MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 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
James Thomas, Springfield District
Alis Wang, Mason District

ABSENT: NONE

OTHERS:

Catherine Lewis, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Kevin McMahan, ZED, DPD
Salem Bush, Planning Development (PD), DPD
Mohamed Ali, PD, DPD
Daniel Creed, ZED, DPD
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission, Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Satabdi Samaddar, Administration, DCS

//

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

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner opened the September 10, 2025, Planning Commission meeting by welcoming everyone back after the break and introducing the evening's public hearings. He also took a moment to recognize and thank Theresa Marie DeSantis for her service to the Planning Commission. Ms. DeSantis began her career in Fairfax County in 1988 as a public safety communications assistant with the Police Department and later served for more than ten years in increasingly senior roles supporting both the Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner commended her contributions, describing the staff's support as outstanding, and emphasized that her dedication and service would be missed. He extended best wishes on behalf of the Commission on her future endeavors.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Hancock announced that Commissioners were emailed copies of the draft minutes for Planning Commission meetings held in April 2025. Commissioner Hancock announced his intent to move for approval of the April meeting minutes during the Planning Commission meeting on September 17, 2025.

//

Commissioner Carter announced that the Urban Development and Placemaking Committee would meet on Thursday, September 11, 2025, at 7:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center. The agenda would include two presentations: the first on Volume I of the design guidelines affecting several activity centers, and the second on the Urban Development and Placemaking Report, which Carter would present. He noted that the meeting could take longer than an hour and emphasized the importance of having a quorum so the committee could move matters forward to the full Commission. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner encouraged all commissioners to attend, describing the session as valuable and worthwhile.

//

Commissioner Landgraf announced that the Housing Committee meeting originally scheduled for September 18, 2025, had been postponed. A new date would be determined and announced later this year.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. PCA/FDPA 2000- HM-044-04/CDPA 2000-HM-044-03 (RZPA-2024-HM-00031) - MAPLE MULTI-FAMILY LAND EAST COAST, L.P
2. SSPA 2023-II-1M (CONCURRENT WITH RZ/FDP-2024-DR-00006) - 7600 LEESBURG PIKE
3. RZ/FDP 2024-DR-00006 (CONCURRENT WITH SSPA 2023-II-1M) - GACM 2019-FL1 REO (7600 LEESBURG), LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

PCA/FDPA 2000- HM-044-04/CDPA 2000-HM-044-03 (RZPA-2024-HM-00031) - MAPLE MULTI-FAMILY LAND EAST COAST, L.P- Appls. to permit a multifamily residential and a self-storage building at a 3.09 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) resulting in an FAR of 0.84 across the overall development. Located in the S. W. quadrant of the intersection of the Dulles Airport Access Rd. and Monroe St., bounded to the S. by Woodland View Dr., on approx. 3.33 ac. of land zoned PDC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Mixed Use. Tax Map 16-4 ((27)) 3B. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Amanda Williams, Applicant's Agent, Cooley LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated August 5, 2025.

Kevin McMahan, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that the staff recommended approval of PCA/FDPA 2000-HM-044-04/CDPA 2000-HM-044-03.

Ms. Williams gave a presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Williams; Mr. McMahan; Kathy Lewis, ZED, DPD; William F. Johnson, Traffic Consultant, Galloway & Company, Inc.; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the bike share location space shown in the images was being reserved for a future bike share station at the site plan stage;
- Explanation that easements would be granted to the County upon demand and that funds would be contributed to support installation, though it was not guaranteed that a bike share would be placed there;
- Concerns that proffers in other cases had been $23,000, while this one was $20,000, and how clarity on installation costs to ensure adequate funding for Capital Bikeshare was needed;
- Explanation that Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) was agreeable to the proposed amount and noted that final costs could vary depending on the number of bikes included in the station;

- Explanation that the applicant intentionally designed the interim park to be a usable, attractive space in case the self-storage did not proceed. They stated that signage or notices to residents would make it clear the park was temporary;
- Clarification that the area already had significant park space, including an urban sports park nearby and more than the required amount of parkland under the Comprehensive Plan;
- Clarification that self-storage was considered commercial use, not office use;
- Explanation that because this was part of a larger rezoning, the broader Woodland Park area still had office as the primary use;
- Explanation that within this partial Proffered Condition Amendment (PCA), there were only two secondary uses, but office remained part of the overall PDC;
- Explanation that the cohesive appearance was intentional and aligned with zoning standards;
- Clarification that while signage could vary by operator, the building design would remain consistent with the elevations presented;
- Concerns that self-storage buildings often use bright colors like orange or blue for branding;
- Explanation that the cohesive appearance was intentional and aligned with zoning standards;
- Clarification that while signage could vary by operator, the building design would remain consistent with the elevations presented;
- Explanation that the building design would remain cohesive regardless of operator, with only signage subject to variation;
- Clarification that while color was not specified, the elevations themselves were included in the proffers;
- Clarification that the applicant was obligated and needed to provide integrated architectural elevations as part of their commitment;
- Clarification that there would be bike lanes, a reserved space and contribution for a bike share station, bike racks at the front entrance, and a bike room for the multifamily building;
- Explanation that two bus shelters had been previously committed as part of the overall development, with at least one already nearby, though they did not have an image to show exact locations;
- Explanation that the original workforce dwelling units (WDU) percentage was 10% but had been increased to 12% in coordination with staff. Further breakdown that out of the 38 WDUs:
    - 10 units would be at 60% of Area Median Income (AMI), about $98,000 for a household of four;
    - 10 units would be at 70% AMI, about $114,000 for a household of four; and
    - 18 units would be at 80% AMI, about $130,000 for a household of four.
- Explanation that proffer 6 covered the entire Phase 1 and Phase 2, meaning a future self-storage operator could not override the design with brand colors if they were incompatible;

- Explanation that the operator would need to come back and seek changes through staff if they wanted to alter the design, but clarified that was not the intent;
- Concerns about potential density loss near the Metro;
- Explanation that existing streetlights would be relocated to match the streetscape and nearby developments;
- Clarification that lighting would also come from amenity spaces, corner ground-floor uses, porch and stair lights for walk-up units, and activity in the area;
- Explanation that adding more pedestrian-scale lighting could interfere with tree placement;
- Explanation that if lighting were not approved, they would pursue a pedestrian crosswalk with appropriate safety equipment, subject to Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT's) study and approval;
- Clarification there was already a well-worn crossing path at the location, and they wanted to encourage safer use;
- The applicant confirmed they were committed to lighting, but any installation had met VDOT's criteria;
- Clarification that the proffers tied the outcome to the site plan review;
- Explanation that if VDOT approved a signal, it would include crosswalks. If not, they would still be required to evaluate and provide an approved pedestrian crossing with safety mitigation, not just paint striping; and
- Explanation that the median appeared wide enough and that design tools such as a refuge or offset crosswalk could be considered, subject to VDOT approval.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

John Cantrell, 12913 Alten Square, Herndon, signed up to speak on the application and stated the following:

- Concerns about the existing flood pond;
- Concern about what would happen to the flood pond once the new development moved forward, asking whether it would be removed, replaced, or otherwise addressed; and
- Explanation that the flood pond was originally part of the area's infrastructure.

Barbara Banks, 13037 Rore Petal Circle, Oak Hill, signed up to speak on the application and stated the following:

- Concerns about what would be tree-lined and screened from view of the toll road;
- Concerns about the 314 proposed residential units, asking what type of units they would be apartments, condos, public housing, or private ownership;
- Concerns on whether they might be used primarily for business investment or temporary dwellings;

- Explained that 27 years ago, 10% of Fairfax County remained undeveloped, and the subject area was already one of the highest-density parts of the county;
- Concerns that adding more townhouses and condos would further intensify density;
- The Metro station was only about a quarter-mile away, and suggested that proximity might justify office buildings instead of more residential;
- Concerns about traffic circulation near the site, specifically at Van Buren onto Monroe and the bridge over the toll road; and
- Concerns of installing a crosswalk there, pointing out that pedestrians would need to cross a busy area with significant car traffic, which they viewed as precarious.

//

There was a discussion between Ms. Williams; Mr. McMahan; Ms. Lewis; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the application had been reviewed and supported by the Stormwater Department;
- Clarification that the existing open flood pond would be replaced with an underground stormwater storage structure designed to detain runoff on-site;
- Explanation that the applicant had provided an architectural drawing showing what the site would look like from the toll road, ensuring context for visibility concerns;
- Staff acknowledged that both FCDOT and VDOT were aware of safety issues near the bridge over the toll road;
- Explanation that traffic speed and safety would be carefully reviewed during design;
- The applicant reiterated that the flood pond had been shifted during earlier phases of development, and this final block would treat stormwater fully on-site through a combination of bioretention tree pits, manufactured treatment facilities, and underground detention vaults;
- Explanation that about 65 feet of existing trees between the property line and the toll road would remain untouched, providing natural screening;
- Clarification that the proposed housing would be multifamily rental units, consistent with prior approvals for residential uses along the toll road;
- Explanation that the signal proffer from the original approval was carried forward and updated with alternatives to cover different scenarios, all subject to VDOT review to ensure safety;
- Clarification that the site layout was intentionally designed to mitigate noise;
- Explanation that the self-storage building and parking garage would serve as buffers, absorbing much of the noise from the toll road;
- Clarification that no residential units would directly face the toll road, as an internal corridor was planned along that side of the building;
- Explanation that a detailed acoustical analysis had been completed as part of the concurrent site plan process;
- Explanation that the study confirmed that interior noise levels met county standards, and courtyard spaces benefited from strong noise mitigation;

- Explanation that the analysis identified one unit with noise levels slightly above standards. The noise consultant recommended installing an advanced glazing package for that unit, which the applicant committed to provide.

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 Carter for actions on these proposed applications.
//

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

- PCA 2000-HM-044-04 AND CDPA 2000-HM-044-03, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED AUGUST 20, 2025;

- MODIFICATION OF SUBSECTION 2105.4.C(1)(B) TO ALLOW THE GROSS FLOOR AREA (GFA) OF SECONDARY USES TO EXCEED 75 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA IN THE DEVELOPMENT;

- MODIFICATION OF SUBSECTION 5100.2.D(8)(A)1 TO ALLOW PRINCIPAL RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE DULLES AIRPORT ACCESS ROAD TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDPA/FDPA;

- MODIFICATION OF SUBSECTION 5100.2.D(8)(A)2 TO ALLOW COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS WITHIN 75 FEET OF THE DULLES AIRPORT ACCESS ROAD TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDPA/FDPA;

- MODIFICATION OF SUBSECTION 5107.3.A(2) TO PERMIT PRIVATE STREETS LESS THAN TWENTY-FOUR (24) FEET IN WIDTH AND TO ALLOW THE PROPOSED ACCESS DRIVE TO REMAIN TWENTY-TWO (22) FEET IN WIDTH, AS SHOWN ON THE CDPA/FDPA; AND

- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 5107.3.A(3) TO PERMIT A PRIVATE STREET GREATER THAN 600 FEET IN LENGTH, AS SHOWN ON THE CDPA/FDPA.

Commissioners Cortina, Landgraf and Sargent seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

In a related action, the Planning Commission voted 12-0 to approve FPDA 2000-HM-044-04.

//

SSPA 2023-II-1M (CONCURRENT WITH RZ/FDP-2024-DR-00006) - 7600 LEESBURG PIKE– Plan Amendment #SSPA-2023-II-1M concerns approx. 10.16 acres located at 7600 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA Tax Map Parcel # 40-1 ((1)) 39 in the Dranesville Supervisor District. The area is planned for 5-8 du/ac. The amendment will consider an option for residential use up to 12-16 du/ac with development conditions. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Mohamed Ali, 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 SSPA 2023-II-1M.

Lynne Strobel, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C., gave a presentation on the site-specific plan amendment.

There was a discussion between Mr. Ali; Salam Bush, Branch Chief, PD, DPD; Ms. Strobel; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the pedestrian connectivity throughout the site had been a major focus during the rezoning process;
- Explanation that the plan included a shared-use path along Leesburg Pike;
- Clarification that the applicant had not been asked to provide a bike share station;
- The applicant's agent stated they discussed it with their client and were open to considering it, even though it had not been requested previously;
- Clarification that the special permit allowed a maximum height of 50 feet, while the rezoning permitted up to 55 feet;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan language guided height allowances up to 55 feet for stacked townhomes, and this was incorporated into the plan;
- A discussion on the reasons behind the rezoning and SSPA applications being heard concurrent, the process for recommending them in the presented format for approval, coordination efforts between Planning and Zoning Evaluation Division staff on the plan's language and implementation, which aligned with directives issued by the Board of Supervisors;
- Explanation that there was a Resource Protection Area (RPA) toward the Tysons Pennant Park, which could impact the feasibility of making the connection;
- The applicant stated that they had reviewed the public schools' report in detail and were providing contributions typically required in the rezoning process. They added that they were not aware of any other requests or updated policies at this time but would consider them if they arose;
- Clarification that school planning and funding decisions were made by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS);
- Explanation that the county projected population growth to anticipate school needs, but FCPS determined how to respond;

- Explanation that expansion had become the county's primary strategy for addressing capacity issues;
- Explanation that they had already completed a noise study and would conduct further analysis at the site plan stage;
- Explanation that they confirmed that interior noise requirements and exterior noise requirements would be met;
- Clarification that no homes were located in areas where noise would prohibit residential use;
- The applicant proffered to provide notification to buyers or residents about potential impacts, for units with balconies exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA;
- Explanation that building materials would be used to mitigate interior noise levels, and that common recreation areas fell outside of the higher noise zones; and
- The applicant responded that while Electric Vehicle (EV) charging was proposed in garages as part of the rezoning, there was no plan for community-based charging stations.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Sereen Othman, 2022 Kilgore Road, Falls Church, signed up to speak on the application and stated the following:

- Concerns of the lack of affordable housing in Fairfax County;
- Explanation that while they had grown accustomed to development and noise over the years, the cost of living had become a serious challenge;
- Explanation that even families with housing subsidies struggled to afford their units, and that they personally could not afford housing despite having a full-time job and a 401(k) plan;
- Explanation that at a prior meeting on June 16, 2025 they were told that the starting prices for townhomes in the proposed development began at $800,000;
- Explanation that many residents remained on housing voucher waitlists for nearly a decade, which they said reflected a broken system; and
- They concluded by stating that addressing affordability was essential for Fairfax County's economic growth and stability.

There was a discussion between Mr. Ali; Mr. Bush; Ms. Strobel; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the approach to affordable housing in the planning area followed Countywide policy;
- Explanation that while the Board's authorization was for 50 feet, the plan recommendation was set at 55 feet, consistent with the rezoning filing;
- Explanation that plan amendments often used "should" which allowed for flexibility where constraints might exist;
- Clarification that in this case, they noted that potential RPA issues could affect feasibility;

- Explanation that the rezoning application included a clear park connection;
- Clarification that the $800,000 figure was an estimate for townhomes, but further clarified that pricing was still uncertain since the project had not yet been built;

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 Batchelor-Causey for actions on this proposed application.

//

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF SSPA 2023-II-1M, AS FOUND IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED AUGUST 21, 2025.

Commissioner Hancock seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

RZ/FDP 2024-DR-00006 (CONCURRENT WITH SSPA 2023-II-1M) - GACM 2019-FL1 REO (7600 LEESBURG), LLC–Appls. to rezone from C-2 and HC to PDH-16 and HC to permit residential development with an overall density of 13.48 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the N. side of Leesburg Pike (Route 7), E. of its intersection with George C Marshall Dr. on approx. 10.16 ac. of land. Existing Comp. Plan Rec: Residential 5 to 8 du/ac. Proposed Comp. Plan Rec.: Residential 12 to 16 du/ac. Tax Map 40-1 ((1)) 39. (Concurrent with SSPA 2023-II-1M). DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Ms. Strobel reaffirmed the affidavits dated August 18, 2025.

Daniel Creed, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Development presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that the staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP 2024-DR-00006.

Ms. Strobel gave a presentation on the subject applications.

There was a discussion between Ms. Strobel; Peter L. Rinek, Engineer, VIKA Virginia, LLC; Mr. Creed; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the site plan showed a 24-foot-wide public street without parking along Kilgore Road;

- Explanation that a proffer allowed the street width to be modified to 26 feet with a 4-foot-wide landscape panel on one side;
- Clarification that the modification was contingent on not losing street trees and was consistent with a VDOT-approved cross-section;
- Explanation that while garages and other parking were provided, on-street parking would likely benefit the community in the future;
- Explanation that the primary objective was to ensure the road would be accepted by VDOT;
- Concern about retaining walls as part of the project and are passed on to the HOA;
- Clarification that the park connection was located at the back right of the site, across the street;
- Explanation that if on-street parking were counted they would achieve several spaces, a waiver would not be necessary;
- Clarification that on-street spaces would likely be used by guests but would not be restricted solely to them;
- Explanation that parking would also be available along Kilgore Road and the access road parallel to Leesburg Pike;
- Clarification that along Kilgore Road, no street trees could be placed due to sight distance issues;
- Explanation that reducing the landscape panel width in this area would not impact tree requirements;
- Further explanation that one tree potentially would be relocated along the stretch parallel to Leesburg Pike but emphasized that their landscape plan remained intact and binding;
- Explanation that all stormwater calculations were based on the site's undeveloped condition as farmland;
- Further explanation that this meant runoff rates for the one- and two-year storms would be less than or equal to those of the undeveloped site, while the ten-year storm was modeled as though the land had been entirely forested;
- Clarification that the proffer language would be clarified which would align with the engineering sheets, ensuring consistency prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting;
- Explanation that a Housing Authority report was attached as an appendix and stated the following:
    - The report identified three income tiers (70%, 80%, and 100% of AMI) for-sale units; and
    - Clarification that the project would provide WDUs in line with these tiers and referenced proffer 43, which formalized this commitment.
- Concerns about stormwater drainage near the transition from the public road to the church access road, where tall retaining walls were proposed;
- Explanation that the wall was not a continuous 12-foot barrier but tapered at the sides;
- Concerns that runoff flowing down toward Leonard Road might bypass existing inlets and pool near the corner house, as the driveway broke the curb line before the next inlet;
- The applicant agreed to review and address the issue, acknowledging the importance of accounting for increasing rainfall intensity in recent years.

//

There being no listed speakers, no speakers from the audience, no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Batchelor-Causey for action on this application.

//

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

- RZ-2024-DR-00006 AND ASSOCIATED CDP, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED AUGUST 29, 2025;

- WAIVER OF 200-SQUARE FOOT PRIVACY YARD REQUIREMENT FOR THE REAR-LOADING SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED UNITS;

- WAIVER OF 600-FOOT MAXIMUM LENGTH FOR PRIVATE STREETS;

- MODIFICATION OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP;

- WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE NORTHERN PROPERTY LINE;

- MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP; AND

- PARKING REDUCTION REQUEST #PKS-2024-00015 FOR THE SITE PURSUANT TO SECTION 6100.6.C.(1) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, BASED ON THE PROXIMITY TO TRANSIT, AND SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS DATED JULY 15, 2025, CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 16 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

In a related action, the Planning Commission voted 12-0 to approve FDP-2024-DR-00006.

Commissioners Handcock, Landgraf and Wang seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed with a further discussion on the issue of concurrency, the practice of reviewing Comprehensive Plan amendments and rezonings together. He noted that the Board of Supervisors had recently provided direction through two unanimously approved board matters which emphasized the need for increased housing production and streamlined processes.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:11 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: December 10, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 15 day of December 2025, by Nicole Blackwell.

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114173

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal