MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 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
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: Joe LaHait, Deputy Director, Department of Management and Budget (DMB)
Tabatha Cole Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Sophia Fisher, Planning Division (PD), DPD
William Vannoy, Deputy Chief, Office of the Fire Marshal
Fairfax County Fire and Rescue (FCFR)
Bill Hicks, Director, Land Development Services (LDS)
Adam Nowaczyk, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), DPD
William Mayland, ZAD, DPD
Kazi Mohaimin, PD, DPD
Clara Johnson, Branch Chief, PD, DPD
Tom Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FXDOT)
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 the markup of FY 2027–FY 2031 Capital Improvement Program to the Board of Supervisors, and commission business consisting of seven public hearings.

//

MARK-UP ON THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) – FISCAL YEARS 2027 – 2031 ADVERTISED

Commissioner Sargeant made opening remarks where he gave a brief overview of the development of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) workshop. In addition, Commissioner Sargeant thanked Vice Chair Batchelor-Causey and staff for their hard work and recognized the contributions of Martha Reed, Joe Lahait, Mark Thomas, Amy Simon, Vrushali Oak, Martha Sansaver, and Salem Bush.

Commissioner Sargeant MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE ADVERTISED FAIRFAX COUNTY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 THROUGH 2031, WITH FUTURE FISCAL YEARS TO 2036.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was 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 STAFF TO IDENTIFY LONG-TERM FUNDING STRATEGIES AND RESOURCES TO INCREMENTALLY INCREASE THE BASELINE FOR CAPITAL RENEWAL PROJECTS. PRIORITIZING PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE AND SYSTEM RENEWAL IS A FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO THE HIGHER COSTS OF FULL RENOVATIONS OR FACILITY REPLACEMENTS. FURTHERMORE, MAINTAINING ASSETS IN A STATE OF GOOD REPAIR REDUCES THE COUNTY'S LONG-TERM RELIANCE ON BOND-FUNDED PROJECTS.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey seconded the motion.

Prior to the vote Chair Niedzielski-Eichner noted that staff had compiled a historical summary of past follow-on motions, which highlighted the Commission’s consistent focus on facility maintenance. He observed that the Commission had repeatedly emphasized to the Board that maintenance remains an ongoing priority. While acknowledging that progress had been made over time, he stated that more work was still needed and expressed support for the motion based on its intent to continue addressing those needs.

Commissioner Cortina agreed that facility maintenance had been a long-standing concern and noted that the county was now facing challenges in sustaining its pay-as-you-go funding for future capital renewals. She suggested that more bond funding needed to be directed toward major system replacements, such as Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and roofs, rather than primarily funding new facilities. While acknowledging that this approach may be less appealing, she emphasized that maintaining existing infrastructure was increasingly necessary given rising construction costs and the number of aging facilities.

Staff responded in agreement, noting that the commission had consistently highlighted the maintenance backlog and that recent budgets reflected a shift toward addressing it. They explained that the county was working to increase baseline funding, balance the use of bonds, cash, and explore additional financing options while maintaining affordability. Staff also noted a strategic shift toward prioritizing maintenance over new projects.

The commission proceeded to vote on the follow-on motion which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

//Commissioner Sargeant offered closing remarks, thanking his fellow Commissioners for their support on the follow-on motion and expressing interest in earlier coordination before the CIP advertisement, with future discussions to continue in collaboration with staff.

Commissioner Sargeant also recognized Martha Reed's 37 years of service with the county and her upcoming retirement. He praised her professionalism, patience, and ability to clearly explain complex financial and CIP-related issues, noting her significant impact on the Commission's work and expressing appreciation for her leadership and contributions.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner highlighted her approachability and willingness to answer all questions without judgment, despite the complexity of the process. He also thanked Commissioner Sargeant and the CIP Committee leadership for their work in advancing the recommendations to the Board.

//

Commissioner Hancock announced that the Planning Commission's Infrastructure Committee would meet on Thursday, April 9, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035, to discuss street lighting. This meeting would also be televised on Channel 16.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. AFR-2025-SU-00003- HICKOX LOCAL AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT
2. RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00011 - CIA-BEULAH STREET LLC
3. SSPA 2023-III-11UP (PA-2023-00047)- SAMUEL MORSE DRIVE
4. PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT – ZONING APPLICATION FEES AND THE PLANNED DISTRICT RECREATION MINIMUM EXPENDITURE
5. PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO APPENDIX Q (LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FEE SCHEDULE) OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA REGARDING ADJUSTMENT OF FEES

CHARGED BY LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR PLAN REVIEW, PERMITS AND INSPECTION SERVICES
6. PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, CHAPTER 62
7. PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, APPENDIX Q, SECTIONS D AND H

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

AFR-2025-SU-00003- HICKOX LOCAL AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT- Local A&F District Renewal Appl. authorized by Chapter 115 (County Code), effective June 30, 1983, to permit renewal of a previously approved agricultural and forestal district. Located at 15950, 16006, 16010, 16012 Route 29; 6852 Lady Adelaide Ct.; 6780 Bull Run Post Office Rd., Centreville, 20120 on approx. 80.94 ac. of land zoned RC, WSPOD and HD. Please call the Planning Division at 703-324-1380 after April 8, 2026, to obtain the A&F District Advisory Committee and Planning Commission recommendations. Sully District. Tax Map 53-3 ((7)) 32Z, 33Z, 64-1 ((4)) 7Z1, 7Z2, 7Z3, 7Z4, 64-1 ((7)) 31Z, 34Z, 35Z, 36Z, 37Z, 38Z, 39Z, 40Z, 41Z, 42Z. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sophia Fisher, Planning Division (PD), 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 AFR-2025-SU-00003.

John Hickox, Applicant, gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Fisher; Mr. Hickox; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns about manure storage and soil stability, noting potential issues with erosion near the Horse Trails area and asking about efforts to stabilize conditions;
- Explanation that:
  - Manure was regularly collected from horse stalls and stored temporarily before being reused; and
  - It was later spread across fields as fertilizer once properly dried and processed.
- Explanation that the conditions observed during inspection were not typical, as the visit occurred during winter when spreading was limited;
- Explanation that the manure pile appeared larger than usual due to seasonal constraints;

- Explanation that a tarp had been placed over the manure pile as a short-term mitigation measure;
- Explanation that for long-term improvements the installation of a specialized dumpster system was being explored;
- Explanation that this system would include aeration piping which would speed up drying and reducing bacteria;
- Clarification that short-term mitigation was already in place;
- Explanation that long-term solutions were being actively evaluated to improve management and reduce impacts;
- Explanation that a tarp was currently being used as a short-term solution preventing rainwater from soaking into the manure pile;
- Clarification that a tarp was only a temporary measure and that the long-term solution was to return to using a dumpster system;
- Explanation that the dumpster system would provide an impermeable surface and be covered to protect from rainwater, and better contained and managed manure;
- Explanation of operational challenges;
- Explanation that the manure pile was constantly changing due to it being added and removed;
- Further explanation that equipment like a front-end loader was needed for daily operations, requiring a durable and accessible system;
- Concerns about overgrazing in pastures 2 and 3 and the presence of buttercups, which could be harmful to horses;
- Explanation that:
    - The number of horses was within county-allowed limits based on acreage; and
    - The condition observed reflected a seasonal snapshot, not year-round conditions.
- Clarification that:
    - The identified pasture was used as a winter-feeding area, where:
        - Grass was not growing; and
        - Horses congregated and created heavier wear on the land.
    - This resulted in temporary overuse and visible soil disturbance.
- Explanation that the farm used rotational grazing practices, moving horses between pastures as conditions changed;
- Explanation that in spring, pastures recovered as horses were rotated out and vegetation regrew;
- Explanation regarding buttercups:
    - There had been no reported health issues among the horses; and
    - If toxic conditions were present, it would be quickly noticed by horse owners.
- Explanation that the applicant would be interested in exploring National Register designation further as part of long-term preservation efforts;
- Clarification that one additional dwelling was permitted under the condition and that the dwelling could be used for a family member or farm-related occupant;
- Explanation that agricultural operations typically allowed housing for workers by-right under zoning;

- Explanation that the condition allowed only one additional structure, even though zoning otherwise allowed more;
- Clarification that the limitation could potentially be revisited or reviewed if needed;
- Concerns about whether the proposal might be more restrictive than by-right zoning allowances; and
- Staff explained that they would review and clarify the language before the application proceeded to the Board of Supervisors.

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 Spain to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Spain shared positive remarks following the site visit, noting both the educational experience and the value of the property. She highlighted the applicant's stewardship of the land and praised the Bull Run Winery as a strong community asset and potential venue for events. She also emphasized the applicant's contribution to addressing affordable housing needs by providing housing for the winemaker and his family, reducing the burden of long-distance commuting. Commissioner Spain expressed support for further exploration of historic resource designation and clarification of zoning allowances related to on-site housing.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Spain requested that the applicant confirm for the record, their acceptance of the provisions contained in the proposed ordinance dated March 25, 2026.

Mr. Hickox affirmed acceptance of the provisions contained in the proposed ordinance dated March 25, 2026.

Commissioner Spain MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF A DISTRICT ORDINANCE RENEWING THE HICKOX LOCAL AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT, TO BE CODIFIED IN APPENDIX F OF THE *COUNTY CODE*, AS PROPOSED IN AFR 2025-SU-00003, PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 44 OF TITLE 15.2 OF THE CODE OF VIRGINIA AND CHAPTER 115 OF THE FAIRFAX *COUNTY CODE*, AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 25, 2026.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioners Batchelor-Causey, Cortina, Sargeant, and Wang seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Thomas was absent from the meeting.

//

RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00011 - CIA-BEULAH STREET LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from R-1, C-2, C-5 and HC to PDH-12 and HC to permit residential development with an overall density of 11.88 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) exclusive of bonus density for affordable and workforce dwellings and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located in the N.W. quadrant of the intersection of Beulah St. and Grovedale Dr. on approx. 6.82 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Office with an option for Residential up to 12 du/ac exclusive of bonus density for affordable and workforce dwellings. Franconia District. Tax Map 81-3 ((5)) 15, 15A, 15B, 15C, 17C and 17D.
FRANCONIA DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Lynne J. Strobel, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavit dated February 4, 2026.

Tabatha Cole, 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 RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00011.

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

There was a discussion between Ms. Cole; Ms. Strobel; William F. Johnson, Galloway & Company AE Services, LLC; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the connecting streets between parcels would use different pavement treatments;
- Explanation that this design was intended to discourage cut-through traffic;
- Additional design features included:
    - Creating a visual distinction between areas; and
    - Encouraging slower vehicle speeds.
- Explanation that bollards would be installed near playground areas, which would help protect pedestrians and children while reinforcing traffic calming measures;
- Explanation that the original plan included a connection to Grovedale, but this required approval from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT);
- Clarification that VDOT did not formally deny the request;
- Explanation that VDOT raised concerns and did not support the connection, but questioned its necessity;
- Explanation that VDOT noted that another access point already existed nearby;
- Clarification that the current plan showed the area as a vehicle turnaround instead of a full connection;
- Explanation that the applicant would continue working with VDOT to seek approval;
- Explanation that if the approval was obtained the connection could be added later during site plan review;

- Clarification that if it was not obtained then the turnaround would remain as designed;
- Explanation that VDOT did not deny the access request but raised concerns about the proximity to the KinderCare entrance;
- Clarification that the issues were related to access spacing requirement, not necessarily the use itself;
- Explanation of key details provided:
    - For a local street like Grovedale Drive, VDOT required 50 feet of spacing between access points;
    - The existing entrance was about 20 feet short of that requirement; and
    - The entrance predates current regulations, which likely explained why it existed today.
- Explanation that the connection would help improve circulation, but was not critical for site functionality;
- Explanation that the site could still operate effectively with:
    - Two other access points; and
    - Internal connection to adjacent properties.
- Clarification of the plan moving forward:
    - Continue working with VDOT during the site plan process;
    - If approved, the connection would be added; and
    - If not then the site would function without it.
- Explanation that the applicant had already coordinated with the neighboring property owner on access and design, and that there was a clear intent to continue collaboration moving forward.

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 Landgraf to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion Commissioner Landgraf thanked staff and the applicant for their work on what he described as a complex SP process in the Franconia Triangle. He noted that public input played a significant role in shaping the project, particularly in improving integration between the two parcels and enhancing pedestrian connectivity from Franconia Road through Grovedale and Beulah. He emphasized that these changes reflected strong collaboration and responsiveness to community feedback. While the Land Use Committee had some concerns about the loss of a second entrance, especially since one previously existed, the project ultimately received approval. Commis8sioner Landgraf concluded that the revisions and coordination resulted in a well-designed project.

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

- RZ-2025-FR-00011 AND ITS ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MARCH 20, 2026;
- WAIVER OF THE 200 SQUARE FOOT PRIVACY YARD FOR REAR LOAD TOWNHOMES; AND
- WAIVER OF THE PRIVATE STREET WHICH EXCEEDS 600 FEET IN LENGTH.

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 11-0 (COMMISSIONER THOMAS WAS ABSENT FROM THE MEETING) TO APPROVE FDP-2025-FR-00011.

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

//

SSPA 2023-III-11UP (PA-2023-00047)- SAMUEL MORSE DRIVE- Concerns approx. 5 ac. located at 1810, 1825, and 1850 Samuel Morse Drive in the Wiehle-Reston East Transit Station Area (Tax Map #18-3 ((6)) 7A, 7B, and 7C) in the Hunter Mill Supervisor District. The area is planned for office, industrial, institutional and mixed-use, at an intensity between 0.5 to 1.0 FAR. The amendment will consider adding an option for residential use up to 1.4 FAR. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified.
HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Kazi Mohaimin, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of SSPA 2023-III-11UP.

Kelly A. Posusney, DLA Piper LLP, Applicant's Agent, gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Mohaimin; Ms. Posusney; Clara Johnson, PD, DPD; Tom Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the project included affordable housing commitments consistent with the Reston plan;
- Explanation that workforce housing would be provided through the sliding scale approach;

- Explanation that the stacked townhomes did not trigger the Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance due to being under 50 units;
- Clarification that multifamily units were not subject to that ordinance either;
- Explanation that all affordability was provided through the workforce dwelling unit program;
- Clarification that this application was an SSPA which focused on the overall vision for the area;
- Clarification that specific details, including affordability requirements, would be addressed later during the rezoning phase;
- Clarification that the Zoning Ordinance sets the rules, while design guidelines illustrate how to achieve them;
- Explanation that discussion regarding stormwater management was more appropriate at the rezoning stage;
- Explanation that the applicants engineering team had been working closely with county staff;
- Clarification that the project was expected to meet the maximum feasible stormwater measures;
- Explanation that full compliance with certain standards may not be achievable on site;
- Clarification that those finding and limitations would be documented and addressed during rezoning;
- Clarification that Pulte Group developed a nearby project Lofts 1, but was not involved in this application;
- Clarification that the adjacent parcel office building site had a different property owner;
- Explanation that the applicant had been actively working with the neighboring property owner and staff;
- Explanation that the goal was to ensure compatible design, scale, and streetscape continuity;
- Explanation that each developer was responsible for building their portion of the shared street;
- Explanation that final construction would depend on phasing and sequencing between projects;
- Explanation that coordination was required due to grading and safety considerations;
- Explanation that construction access would be addressed later during the site plan review and building permit stage;
- Explanation about the spacing between Samuel Morse Drive and Easterly Road;
- Concerns due to curve alignment and limited distance between intersections;
- Explanation that once Easterly Road was constructed Samuel Morse would close;
- Explanation that staff did not make a firm recommendation yet and instead included flexible language for further evaluation during zoning;
- Concerns with timing and phasing, since development may begin before Easterly Road was completed;
- Concerns about safe pedestrian and bicycle access from the development to the nearby W&OD Trail and surrounding activity area;

- Explanation that the current expectation were that users would go to nearby intersection to access the W&OD trail;
- Explanation from staff that:
    - There had been discussions about a possible crossing near the post office, which was a more suitable location;
    - The curve in the road near Samuel Morse made crossings there unsafe; and
    - The most logical existing crossing may be at Michael Faraday Drive, though it was farther away.
- Explanation that the current plan encouraged a crossing at Reston Station Boulevard to improve access;
- Explanation that additional improvements may be considered, but safety constraints would limit options;
- Explanation that the 1.4 floor area ratio (FAR) was intentionally selected and derived from the applicant and staff;
- Explanation that since the SSPA was evaluated concurrently with a specific proposal, they focused on that proposal rather than analyzing higher intensities not under consideration;
- Explanation that evaluating a higher FAR would require assessing impacts and mitigation for a scenario not being proposed;
- Clarification that the chosen multifamily and stacked townhomes best fitted the surrounding area;
- Explanation that the goal was to match the existing development pattern, not maximize density;
- Explanation of additional constraints affecting density:
    - Right-of-way dedications along multiple frontages Sunset Hills Road and Reston Station Boulevard; and
    - Internal street grid requirements.
- Clarification that the prior development attempts did not fail due to excessive intensity;
- Explanation that the challenges were not due to density being too high;
- Explanation that the application evolved over time due to:
    - Changes in participating parcels;
    - Coordination with the Reston Comprehensive Plan and task force process; and
    - Property owners joining or leaving the proposal.
- Explanation that the site had gone through a multi-year planning process;
- Explanation that earlier concepts included different configuration and partnerships; and
- Explanation that it was decided to pursue a standalone SSPA and rezoning for this application;

Following the public hearing, which included testimonies from 4 speakers, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers wishing to speak.

Ms. Posusney provided closing remarks and acknowledged speakers' testimonies.

Commissioner Cortina asked staff whether elements such as tree canopy, stormwater management, and screening were being addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff clarified that

no site-specific guidance was included, but that countywide and Reston-wide policies would still apply. Cortina noted that screening requirements could be limited in mixed-use developments, particularly where residential uses were involved, and suggested this could create gaps in buffering between uses. Staff acknowledged this concern and indicated it could be reviewed during the rezoning phase.

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 Carter to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter emphasized the importance of resident feedback, especially on parking, management, and open space. He supported the proposed density as appropriate but noted flexibility for increases. He raised concerns about coordination with adjacent development and suggested a possible deferral which would allow more time to address those issues.

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SSPA 2023-III-11UP TO A DATE CERTAIN OF APRIL 29, 2026, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

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

//

The Chair explained that the next four cases all involved adjusting fees for services and would be handled using a streamlined process. Staff would provide one combined presentation covering all four cases, followed by separate public hearings for each case. Each hearing would be opened, discussed, closed, and acted upon individually before moving to the next. The Chair then confirmed the process was clear and invited staff to begin the presentation.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner requested that Vice Chair Spain conduct the public hearing for these amendments. Without objection, he relinquished the Chair to Vice Chair Spain.

//

PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT - ZONING APPLICATION FEES AND THE PLANNED DISTRICT RECREATION MINIMUM EXPENDITURE –- The proposed changes may include, without limitation: (1) Increase certain zoning application fees set out in Zoning Ordinance Table 8102.1 by up to five percent and rounded to the nearest $5. (2) Increase the application fee for sign permits and limited riding and boarding stable administrative permits to $140. (3) Create a new reduced fee for developments providing a significant percentage of Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) or equivalent. (4) Include an option for a new reduced fee for special permit applications seeking a reduction in the minimum distance requirements for manufactured homes. (5) Create a new reduced fee for nonprofit organizations seeking interpretations of approved zoning applications or minor variations to approved proffered conditions. (6) Increase the required Planned District recreational facility minimum expenditure from $2,400 to up to $2,520 per dwelling unit for residential development in the PDH, PDC, PRM, and PTC Districts. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Adam Nowaczyk, Zoning Administration Division (ZAD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of the proposed amendment.

There was a discussion between Mr. Nowaczyk; William Vannoy, Deputy Chief, Office of the Fire Marshal, Fairfax County Fire and Rescue; Bill Hicks, Director, Land Development Services; William Mayland, ZAD, DPD; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification between the two tables shown on the staff's presentation;
- Explanation that Table 1 was staff's recommended option, and Table 2 was an alternative, simplified version;
- Explanation on how Fairfax County's fees compared to neighboring jurisdictions;
- Explanation that fee structures varied by jurisdiction;
- Explanation that a prior comparison showed the county was higher in some areas and lower in others;
- Explanation that the goal was to ensure efficient operations and appropriate cost coverage;
- Explanation that a new regional comparison study was planned within 12-15 months;
- Clarification that the 5% fee increase was not solely based on Consumer Price Index (CPI);
- Explanation that it was a broader effort to achieve cost recovery, especially for LDS;
- Clarification that zoning application fees were not based on cost recovery;
- Clarification that overall, zoning fees were fairly consistent across jurisdictions with minor differences;

- Explanation on the two different fee structures:
    - Table one was originally designed to incentivize higher levels of affordable housing (ADUs), but over time staff felt it was too complex; and
    - Table two was created as a simpler, two-tier option.
- Clarification that the zero application fee in tier 4 of table one applied when 75% or more of units were ADUs;
- Explanation that the zero fee was an incentive and predictable benefit;
- Explanation that without it, applicants needed to request fee waivers separately from the Board;
- Explanation that the last fee increase occurred two years ago;
- Explanation that it was implemented in phases;
- Explanation that the first half was in fiscal year 2025, and the second half was in fiscal year 2026;
- Explanation that the Board directed staff to move toward a more regular predictable schedule;
- Explanation that future increases would likely be smaller incremental adjustments, rather than large infrequent changes;
- Explanation that the applications with 75% or more ADUs were likely primarily affordable housing providers, though some projects included mixed-use or mixed-income components;
- Concerns about fee comparisons with other jurisdictions;
- Explanation that staff would evaluate Fairfax's model compared to others;
- Explanation that Fairfax County adopted a special revenue fund model, similar to Prince William County, with clearer cost recovery targets;
- Explanation on how Workforce Dwelling Units (WDUs) factored into fees;
- Clarification that WDUs themselves did not change the base fee;
- Clarification that providing higher percentages of ADUs/WDUs could reduce fees under the tier system;
- Explanation that tiers were based on the percentage of affordable units within the residential portion;
- Explanation that if an application exceeded the typical 12.5% requirement it would qualify for fee reductions;
- Explanation that if staff were to reduce fees to zero it would have a financial impact;
- Explanation that a rezoning application could cost around $38,000;
- Clarification that these also applied to projects involving the Housing and Redevelopment Authority;
- Explanation that the 5% increase was primarily based on the CPI;
- Explanation that the goal was to keep fees aligned with inflation and rising costs;
- Clarification that while comparisons were included for context, they were not the basis for the fee calculation;
- Explanation that the Board directed staff to focus on incremental, predictable increases, not matching other jurisdictions;
- Explanation on why this application could not go on the work program;

- Clarification that a decision on fees had to be made tonight to align with the budget timeline;
- Explanation that the concept could still be studied for future fee updates;
- Explanation that fee reviews occurred regularly every two years;
- Explanation that designing fee structures was complex and could significantly shift costs across development types;
- Explanation that multiple scenarios had already been tested with varying financial impacts;
- Explanation that the Zoning Ordinance allowed the Board to modify or reduce fees;
- Clarification that it could be done when there was justification;
- Explanation that the process included the following:
    - It was brough forward as a Board item;
    - Did not require a public hearing; and
    - Required a vote by the Board.

Following the public hearing, Vice Chair Spain called for speakers. Vice 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, Vice Chair Spain closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR ZONING APPLICATION FEES AND PLANNED DISTRICT RECREATIONAL FACILITIES MINIMUM EXPENDITURE WITH THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED OPTIONS AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 3, 2026, AND THAT THE AMENDMENT BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2026, WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- THE FEE FOR REDUCTIONS OF MINIMUM DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR MANUFACTURED HOMES WILL INSTEAD BE THE PROVIDED OPTION OF $615; AND
- THE FEE FOR DEVELOPMENTS PROVIDING AFFORDABLE DWELLING UNITS WILL INSTEAD BE THE TWO-TIER OPTION THAT WAS PROVIDED.

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

//

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO APPENDIX Q (LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FEE SCHEDULE) OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA REGARDING ADJUSTMENT OF FEES CHARGED BY LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR PLAN REVIEW, PERMITS AND INSPECTION SERVICES - The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider a proposed amendment to Appendix Q of The Code of the County of Fairfax, Virginia (County Code) regarding adjusting the fees charged by Land Development Services (LDS) for plan review, permits, and inspection services. Pursuant to authority granted by inter alia, Code of Virginia §§15.2-2241(A)(9), 15.2-2286(A)(6), 62.1-44.15:27(H)(4), 36-98.3, 36-105(D)(1), 62.1-44.15:28(9), 62.1-44.15:29, 15.2-107, 15.2-2204, the amendment proposes an approximately five percent increase in all fees with certain exceptions. The proposed 5% increase does not apply to elevator permits and inspections, the technology surcharge percentage, code academy levy percentage, or zero fee applications–each of which will remain unchanged. The amendment also proposes minor adjustments to the 5% increase for smaller fees where 5% does not round to a penny. The amendment further proposes a fifty percent (50%) increase in fees related to major Water Quality Impact Assessments (WQIA) and exceptions under Article 6 of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 118 of the County Code) which require a public hearing. Minor editorial changes are also being made to the LDS fee Schedule (Appendix Q). COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Bill Hicks, Director, Land Development Services (LDS), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of Proposed Amendments to Appendix Q (Land Development Service Fee Schedule) of the Code of the County of Fairfax, Virginia Regarding Adjustments of Fees Charged by Land Development Services for Plan Review, Permits, and Inspection Services.

Commissioner Sargeant asked whether applying the same fee structure across all four cases might be too much of a one-size-fits-all approach or if it was appropriate for the different situations. Staff responded that they were comfortable with the proposed structure and believed it worked effectively across the cases from an economic standpoint.

Following the public hearing, Vice Chair Spain called for speakers. Vice 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, Vice Chair Spain closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO APPENDIX Q (LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FEE SCHEDULE) OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA REGARDING ADJUSTMENT OF THE FEES CHARGED BY LAND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR PLAN REVIEW, PERMITS, AND INSPECTION SERVICES AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 3, 2026, AND THAT THE AMENDMENT BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2026.

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

//

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, CHAPTER 62 - Public hearing, pursuant to authority granted by Virginia Code §§ 15.2-107, 27-97 and 27- 98, on proposed administrative amendments to Chapter 62 of the County Code to increase fees associated with operational permits, hourly reviews, and inspections. All operational permits with a cost of $195 shall increase to $204. Hourly rates currently charged at $208 shall increase to $216. Fire prevention permit fees for Floor Finishing, and Torch or Open-Flame Operations other than Roofing, Welding and Other Hot Work, and Open Flame and Candles will increase from $104 to $109. Fire prevention permit fees for Pyrotechnics and Fireworks shall increase from $936 to $982. Fire prevention permit fees for Explosives will increase from $234 to $245. Operational permits for LP-Gas: Storage and/or Use Outside, Portable Installation, Per Event, more than 10 gallons aggregate shall increase from $104 to $204. Plan review fees for Hazardous Material Emergency Response Plan shall increase from $133 to $139. Inspections for State Regulated Care Facilities will increase from $33 to $35. All fee increases shall be effective on July 1, 2026, at 12:01 a.m. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

William Vannoy, Deputy Chief, Office of the Fire Marshal, Fairfax County Fire and Rescue, presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of Proposed Amendments to the Code of County of Fairfax, Chapter 62.

Following the public hearing, Vice Chair Spain called for speakers. Vice 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, Vice Chair Spain closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, CHAPTER 62, AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 3, 2026, AND THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2026.

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

//

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, APPENDIX Q, SECTIONS D AND H - pursuant to authority granted by Virginia Code §§ 15.2-107, 27-97 and 27- 98, on proposed administrative amendments to Appendix Q of the County Code to increase fees associated with operational permits and inspections. Specifically, for Section I(D), all hourly fees for plan review will increase from $208 to $216 and hourly fees for testing and inspections shall increase from $208 to $216. For fire prevention pursuant to Section II(H), all plan review hourly fees will increase from $208 to $216 and acceptance and testing hourly fees shall increase from $208 to $216. Reinspection hourly fees shall increase from $208 to $216. For all Section II(H) reviews and inspections performed outside of normal business hours, the hourly fees shall be assessed at twice the hourly rate. All fee increases shall be effective on July 1, 2026 at 12:01 a.m. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Deputy Chief Vannoy presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of Proposed Amendments to the Code of County of Fairfax, Appendix Q Sections D and H.

Following the public hearing, Vice Chair Spain called for speakers. Vice 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, Vice Chair Spain closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, APPENDIX Q, SECTION I SUBSECTION H, AND SECTION II, SUBSECTION D, AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 3, 2026 AND THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2026.

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

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:29 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: July 15, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 20 day of July 2026
by Nicole Blackwell

Notary Seal
Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028