MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2026

0PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair, Commissioner At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Vice Chair, 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:

Mohamed Ali, Planning Division (PD)
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Salem Bush, Branch Chief, PD, DPD
Phillip Hunt, Wastewater Design and Construction Division, Capital Facilities,
Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Kevin McMahan, Zoning Evaluation Division (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 Chair Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner opened the commission business by noting that the evening's agenda included one decision-only item, the conduct of two public hearings, and a special guest. He introduced Barry Biggar, President and CEO of Visit Fairfax as the guest speaker, highlighting the significance of welcoming individuals whose work had a significant positive impact on Fairfax County.

Under his leadership, Fairfax County's tourism economy had doubled, generating nearly $4 billion annually in direct visitor spending, which supported jobs, businesses, and tax revenues. He had been recognized as one of Northern Virginia's most influential leaders and had received the Tower of Dulles Award for his contributions to Dulles International Airport and the surrounding economic corridor, including efforts to expand international air service and new markets. His service on numerous regional and statewide boards related to tourism, business, arts, and economic development was highlighted.

The Chair emphasized that while the Planning Commission focused on land use, it also considered broader quality-of-life factors that contributed to vibrant neighborhoods and a strong economy, creating natural synergy with Visit Fairfax. The remarks concluded by welcoming Mr. Biggar and inviting him to the podium to begin the discussion.

//

Barry Biggar, President and CEO of Visit Fairfax addressed the Planning Commission. He noted that tourism was often misunderstood, despite its major impact on local economies and residents' quality of life. He explained that the discussion would cover tourism impacts nationally, statewide in Virginia, and locally in Fairfax County, as well as upcoming Visit Fairfax initiatives beginning July 1. Mr. Biggar further delivered his presentation into the following points:

- Stated that in 2024, U.S. travel, tourism, and hospitality generated about $1.3 trillion in direct spending;
- Added that the industry contributed nearly $2.9 trillion to the overall economy, supported more than 15 million jobs, and generated $89 billion in tax revenue;
- Explained that tourism contributed to a national trade surplus, as international visitors spent more in the U.S. than Americans spent abroad;
- Noted that without tourism-generated taxes, the average U.S. household would pay about $800 more per year to fund public services;
- Reported that in 2024, tourism in Virginia generated approximately $39 billion in visitor spending;
- Stated that tourism supported more than 250,000 jobs statewide;
- Explained that in Fairfax County, visitors contributed $3.9 billion to the local economy in 2024;
- Noted that tourism generated $305 million in state and local taxes, including about $189 million in local tax revenue;
- Emphasized that this revenue helped reduce the tax burden on residents and supported infrastructure and public services;
- Added that the tourism industry supported more than 13,000 local jobs;
- Discussed how tourism-related investments, such as entertainment venues, sports facilities, and hotels, brought new wealth into the county rather than redistributing existing spending;
- Highlighted the importance of hotels, noting that a single hotel room generated more than $8,500 annually in tax revenue, often comparable to a single-family home;

- Explained that tourism provided a diversified tax base through hotels, meals, and entertainment taxes;
- Explained that a recent hotel tax increase would provide Visit Fairfax with an additional $6.5 million annually for tourism marketing and development;
- Noted that this investment was expected to produce a strong return and could help grow Fairfax County's tourism economy to at least $5 billion within three to five years; and
- Concluded by thanking the Planning Commission for its service and emphasized that land-use decisions were critical to tourism, economic vitality, and quality of life throughout Fairfax County.

There was a discussion between Mr. Biggar and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that Fairfax County should pursue a conference center rather than a large convention center;
- Explanation that building a full convention center would be an inefficient use of taxpayer funds due to nearby competition, including the Washington, DC Convention Center, the Gaylord Convention Center, the National Conference Center, and facilities in Baltimore;
- Clarification that a properly designed conference center, with modern technology and security and approximately 140,000 square feet of space, would significantly increase Fairfax County's ability to attract meetings and conferences;
- Explanation that such a facility could expand the county's market opportunity by approximately 68 percent compared to current capacity;
- Explanation that Fairfax County lost its largest meeting space when the Sheraton Tysons closed after COVID 19, leaving the county without a major large-scale conference venue;
- Explanation that feasibility studies showed the county was roughly 20 years behind where it should be in conference infrastructure;
- Explanation that an independent hotel company conducted its own feasibility study and concluded that the county's original analysis was conservative and further supported the necessity for a conference center;
- Explanation that a conference center would prevent local events and organizations from leaving the county due to lack of space;
- Clarification that it would help retain corporate events currently going to Maryland or Washington, DC;
- Explanation that such a facility would allow Fairfax County to compete for a large portion of the regional meetings market that was currently inaccessible;
- Concern that tax collection from short-term rentals appeared inconsistent;
- Explanation that Fairfax County's short-term rental ordinance was well written and had been used as a model by other jurisdictions;
- Explanation that short-term rentals were required to be licensed, pay applicable taxes, and follow rules similar to hotels;
- Clarification that short-term rentals needed to pay their fair share of taxes and comply with regulations to address issues like parking, noise, and absentee ownership;
- Clarification that some short-term rental platforms had not fully complied with tax collection requirements, resulting in incomplete reporting and payment;

- Explanation that it was difficult to determine the full scope of unpaid taxes because platforms did not always share data with the county;
- Explanation that apartment buildings using short-term rentals instead of long-term leasing to avoid flooding the rental market fell into a similar category and created an additional challenge for tax enforcement;
- Clarification that some apartment buildings in Fairfax County were intentionally developed for short-term rental use;
- Explanation that these properties were required to obtain appropriate county permits and pay applicable taxes, which differed from traditional residential permitting;
- Explanation that external attractions played a significant role, especially for leisure and weekend visitors;
- Explanation that Visit Fairfax strategically marketed Fairfax County as a more affordable and convenient alternative to Washington, D.C., particularly during major regional events like the Cherry Blossom Festival;
- Clarification that digital advertising targeted visitors interested in D.C. events and encouraged them to stay in Fairfax County due to lower hotel and food costs;
- Clarification that Fairfax County's shopping, historical sites, and unique attractions such as Mount Vernon and the Steven F. Udvar-Hazy Center as key selling points;
- Explanation that Visit Fairfax regularly worked with developers and coordinated with planning staff; and
- Explanation that the organization provided tourism data and market insights to help developers determine hotel type, size, and location.

//

SE-2025-HM-00001– COMSTOCK RESTON STATION HOLDINGS LC
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on January 14, 2026.)

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter explained that regulating signage was complex because it involved balancing brightness, projected light, and surrounding context such as location, height, and day versus night conditions. He noted that signs function differently from typical land-use issues and required careful design rather than simple compromises. Concerns had been raised from both residents about overly bright signs and businesses about standards being too restrictive. Staff had recommended lowering luminance levels, and additional adjustments by time and context were being considered, given the ongoing evaluation and need for further refinement.

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE-2025-HM-00001 TO FEBRUARY 25, 2026, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR COMMENTS.

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

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner noted that there were no scheduled committee meetings for the following evening. Committees would be formally established at the next meeting on February 4. Commissioners were reminded that Statements of Economic Interest must be submitted no later than Monday, with encouragement to submit them as soon as possible to avoid any issues. Additionally, it was announced that on March 11, Victor Hoskins, President and CEO of the Economic Development Authority, would join the Commission for a discussion similar to the one held that evening.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. 2232-2025-SP-00003 - LINCOLN LEWIS VANNOY ODOR CONTROL FACILITY PROJECT
2. FDPA-2022-DR-00006 (RZPA-2025- DR-00027) - FCGP- METRO DEVELOPMENT LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

2232-2025-SP-00003 - LINCOLN LEWIS VANNOY ODOR CONTROL FACILITY PROJECT.- Appl. to consider the proposal by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). The Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) is requesting 2232 approval for the replacement and modification of an existing odor control facility. The facility is located at 5426 Willow Springs School Road, Fairfax VA 22030. Tax Map: 66-2 ((1)) 4B1. Springfield District. Area III. SPRINGFIELD 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 approval of 2232-2025-SP-00003.

Commissioner Thomas deferred making preliminary comments on the application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Ali; Salem Bush, Branch Chief, PD, DPD; Phillip Hunt, Wastewater Design and Construction Division, Capital Facilities, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES); Andrew MacNeill, Michael Baker International (MBI); Jill DiBattista, MBI; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation from staff that required advertisements and notifications had been sent to surrounding communities prior to the Planning Commission meeting;
- Clarification from the applicant that no direct public outreach had yet occurred because the project was still in the early design phase and plans were not finalized;
- Explanation that there was no fixed date, but outreach was expected around mid-February once the project reached approximately 70% design;
- Concern that applicant outreach typically occurred before a 2232 hearing;
- Explanation that early outreach was preferred, but County-required notices and advertisements had been sent prior to the hearing, and no community objections had been received;
- Clarification that the applicant wished to wait for more complete construction details before conducting broader outreach;
- Explanation that the chemical tanks were double-lined and sat on a concrete slab with a sunken secondary containment area capable of holding more than 110% of the tank volume;
- Explanation that all piping was fully contained within steel casing pipes for additional protection;
- Explanation that odor control systems were commonly designed as outdoor installations, with weather protection measures such as heat taping to ensure functionality in cold conditions;
- Explanation that hydrogen sulfide odors were generated by the pressure sewer along Braddock Road and nearby communities, particularly at discharge manholes where pressure flow transitioned to gravity flow;
- Clarification that the odor control system treated the sewer with chemicals which reduced those odors;
- Clarification that the existing system had to remain active during construction because shutting it down would immediately cause odor issues, which was why a full replacement system was required rather than a retrofit;
- Explanation that the closest homes were approximately a quarter mile away, with a wooded buffer between the site and residences;
- Explanation that odor complaints had occurred downstream, which originally led to installation of the existing system in the early 1990s;
- Explanation that the typical design life for such systems was approximately 50 years;
- Concern that the Commission typically heard from the community during public hearings and asked what recourse residents would have if concerns arose after the decision;
- Explanation that the application had an expiration date of March 17 and that there was still time to defer, re-advertise, and hold another public hearing if necessary;
- Clarification that while public outreach was not required under the 2232 process, additional changes could potentially occur later during site plan review, depending on DPWES;
- Explanation that if no action occurred by March 17, the application would be automatically approved unless another public hearing was advertised and held before that date; and

- Explanation that adding an outreach commitment to nearby residents, coordinated with the Supervisor's office, to ensure community awareness would not be a formal condition of approval unless DPWES voluntarily committed to it.

Further discussion between Commissioners regarding the following:

- That the improvements were necessary, beneficial, and located on a wooded five-acre site near schools, fields, and trails;
- Clarification that no feedback had been received from the community;
- Explanation that the footprint remained the same and the project represented improved technology; and
- Requested the record reflect that outreach occurred and no responses were received and that additional outreach would occur at the 70% design stage.

Following the public hearing, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers. Chair inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers.

With no speaker testimony presented, there being no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Thomas to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Thomas MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE APPLICATION 2232-2025-SP-00003 BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND REASONS:

- THE SUBJECT PROPOSAL BY DPWES TO RENOVATE AN EXISTING ODOR CONTROL FACILITY, LOCATED AT WILLOW SPRINGS SCHOOL ROAD AND BRADDOCK ROAD IN FAIRFAX, SATISFIES THE CRITERIA OF GENERAL OR APPROXIMATE LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AS SPECIFIED IN *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED JANUARY 14, 2026.

Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

FDPA-2022-DR-00006 (RZPA-2025- DR-00027) - FCGP-METRO DEVELOPMENT LLC.- FDPA Appl. to amend the previously approved final development plan associated with RZ-2022-DR-00006 to reallocate 23,326 sq. ft. of residential gross floor area from Building A to Blocks E, G, and H. Located at 7040 Haycock Rd. on approx. 23.99 ac. of land zoned PRM and HC. Dranesville District. Tax Map 40-3 ((45)) 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, and 40-4 ((47)) 2, 18, 19, and 20.
DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Bernard S. Suchicital, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavits dated December 23, 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 FDPA-2022-DR-00006 (RZPA-2025- DR-00027).

Mr. Suchicital gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

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

- Concerns about safety, particularly pedestrian crossings;
- Explanation that the original rezoning required coordination with the community, the County, and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to improve pedestrian and trail facilities across the bridge;
- Explanation of the timelines tied to easements, dedications, and right-of-way acquisition could trigger a cash contribution if unmet;
- Clarification that a proffer interpretation request had been submitted to allow additional time to secure the needed easements and avoid a cash-in-lieu contribution, ensuring the applicant remained involved through construction;
- Explanation that construction would involve temporary noise and traffic disruptions;
- Clarification that the development was subject to strict proffers and conditions governing construction hours, noise limits, and coordination with residents and the supervisor's office;
- Explanation that the building was constrained by a proffered minimum and maximum unit range, and that reducing gross floor area (GFA) would not affect that approved range;
- Explanation that the square footage reduction could come from common areas, lobbies, amenities, hallways, or rooftop features, rather than unit count;

- Clarification that the change could result in fewer but larger units, or more units with smaller sizes, as long as the total unit count stayed within the proffered range;
- Explanation that the final configuration would be determined during design, but would remain consistent with the approved minimum and maximum commitments;
- Explanation that the initial plans in proffer 51 referred to the site plan associated with the Ramada property development;
- Explanation that the VDOT had ultimate approval authority on the required waivers and modifications;
- Explanation that the timeframe was negotiated during the rezoning process, with both the county and applicant believing 24 months would be sufficient;
- Clarification they had submitted the site plan early to get ahead of the timeline, but delays occurred during agency review, largely outside the applicant's control;
- Clarification that Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) had worked closely with the developer, but final decisions rested with VDOT;
- Explanation that the formal mechanism for extending the proffer deadline was through a proffer interpretation request, which sought an additional 12 month extension;
- Clarification that there was no commitment from VDOT to approve the necessary items within that extension period;
- Concern that expiring proffers, especially those dependent on external agencies like VDOT, could leave communities without the benefits they were promised;
- Concerns about the lack of clarity and transparency around how commitments were documented, negotiated, and enforced when extensions were needed;
- Explanation that the current action only concerned GFA, not reopening proffers;
- Explanation that submitting a proffer interpretation request was the correct procedural step and that staff would determine whether it could be approved administratively or would require reopening the proffers;
- Explanation that staff was aware of the issue and would follow up with FCDOT;
- Explanation that all placemaking and streetscape proffers remained unchanged and fully in effect; and
- Clarification that the only request was the transfer of approximately 23,000 square feet of GFA, with no alteration to design commitments or delivery of public improvements.

Following the public hearing, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers. Chair inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers.

With no speaker testimony presented, there being no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Batchelor-Causey to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Batchelor-Causey requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the development conditions dated January 14, 2026.

Bernard S. Suchicital, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C., affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated January 14, 2026.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 2022-DR-00006, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JANUARY 14, 2026.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioners Hancock, Sargeant, and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

Before concluding, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner emphasized the importance of public engagement in the 2232 process. He stated that the Commission expected meaningful outreach to occur before 2232 applications came before the Commission, even if that outreach happened at a preliminary stage prior to 70% design.

He explained that part of the Commission's responsibility was ensuring the public had been adequately informed so that, when residents were given an opportunity to speak, they could do so with a clear understanding of the proposal and raise specific, informed concerns based on prior interactions with staff.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair
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: April 29, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 5 day of May 2026, by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028