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors; and
- Explanation that this might become a test case for evaluating the County's authority over PRC plan approvals.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Connie Harke, 11890 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, representing Rescue Reston, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Explanation that all 10 SSPA nominations currently under review also included residential components, asserting that Reston already had sufficient housing in the pipeline;
- Explanation that eliminating either one of the two golf courses in Reston would undermine the community's planning vision;
- Clarification that the golf course owner paid nearly $24 million for land bought in 2005 for $5 million, arguing that it was clearly not zoned for development;
- Explanation that the problem was not golf's viability but the owner's intention to profit from redevelopment;

- Cited a quote from the April 7th community meeting where the owner's attorney claimed the ownership had a right to achieve a financial return and success which she argued reflected entitlement, not planning; and
- Clarification that another SSPA nomination, 10690 Park Ridge Boulevard, where an office building previously worth nearly $40 million was sold at a $24.9 million loss in 2022, noting that real estate investment involved had both risks and losses.

Lisa White, 2061 Wethersfield Court, Reston, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Concerns of wealthy landowners should not outweigh the needs of Fairfax County residents;
- Criticized the golf course owners for claiming a right to profit from their investment, framing it as a speculative gamble that did not pay off;
- Explained that it was not the duty of Reston or Fairfax County to guarantee investor profits;
- Argued that the county's responsibility was to preserve open space, protect the environment, and keep up with the culture and quality of life in Reston; and
- Acknowledged the necessity for more housing but pointed out that over 10,000 residential units were already under development in areas where growth had long been planned.

Travis Johnson, 11741 Dry River Court, Reston, Reston Association, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Explanation of Reston Association's long-standing position opposing any redevelopment of Reston's golf courses, including Reston National Golf Course;
- Clarification of Reston Association Board had previously adopted resolutions affirming this opposition;
- Explanation that the Reston National Golf Course was designated as permanent recreation and open space in the Reston Master Plan;
- Clarification that this designation was reaffirmed during the recent comprehensive plan update, which included over 50 public meetings;
- Clarification that no changes were proposed or adopted to the land use designation for the golf course during that process;
- Explanation that the golf course's status aligned with Reston's original guiding principles, which prioritize recreational opportunity and natural beauty;
- Stressed that any significant land use changes must be driven by community consensus and appropriate public dialogue;
- Explanation that allowing redevelopment of the golf course would set a harmful precedent for converting open space into high-density development; and
- Explanation that any residential development within the Reston Master Plan area must be required to join the Reston Association.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner asked the speaker to clarify or respond to a previous comment made by the nominator regarding Aries' financial stake in the Reston National Golf Course. He explained that he did not fully understand the nominator's statement and wanted to give the

speaker an opportunity to address it if desired. In response, the speaker stated that Aries was financially stable and disagreed with the nominator's remarks, indicating they were inaccurate. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner acknowledged the response and called for the next speaker.

Richard Hoffmann, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Explanation that golf courses were integral to Reston's recreational and environmental framework;
- Explanation that the courses were strategically located and helped balance density within the PRC, where development in some areas was offset by preserved open space in others;
- Concern that the proposal to develop Reston National Golf Course would irreversibly destroy that balance and that the PRC's population cap left no room for such development;
- Criticized the developers as speculators who had overpaid for the land in hopes of bypassing long-standing planning policies; and
- Clarification that similar proposals had been rejected twice before and warned that approval this time would cause permanent damage to Reston.

Ruth Ann Pinkman, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- She rejected the notion that opposition to the development stemmed from resistance to change, emphasizing that the community was not against change itself;
- Concerns that the golf course was not publicly accessible without payment, and questioned the sincerity of promises to create a public park;
- Concerns about who would maintain the proposed park space, fearing it would deteriorate over time;
- Criticized the shifting justifications used for redevelopment, including prior claims of invasive species and now maintenance issues; and
- Clarification that the golf course was currently being maintained and observed maintenance activity regularly.

Jay Szlamowicz, opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Explanation that he paid a premium to live both in Reston and specifically on the golf course, which was thriving and well-maintained at the time;
- Expressed frustration that new owners purchased the golf course with the intent of making money by redeveloping it;
- Noted that the property was initially purchased for $5 million and later for $24 million, and that the current owners had neglected maintenance, especially near his property line, where mowing was no longer being done; and
- Concern that building homes on the golf course would negatively impact existing homeowners who had paid a premium to live there, devaluing their properties.

Bryan Wright, 2121 Owls Cove Lane, Reston opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Explanation that the golf course used to be well-maintained and highly regarded, but noted it now had a low rating of 3.6 out of 5;
- Explanation the course was originally designed by a well-regarded architect and could thrive again under proper ownership; and
- Explanation that the people of Reston, including the Reston Association, overwhelmingly opposed redevelopment of the golf course, estimating over 90% disapproval.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination.

> CPN-2025-III-HM-042 – Wiehle TOD North District –Located at 1886 and 1891 Metro Center Drive; 1840, 1870, and 1900 Reston Metro Plaza; 11501 and 11505 Sunset Hills Road; and 1831 and 1861 Wiehle Avenue. Tax Map Parcels 17-4 ((1)) 17E, 17-4 ((13)) 1, 2, 2A; 17-4 ((18)) 1A, 1B; 17-4 ((20)) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; 17-4 ((24)) 3, 4A; 17-4 ((41)) A. Nomination: Mixed-use up to 2.5-5.0 FAR (50% residential, 50% non-residential).

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 1 item.

Jill Parks, Nominator's Agent, Hunton, Andrews, Kurth LLP on behalf of Comstock, gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Ms. Parks, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that Parcel 52 was zoned to C-8 District with an allowed use at 0.7 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) through special exception, and the proposed expansion to approximately 20,705 square feet;
- Concerns about increasing density further from the Metro station instead of decreasing it;
- Concerns on the environmental issues, such as flooding along Sunset Hills and a stream through the site;
- Concerns on transportation, particularly at major intersections like Wiehle Avenue and Reston Parkway;
- Clarification that the current request was part of a planning exercise to study and assess the site's potential;
- Clarification that staff had recommended Tier 1 for this nomination;
- Explanation that Planning Commission feedback, Board input in June, and an internal review of staff resources would inform the final prioritization;
- Explanation that the applicant had two traffic engineers working on each side of Wiehle Avenue and had already committed funding toward transportation improvements;
- Explanation that Tier 3 nominations were considered to have potential value but required additional policy guidance, studies, or community engagement;

- Clarification that staff would engage with the applicant to develop the proposal further before a more formal review; and
- Explanation that advancing a nomination from Tier 3 to another tier would require a separate motion by the Board of Supervisors.

There being no listed speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination.

> CPN-2025-III-HM-048 - 11600 Sunrise Valley Drive –Located at 11600 Sunrise Valley Drive. Tax Map Parcels 17-4 ((1)) 10. Nomination: Residential use up to a 1.5 FAR, modify mix of uses to 100% residential.

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 1 item.

Brian Winterhalter, Nominator's Agent, DLA Piper., gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Mr. Winterhalter, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns about the layout, specifically the backs of townhouses facing a future arterial and the proximity of development to a pond, questioning whether environmental setbacks had been addressed;
- Recommended coordination of Association Drive with Soapstone Drive, and aligning efforts to resolve the 75% commercial to 25% residential issues; and
- Concerns that the area's historic value might not be fully appreciated until it's too late.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers from the audience and received no response.

There being no additional speakers, further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized the following nomination.

CPN-2025-III-HM-049 – Colvin Woods –Located at 11011 and 11023 Becontree Lake Drive. Tax Map Parcels 18-1 ((1)) 8A and 9A. Nomination: An option to add up to 85 additional residential units, which may contain townhouses, stacked townhouses, and/or low to mid-rise multifamily housing.

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the proposed nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 3 item.

Scott Adams, Nominator's Agent, McGuire Woods, gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Mr. Adams, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns about including this nomination in the work program;
- Clarification that the proposed new development would not be built on existing recreational space;
- Clarification that the plan would increase publicly accessible open space, converting current private land into community amenities;
- Explanation that the proposal had a plan which would enhance the property, not simply a density grab;
- Clarification that the proposed housing would be priced at entry-level market rates; and
- Explanation that the project would be subject to the Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance, which would ensure dedicated for-sale affordable units were included.

There were no listed speakers, no comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public workshop and recognized Commissioner Carter for a motion on these nominations.

//

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE THE PRELIMINARY VOTE TO RECOMMEND THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, AS DESCRIBED IN THE SSPA WHITE PAPER, FOR THE FOLLOWING NOMINATIONS:

- ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-013 - 1841 EXPLORER STREET, TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER THREE PRIORITY ITEM;

- ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-048 - 11600 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE, TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER ONE PRIORITY ITEM; AND

- ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-049 – COLVIN WOODS, TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER THREE PRIORITY ITEM.

Commissioners Cortina and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Carter made additional comments on the nominations.

- NOT TO ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-021 – HUNTER MILL ROAD - TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM;

Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion.

Prior to the vote there was a discussion between Ms. Johnson, Mr. Stinson, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the revised road design was submitted after the community meeting and after publication of the white paper;
- Clarification that staff did not have time to evaluate or respond to the new road concept;
- Clarification that an in-person community meeting took place with strong turnout;
  - Some residents were concerned about changes;
  - Others were concerned about the realignment not being in the original submission; and
  - Overall, the community wanted to be included in the process if the nomination moved forward.
- Explanation that new connection could potentially improve traffic flow in the affected road segment.

The motion carried with a vote of 6-3-2. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey, Clarke and Hancock voted in opposition. Commissioners Bennett and Sargeant abstained from the vote. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

- NOT TO ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-028 – RESTON NATIONAL GOLF COURSE - TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM;

Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion.

Prior to the vote there was a discussion between Ms. Johnson, Mr. Stinson, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concern about the lack of community process in evaluating the future of the open space;
- Concern that the applicant lacks interest in maintaining the golf course; and
- Clarification on what staff recommended on this nomination.

The motion carried with a vote 6-1-4. Commissioner Batchelor-Causey voted in opposition. Commissioners Bennett, Clarke, Hancock and Spain abstained from the vote. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION:

- ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-042 – WIEHLE TOD NORTH DISTRICT, TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER THREE PRIORITY ITEM;

Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was not carried by a vote 3-8.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman Spain.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE THE PRELIMINARY VOTE TO RECOMMEND THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, AS DESCRIBED IN THE SSPA WHITE PAPER, FOR THE FOLLOWING NOMINATIONS:

- ADD CPN-2025-III-HM-042 – WIEHLE TOD NORTH DISTRICT, TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER ONE PRIORITY ITEM;

Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote 10-1. Commissioner Carter voted in opposition. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair.

//

SITE-SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS UNDER REVIEW FOR THE PROVIDENCE DISTRICT

CPN-2025-I-PR-014 – Eaves Fairfax Towers –Located at 2251 Pimmit Drive, Falls Church, VA 22043 Tax Map Parcels 40-3 ((1)) 4. Nomination: Plan option for residential mixed-use development up to 1.63 FAR.

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, gave a presentation on the subject nomination. Staff supported including the nomination in the Comprehensive Plan Work Program as a Tier 3 item.

Katie Butler, Nominator's Agent, Odin, Feldman & Pittleman, P.C., gave a presentation on the subject nomination.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Ms. Butler, Katrina Newton, PD, DPD; Clara Johnson, PD, DPD and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that for a project to proceed under the preservation policy, the developer must submit a preservation plan;
- Clarification that the developer had begun discussions with Housing and Community Development (HCD) on such a plan;
- Clarification that the preservation policy was relatively new, adopted in Spring 2023, and staff was still determining consistent implementation;
- Clarification that under this route, the applicant might be able to bypass a plan amendment, but would still require:
    - Zoning approval; and
    - Impact analyses on transportation, schools, parks, open space, and compatibility.
- Explanation that the current site layout was not guaranteed to remain the same once full analysis was completed;
- Clarification that transportation impact studies would be required as the development process advances;
- Explanation that the applicant would be committed to implementing mitigation measures based on the outcomes of those studies;
- Explanation of potential improvements such as:
    - Increased connectivity; and
    - Possible road widening being considered by a nearby adjacent developer.
- Concern about the topography on that end of the development site;
- Clarification of the breakdown of housing types block by block:
    - Block A:
        - Will contain approximately 450 multifamily apartment units;
        - The site had a significant elevation change 30–40 feet;
        - Design included 2 levels of podium parking below 5 levels of wood-frame construction; and
        - The updated plan moved the community closer to the road which would reduce the retaining wall needed and took advantage of grading.
    - Existing tower:
        - Was 13 stories tall.
    - Block B:
        - Planned for townhomes.
    - Block D:
        - Still under study;
        - Considering townhomes or 2-over-2 units; and
        - Either option would max out at four stories.
- Explanation that the applicant would be committed to implementing mitigation measures based on the outcomes of those studies;
- Clarification that the garage was proposed and would need to be constructed as part of a multi-phase development;

- Explanation that the new garage was necessary to Relocate existing residents and their parking before other construction could proceed; and
- Clarification that the garage parking would be designated for the existing towers.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Meredith MacVicar, Representing: Lemon Road Civic Association, Reston opposed the nomination and stated the following:

- Referred to the Association's detailed letter dated April 25 for a full explanation of concerns;
- Highlighted that the proposal seeks to more than double the existing units, adding 576 units to an already dense property;
- Explanation that this would result in a density of 58 units per acre, compared to nearby townhome projects averaging 12-15 units per acre;
- Concerns about increased traffic, noting both nearby intersections already have failing traffic grades;
- Concerns that the project would eliminate existing wooded or green spaces; and
- Concerns that the proposal was inconsistent with the land use character of the surrounding neighborhood.

There were no additional speakers, no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public workshop and recognized Commissioner Hancock for a motion on this nomination.

//

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE A PRELIMINARY VOTE TO RECOMMEND THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, AS DESCRIBED IN THE SSPA WHITE PAPER, TO ADD CPN-2025-I-PR-014 – EAVES FAIRFAX TOWERS - TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WORK PROGRAM, AS A TIER THREE PRIORITY ITEM.

Commissioners Batchelor-Causey, Bennett, Sargeant and Spain seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner announced that this concluded the May 15, 2025 SSPA workshop, and that the next and final workshop would be held next Thursday May 22, 2025 at 7:30 p.m.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 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: October 8, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 14 day of October 2025, by Nicole Blackwell.

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7144113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal