MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2026

PRESENT: 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
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: Alyssa Batchelor-Causey, Dranesville District
James Thomas, Springfield District

OTHERS: Laura Ghosh, Chief, Active Transportation Section,
Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Michael Lynskey, Planning Division (PD),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Michael W. Garcia, Chief, Transportation Planning Section,
Transportation Planning Division
St. Clair Williams, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), DPD
Savannah Murray, ZED, DPD
Nicholas Cicero, ZED, DPD
Cathy Lewis, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission,
Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Jordyn Crane, Administration, DCS

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., by 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 explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included commission business consisting of one decision only and four public hearings.

//

PA 2025-CW-T1 (PA-2025-00001) – ACTIVE FAIRFAX TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on March 11, 2026.)

Commissioner Sargeant thanked county staff for their work on the Active Fairfax Transportation Plan Study, noting that it had been developed as a living document intended to guide the county's transportation planning efforts for years to come. He gave special recognition to Graham Owen, Michael Lynskey, Laura Ghosh, and Michael Garcia, describing them as the primary team supporting the effort, particularly in addressing environmental considerations such as stream crossings and other related concerns. He also commended their ability to collaborate across county departments to effectively respond to community input and planning needs. In addition, he expressed appreciation to the community leaders and residents who participated in the March 11 public hearing, noting that their feedback had been very valuable.

Commissioner Sargeant requested that Laura Ghosh, Chief, Active Transportation Section, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, give a brief presentation on the changes and considerations made since the March 11, 2026, meeting.

There was a discussion between Ms. Ghosh; Michael W. Garcia, Chief, Transportation Planning Section, Transportation Planning Division; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation of the two-stage environmental review process, including:
  - Stage 1: Preliminary environmental discovery to identify sensitive environmental, cultural, or historical resources; and
  - Stage 2: Detailed environmental, cultural, and historical review prior to final design.
- Explanation of the four key areas in the updated plan, including:
  - Revisions to map notes in Appendix 3 clarifying that trail locations were conceptual and subject to further study;
  - Added language emphasized the necessity to avoid or mitigate environmental impacts alongside community preferences and engineering considerations;
  - Repeated environmental review requirements within the appendix text for clarity; and
  - Clarifications that certain trail recommendations required additional location and alignment studies before final decisions.
- Explanation that the revisions provided an environmental incentive and framework to better assess impacts before final decisions were made;
- Explanation that Map Note 2 applied specifically to trails through open space and stream valleys;
- Explanation that those trails could vary widely in design depending on context, ranging from:
  - Narrow natural surface trails; and
  - To wider shared or dual-use facilities in more active or urbanized locations.
- Clarification that tables 1-3 only applied to trails along roads including:
  - Trails in special planning areas;
  - Trails along other roads; and
  - Neighborhood connectors.

- Explanation that for road-based trails, the plan often recommended:
  - A primary facility on one side of the road; and
  - A secondary or alternative facility on the other side.
- Explanation that for open space and stream valley trails:
  - Only one trail facility would be planned, not multiple alternatives; and
  - Therefore, there was no concept of main vs alternative facilities in those areas.
- Clarification that open space trails were context-sensitive and flexible;
- Explanation that they do not follow the same dual-facility framework used for road-based trails;
- Explanation that the language was developed through a collaborative process, including:
  - Input from community suggestions;
  - Coordination with environmental specialists;
  - Consultation with transportation capital projects and traffic engineering staff; and
  - Consideration of how the language would function during development review.
- Concerns that projects do not advance too far before environmental or site constraints were identified;
- Explanation of the two-step review framework including:
  - Early-stage (preliminary) review, which would:
    - Use existing data sources like GIS, local/state/federal information;
    - Identify potential environmental sensitivities; and
    - Include outreach to the community for local knowledge.
  - Later-stage detailed review, which would:
    - Occur after a project was funded;
    - Involve environmental specialists; and
    - Provide in-depth analysis of species, habitats, and other constraints.
- Clarification that the early review was meant to flag potential issues before committing resources;
- Explanation that it did not replace the more detailed environmental analysis conducted later;
- Explanation that the overall goal was to create a two-pronged approach that improved early awareness while still ensuring thorough technical evaluation at later stage;
- Explanation that a follow-on motion to formally direct coordination among departments was not needed as processes already existed;
- Explanation that the county conducted independent project reviews that involved multiple agencies, including Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), Park Authority, and Board offices;
- Clarification that the newly discussed approach added value by:
  - Introducing earlier-stage awareness and evaluation; and
  - Providing better understanding before projects enter the formal review process
- Clarification that the updated language maintained the ability to include paved trails in open space where appropriate;
- Explanation that it introduced a preliminary environmental discovery process to better inform decisions;
- Explanation that it ensured that decisions would be based on both transportation needs and environmental considerations; and

- Explanation that the approach allowed the Board of Supervisors to make informed decisions with better information upfront.

Commissioner Sargeant MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2025-CW-T1, AS DESCRIBED ON PAGES 18 AND 19, AND IN ATTACHMENTS 1 THROUGH 3, OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2026, WITH ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MODIFICATIONS CONTAINED IN THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALTERNATIVE ATTACHMENT, DATED MARCH 18, 2026. THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION TOOLKIT, FOUND IN ATTACHMENT 4 OF THE STAFF REPORT, IS TO BE A SEPARATE DOCUMENT INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE PLAN.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Sargeant proceeded with a follow-on motion and MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FCDOT) STAFF TO WORK WITH LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND OTHER AGENCIES TO EVALUATE THE PROVISIONS IN THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL (PFM) WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND TRAILS PLAN (ATTP), TO IDENTIFY NECESSARY UPDATES TO 1) REFERENCE THE ATTP, 2) REQUIRE SIDEWALKS ON BOTH SIDES OF ALL STREETS, WHERE APPROPRIATE, AND 3) UPDATE THE SIDEWALK AND TRAIL STANDARDS FOR WIDTH AND MATERIALS TO ALIGN WITH THE ATTP AND VDOT'S STANDARDS FOR ACCEPTANCE.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Sargeant proceeded with a follow-on motion and MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT FCDOT STAFF WORK WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ZONING ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER AGENCIES TO EVALUATE THE ZONING ORDINANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND TRAILS PLAN (ATTP), TO IDENTIFY NECESSARY UPDATES TO 1) REFERENCE THE ATTP, AND 2) UPDATE THE SIDEWALK AND TRAIL STANDARDS TO ALIGN WITH THE ATTP AND VDOT'S STANDARDS FOR ACCEPTANCE.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. SE-2025-PR-00034 - INSIGHT MEMORY CARE CENTER
2. SE-2020-MV-008 - NOVA PETROLEUM REALTY, LLC
3. RZ-2025-FR-00009 - JOSHUA M. AND MADISON G. PATTERSON
4. PCA 84-L-020-28 /CDPA-84-L-020- 09/ FDPA-84-L-020-02-17 (RZPA-2024-FR-00030) - KINGSTOWNE M&N LP AND FEDERAL REALTY PARTNERS LP

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

SE-2025-PR-00034 - INSIGHT MEMORY CARE CENTER- SE
Appl. to permit a adult day care center. Located on approx. 2.02 ac. of land zoned C-3. Providence District. Tax Map 49-3 ((21)) 1. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sasha Brauer, Applicant's Agent, Odin Feldman Plittleman, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 9, 2026.

Savannah Murray, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of SE-2025-PR-00034.

Ms. Brauer gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Murray; Ms. Brauer; Angela A. Bailey, Applicant; David B. Sidell, Project Manager, Cresa, LLC; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the adult daycare entrance would be located at the back of the Red Cross building;
- Clarification that the entrance would serve as the only access point for participants;
- Clarification that the design ensured the space would be secure and controlled;
- Explanation that the generator supported life safety systems for the building;
- Explanation that it was tested weekly for a short duration;
- Explanation that testing typically occurred once a week in the early morning;
- Explanation that while the generator was present, its operation would be limited and routine, minimizing impact on the outdoor space;

- The applicant explained that:
  - A designated staff member would manage all drop-offs and pickups;
  - Participants typically arrived between 7:30 AM and 9:30 AM;
  - Programming began between 9:30 AM and 10:00 AM, so timely arrival was encouraged;
  - Staff would remain with any participant who had not yet been picked up;
  - At least two staff members would always be on-site while participants were present; and
  - Staff would stay until the participant was safely picked up, maintaining communication with families.
- Explanation that the facility would use access-controlled entry systems;
- Clarification that the entry and exit would be monitored and restricted;
- Explanation that cameras had been considered, especially for perimeter security;
- Explanation that in memory care settings, cameras could sometimes distress participants
- Clarification that additional security measure included:
  - Staff would remain with any participant who had not yet been picked up;
  - At least two staff members would always be on-site while participants were present; and
  - Staff would stay until the participant was safely picked up, maintaining communication with families.
- Explanation that in emergency situations, staff would escort participants and followed established safety procedures;
- Explanation of the emergency protocols and that staff would be trained on safe evacuation and response procedures as part of the relocation plan;
- Concerns about the facility's location near major roads and the risk that individuals with memory impairments might unexpectedly leave the building;
- Explanation that the applicant would establish a working relationship with local public safety and first responders;
- Explanation that first responders would be made aware that the facility served individuals with cognitive impairments, which allowed for quicker and more informed response if needed;
- Explanation that the facility had formal elopement procedures including:
  - Maintaining up-to-date photographs of all participants;
  - Preparing emergency packets that could be quickly shared with responders; and
  - Having protocols ready to rapidly distribute identifying information if someone goes missing.
- Explanation of additional proactive safety measures which included:
  - Routine accountability checks throughout the day;
  - High staff-to-participant ratios; and
  - Continuous staff supervision.

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 Hancock to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Hancock requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated March 5, 2026.

Ms. Brauer affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated March 5, 2026.

Commissioner Hancock stated that the applicant, Insight Memory Care Center, requested approval of a special exception to permit an adult daycare facility providing much-needed memory care services. He noted that safety considerations had been addressed, including the management of both the center and the outdoor area. He further explained that the site was located within an established office park with no identified impacts on adjacent uses, that there was no community opposition, and that the proposal had received a recommendation from the Healthcare Advisory Board. Based on these factors, he indicated support for moving forward.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE-2025-PR-00034, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 5, 2026.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioners Landgraf, Sargeant, and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

//

SE-2020-MV-008 - NOVA PETROLEUM REALTY, LLC- SE Appl. to permit a vehicle fueling station with waiver for minimum lot size requirements. Located on approx. 40,659 sq. ft. of land zoned C-8 and HC. Mount Vernon District. Tax Map 101-3 ((11)) 1 and 1B. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kathryn R. Taylor, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavit dated March 4, 2026.

Savannah Murray, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of SE-2020-MV-008.

Ms. Taylor gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Murray; Ms. Taylor; Gregory J. Ellwood, Civil Engineer, Bohler Engineering VA, LLC; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that this application was set to go in front of the Board of Supervisors on May 5, 2026;
- Explanation that:
  - Signage would comply with Richmond Highway design guidelines;
  - There were development conditions requiring coordination with the county's revitalization section;
  - Signage would be integrated into a screening wall, rather than using large poles or freestanding signs; and
  - The goal was to create a more aesthetic, cohesive appearance consistent with the corridor.
- Explanation that the pricing signage would be placed within the corner of the screening wall near the intersection;
- Clarification that signage and branding elements would be limited and controlled in accordance with guidelines;
- Clarification that lighting would be minimal and included the following:
  - Canopy lighting;
  - Building-mounted lighting; and
  - No additional standalone lighting features.
- Explanation that lighting would not impact adjacent housing;
- Explanation that it would comply with all zoning code requirements;
- Explanation that coordination with Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was ongoing;
- Explanation that planned improvements were d4esigned to align with future roadway work;
- Clarification that interim improvements focused on sidewalks and safe connections, while avoiding conflicts with upcoming VDOT construction;
- Clarification that the proposed stormwater system was fully committed and would be implemented;
- Explanation that the development conditions required construction to be in substantial conformance with the approved plan;
- Explanation that a hydrodynamic separator would be installed to treat runoff, particularly suited for gas station uses involving oils and fuel;
- Clarification that an urban bioretention facility would also be included to treat rooftop runoff;
- Explanation that together, these systems would manage both water quality and quantity on-site;
- Explanation that the word potential referred only to the exact location on the plan, not whether the system would be installed;
- Explanation that the stormwater infrastructure itself was required and guaranteed as part of the project; and
- Explanation that the electric vehicle chargers on the application site were level 2.

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 Clarke to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Clarke requested that the applicant confirm for the record, their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated March 5, 2026.

Ms. Brauer affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated March 5, 2026.

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

- SE-2020-MV-008, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED MARCH 5, 2026;
- WAIVER OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA; AND
- MODIFICATION OF THE MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK AS SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT.

Commissioners Bennett, Wang and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

//

RZ-2025-FR-00009 - JOSHUA M. AND MADISON G. PATTERSON- RZ Appl. to rezone from R-1 and HC to R-4 and HC to permit construction of up to four single-family detached dwellings with an overall density of 3.22 du/ac. Located on the corner lot at the intersection of Summerton Way and Elder Way on approx. 1.24 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential; 3-4 du/ac. Franconia District. Tax Map 90-2 ((12)) 2. FRANCONIA DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Gregory J. Budnik, Applicant's Agent, GJB Engineering, Inc., reaffirmed the affidavit dated January 26, 2026 (sic); however, the affidavit on file was dated January 28, 2026.

St. Clair Williams, 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 staff recommended approval of RZ-2025-FR-00009.

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

There was a discussion between Mr. Budnik; Mr. Williams; Cathy Lewis, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD; Joshua M. Patterson, Applicant; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that outreach had been conducted;
- Explanation that a team member familiar with the neighborhood had personally engaged with nearby residents;
- Summarization of the outreach included the following:
    - The adjacent property owners to the south expressed verbal support;
    - The corner property to the north also expressed support;
    - The northeast neighbor participated in a meeting and indicated support; and
    - The southeast adjacent property owner met with the applicant and an arborist to review tree impacts.
- Explanation that the project design was modified based on feedback from one of these meetings, particularly regarding tree protection;
- Clarification that the nearby school was not directly contacted, as staff had indicated there were no concerns from the school;
- Concerns about potential noise and property impacts during construction, particularly from nearby residents;
- Explanation that construction would occur in a sequential and limited manner, rather than a large-scale, simultaneous buildout;
- Explanation that construction would likely begin with one home rather than the entire site at once;
- Clarification that the project would resemble building a few individual homes, not a full subdivision development;
- Explanation that construction would follow standard residential building practices;
- Explanation that all activity would comply with the county's noise ordinance;
- Explanation that no unusual activities such as blasting or specialized heavy equipment was anticipated;
- Explanation that the level of disruption was expected to be similar to typical single-family home construction;
- Clarification that the site had sufficient space to accommodate construction vehicles and equipment on-site, minimizing street congestion;
- Explanation that the reason why trees were not planted along the southern boundary was related to the stormwater facility design requirements;
- Clarification that certain structures and regulations per the Public Facilities Manual (PFM) restricted tree planting in that area;
- Explanation that some vegetation may be allowed, but tree placement was constrained;
- Explanation that a comprehensive review of potential Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Low Impact Development (LID) strategies had been conducted;
- Explanation that soil conditions and groundwater levels on the site limit the use of infiltration-based stormwater solutions;
- Explanation that many preferred stormwater techniques rely on infiltration, which was not feasible here;
- The applicant committed to:

  - Continuing coordination with Land Development Services (LDS) during the next design phase;
  - Re-evaluating all possible on-site stormwater options; and
  - Attempting to minimize or avoid reliance on nutrient credits where possible.
- However, the applicant acknowledged that:
  - Based on current constraints, it may be necessary to rely on off-site nutrient credits as a fallback; and
  - Waivers or modifications could be required if full on-site treatment cannot be achieved.
- Staff confirmed that:
  - The applicant had provided a thorough technical analysis;
  - There were legitimate site constraints limiting full on-site stormwater treatment; and
  - Staff supported continued evaluation of all feasible options.
- Staff added that:
  - If full compliance cannot be met on-site, they supported the use of off-site nutrient credits; and
  - The applicant had formally committed to that approach if needed.

Following the public hearing, which included testimonies from 2 speakers, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers wishing to speak.

Mr. Budnik provided closing remarks and acknowledged speakers' testimonies.

Commissioner Cortina asked if there was a required timeline to remove the existing house. Staff clarified that there was no timing requirement in the proffers; the option to remove and replace the house was only shown on the plan and was left to the applicant's discretion.

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 Landgraf to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Landgraf thanked staff and the applicant for their work on the project, noting that considerable time was spent addressing stormwater management, even though full infiltration was not feasible due to soil conditions. He explained that the proposal aimed to mitigate impacts as much as possible while not fully maximizing the allowable density. He highlighted improvements such as splitting driveway access onto two streets and enhancing sidewalks and crosswalks, particularly at the Somerton and Elder intersection, which had been a concern. He also noted that the project was reviewed by the Franconia District Land Use Committee, where it received majority support, including from adjacent homeowners associations, and concluded that the proposal reflected meaningful improvements and responsiveness to community input.

Commissioner Landgraf MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF RZ-2025-FR-00009, SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED FEBRUARY 24, 2026.

Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

//

PCA 84-L-020-28 /CDPA-84-L-020-09/ FDPA-84-L-020-02-17 (RZPA-2024-FR-00030) - KINGSTOWNE M&N LP AND FEDERAL REALTY PARTNERS LP- PCA, CDPA and FDPA Appl(s). to amend the proffers, conceptual development plan, and second final development plan for RZ-84-L-020, previously approved for mixed-use development to eliminate the non-residential uses and associated modifications to proffers and site design at an overall intensity of 3.2 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Located on the S. side of Kingstowne Village Pkwy. approx. 1,650 ft. W. of its intersection with South Van Dorn St. on approx. 5.46 ac. of land zoned PDC and NR. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed-Use. Franconia (formerly Lee District) District. Tax Map 91-2 ((1)) 36B and 36G (pt.). FRANCONIA DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kelly A. Posusney, Applicant's Agent, DLA Piper LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 4, 2026.

Nicholas Cicero, 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 staff recommended approval of PCA 84-L-020-28/CDPA-84-L-020- 09/FDPA-84-L-020-02-17.

Ms. Posusney gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Posusney; Mr. Cicero; Cathy Lewis, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD; Jonathan B. Halle, Applicant, Kingstowne M&N LP; Kevin R. Fellin, Civil Engineer, Galloway & Company AE Services, LLC; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation regarding who would maintain the park after construction;
- The applicant explained that:
  - Federal Realty Partners owns the plaza parcel;
  - The multifamily developer would construct the park; and
  - After construction, the park would be turned over to Federal Realty
- The applicant noted that:

  - The park would be privately maintained; and
  - It would include a public access easement, similar to other privately owned public spaces in the county.
- Concerns that the proposal appeared to offer more flexibility for the applicant;
- Concerns that there were potentially fewer amenities for residents;
- Concerns that the building had increased by approximately 31,000 square feet without a clear benefit;
- Explanation that the site had gone through multiple redevelopment attempts over decades, originally planned for office use;
- Explanation that a more ambitious mixed-use plan, including retail and multiple buildings was proposed around 2016 but was not financially viable;
- Explanation that a revised plan in 2020 reduced density, square footage, and retail, but still did not move forward;
- Explanation that the current proposal reflects what was financially feasible and buildable today;
- Explanation that retail was reduced because it was difficult to compete with existing retail in Kingstowne Town Center;
- Explanation that the previously proposed ice rink was removed due to lack of viability;
- Clarification that the design now focused on a more functional and flexible pedestrian plaza with year-round usability;
- Clarification that the plan had been generally well received by the Franconia Land Use Committee;
- Regarding the additional square footage:
  - It resulted from architectural refinements, such as building layout adjustments and internal spaces; and
  - Some new amenities were added, including:
    - Indoor and outdoor pools; and
    - Enhanced courtyard spaces.
- Explanation that the building had been significantly upgraded in amenities compared to prior versions;
  - Additions include:
    - Indoor pool;
    - Larger courtyards;
    - Expanded fitness areas; and
    - Rooftop terrace with gathering space, grills, TVs, and bar areas.
  - The project was now designed to be highly amenitized, which accounts for the added square footage.
- Explanation that the additional design changes included:
  - Relocating the main entrance closer to the plaza;
  - Creating stronger pedestrian connections and interaction with the plaza; and
  - Replacing retail space with resident-focused amenity areas to improve usability and cohesion.
- Clarification of the interim condition if full buildout was delayed;
- Explanation that the intent was to build both phases back-to-back;

- Explanation that if there was a delay beyond 90 days, the interim area would be seeded and maintained as open lawn space;
- Explanation that this prevented the site from becoming vacant or construction debris-filled;
- Concerns about the risk of delays, noting that projects sometimes do not move forward as intended;
- Concerns that interim conditions could persist longer than expected;
- Concerns that there may be opportunities to improve the design of interim or blank building areas, such as incorporating murals or more intentional features;
- Explanation that the difference in the student generation projection was likely due to updates in the school system's student generation formulas;
- Explanation that these formulas were periodically adjusted based on unit types and demographic trends;
- Clarification that in the 2020 proposal, the 55+ component was introduced later in the process;
- Explanation why there were two access points instead of one;
- Explanation that two access points support the phased construction approach, which allowed each building to function independently;
- Explanation that it would improve circulation and efficiency for vehicles entering and exiting the site;
- Clarification that the preference was largely based on design feasibility and phasing, rather than a formal traffic study;
- Explanation that separate entrances were needed because garage structures were built in phases and cannot easily share access initially;
- Explanation that a general guideline was one entrance per 500 parking spaces, which supported having two entrances for this project;
- Additional justification included:
    - Maintaining an entrance on Kingstowne Village Parkway, which had been part of long-standing plans;
    - Helping to distribute traffic more evenly; and
    - Reducing congestion and conflicts in the rear service/loading areas of the existing shopping center.
- Concerns regarding phasing and undeveloped portions of the site; and
- Concerns about interim conditions and community impact.

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

Staff provided closing remarks addressing the activation of the vacant parcel during phased development.

- They explained that prior discussions with the Supervisor's Office had explored opportunities to activate the space while the second apartment building was pending construction; and

- Ideas included temporary uses such as outdoor movie nights projected onto the parking garage wall and other community-oriented activities to keep the area engaged and functional.

Staff noted that they plan to continue coordination with the Supervisor's Office and the applicant following the meeting, with the goal of formalizing these concepts through proffers or notes on the conceptual plan. The intent was to establish a clear and proactive approach to interim activation before the project moves forward to the Board, ensuring the space remains beneficial to the community during the development process.

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 Landgraf to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Landgraf supported the proposal, noting it better integrates residential use with existing retail and park space. He acknowledged concerns about interim activation but expressed confidence in the phased construction plan. He confirmed that the first phase would include 328 units and the second phase 318 units, resulting in a slight majority of units delivered in the first phase and stated that the Supervisor would take the lead on addressing any remaining concerns about the space.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Landgraf requested that the applicant confirm for the record, their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated February 25, 2026.

Ms. Brauer affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated February 25, 2026.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA 84-L-020-28 AND THE ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT CDPA 84-L-020-09, CONSISTENT WITH PROFFERS DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2026.

Commissioners Cortina and Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

In a related action, the Planning Commission voted 10-0 (Commissioners Batchelor-Causey and Thomas were absent from the meeting) to approve FDPA 84-L-020-02-17, subject to the development conditions dated March 18, 2026.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 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: June 24, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 30 day of June 2026
by Nicole Blackwell

Notary Seal
Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028