MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 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
James Thomas, Springfield District
Alis Wang, Mason District

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: William Nance, Planning Division (PD),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Salem Bush, Branch Chief, Public Facilities Branch, PD, DPD
Mary Ann Tsai, Branch Chief, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Karen Yee, ZED, DPD
Kevin McMahan, ZED, DPD
Sunny Yang, ZED, DPD
Ashley Denner, Transportation Planning Division (TPD),
Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Erik Gordon, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS)
Greg Fuller, Capital Projects and Operations Division, FCDOT
Nina Aamodt, TPD, FCDOT
Suzianne Battista, PD, DPD
Bin Zhang, Assistant Division Director, Site Development and Inspections,
Land Development Services (LDS)
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 explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included commission business, an application deferral, and five public hearings. Before beginning, he highlighted several recent committee meetings held by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors that focused on economic development and housing initiatives stemming from Board matters introduced in 2025.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner explained that county staff had been directed to examine ways to strengthen the county's economic competitiveness and expand housing opportunities, particularly affordable housing. He praised the comprehensive staff presentations and noted the strong collaboration among county agencies under the leadership of the County Executive and Deputy County Executive. He emphasized that the reports contained meaningful, actionable recommendations and expressed optimism about the Planning Commission's future role in helping implement those initiatives. Chair Niedzielski-Eichner also encouraged the public to watch the recorded committee meetings on the Board's website for those interested in the county's economic and housing future.

//

SE-2025-MA-00035 - SJS&W WASHINGTON PROPERTY LLC

Commissioner Wang MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SE-2025-MA-00035 TO JUNE 3, 2026.

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

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. 2232-2025-SU-00010 - WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL
2. SE-2025-DR-00027 - SWEETGREEN DUPONT, LLC
3. RZ/FDP-2025-PR-00014 - 1950 OG JV LLC
4. RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003 - PULTE HOME COMPANY LLC
5. PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 7 (STREETS, STREET LIGHTS, PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS) OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL REGARDING STREET LIGHTS

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

2232-2025-SU-00010 - WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL - Application 2232-2025-SU-00010 to consider the proposal by the Fairfax County School Board. The Fairfax County School Board is requesting 2232 approval for the conversion of an existing private school to a public high school. The facility is located at 2949, 2950, and 2954 Education Drive, Herndon VA 20171. Tax Map: 24-4 ((1)) 3C, 3D, 3E, and 3F. Sully District. Area III. SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

William Nance, 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 approval of 2232-2025-SU-00010.

Jessica N. Vara, Applicant's Agent, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP., gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Nance; Ms. Vara; Salem Bush, Branch Chief, Public Facilities Branch, PD, DPD; Erik Gordon, Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS); Ashley Denner, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns about potential traffic congestion related to the proposed new school, particularly existing backups during morning drop-off;
- Explanation that a traffic study was not typically required for a 2232 review;
- Explanation that the review focused on whether the proposal conforms with the Comprehensive Plan;
- Clarification that the roadway and access points already existed;
- Explanation that Education Drive was an existing roadway;
- Explanation that the property had historically operated as a private school;
- Explanation that since there was no change in land use a traffic study was not warranted;
- Explanation that there was no rezoning for the upcoming Phase 2;
- Explanation that there were no concerns regarding bus circulation or site access;
- Explanation that the internal circulation and access were considered functional and acceptable for school operations;
- Clarification that there was a kiss-and-ride area and separate entrances for buses and vehicles from Education Drive;
- Explanation that FCPS had reviewed the site and determined that the existing parking supply was sufficient for the school's anticipated needs;
- Explanation that there was an extensive due diligence review before acquisition of the mechanical systems and building infrastructure;
- Explanation that a third-party consultant evaluated the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems, building systems, and overall infrastructure;
- Clarification that most Phase 2 changes involved the two-shell building across Education Drive;

- Explanation that FCPS was currently hiring consultants and designers to determine the extent of the retrofitting need for those buildings;
- Explanation that modification to the existing main school building were expected to remain relatively minor;
- Clarification that FCPS initially proposed a phased enrollment approach and that the initial target of 1,000 students was developed collaboratively between staff and FCPS;
- Clarification that the original approved capacity was approximately 2,000 students and that FCPS did not anticipate enrollment exceeding that amount;
- Explanation that the shell buildings would be part of a future Phase 2, and FCPS would need to return through the county review process before using or retrofitting them;
- Explanation that the shell building would be used primarily for academic classroom space;
- Explanation that there were plans to design a crosswalk over Education Drive;
- Explanation that FCPS was actively working through the enrollment process and believed they were on track to reach the goal of approximately 1,000 students for the first year;
- Clarification that FCPS had already identified a principal and initial staff;
- Clarification that the existing facility engineer was retained to ensure continuity in building maintenance and operations;
- Explanation that because students would primarily be transferring from other schools within the division, corresponding teachers and staff positions would shift with enrollment needs;
- Explanation that the school would be using a phased approach, beginning with selected grade levels;
- Concerns about students traveling between the main school building and the future shell buildings across Education Drive;
- Explanation that FCPS was coordinating with county transportation staff to create a safe crosswalk design which included:
    - Raised medians;
    - Lighted signage; and
    - Crosswalk features meeting school safety standards.
- Explanation that the outstanding issues in the staff report would be addressed in the Phase 2 review and the exact timeline was still unknown;
- Explanation that FCPS was currently working with consultants and design teams to prepare the Phase 2 submission;
- Clarification that the application for Phase 2 was expected soon, before the upcoming school year began;
- Explanation that there would be no exterior modification and the building interior would remain as is;
- Explanation that since Phase 1 would primarily serve 9th and 10th grade students, most would not be driving themselves and they would be relying on bus or parent drop off;
- Explanation that the site was considered well parked and capable of handling anticipated demand;
- Concerns about neighborhood parking spillover;
- Explanation that the main building would support normal high school operations, including classrooms and student activities;

- Explanation that no major interior renovations were currently planned, though some lounge areas could potentially be converted into classrooms in the future if needed;
- Explanation that FCPS intended to ensure construction activities would not block public roads or create traffic issues;
- Explanation that the Park Road connection shown in the Comprehensive Plan had existed for many years;
- Explanation that removing the road connection would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment;
- Clarification that the adjacent parcel was privately owned, which could complicate future road connections;
- Explanation that eliminating the connection could provide additional flexibility for the school site if the road was no longer needed;
- Explanation that FCPS did not see a necessity for the connection and would support an amendment to remove it;
- Explanation that FCPS had previously estimated that acquiring land and constructing a new high school in western Fairfax County from the ground up would cost approximately $430 million;
- Clarification that the estimate was reflected in the county's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) planning; and
- Explanation that purchasing the existing private school campus for less than roughly one-third of that projected cost created substantial savings.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner noted that while the school acquisition presented major benefits, it also created an opportunity cost within the county's broader CIP, since funding directed toward this project could affect other planned projects.

Following the public hearing, which included testimony from 1 speaker. Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk if there were any other speakers. Clerk confirmed that there were no callers wishing to speak.

With no other testimony presented, and 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.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Spain stated that FCPS had been extremely transparent and proactive throughout the public outreach process for Skyview High School by hosting numerous open houses and tours during both daytime and evening hours. She noted that presentations were offered in multiple languages with interpreters available and praised school leadership and staff for being well prepared to answer questions and address community concerns. Commissioner Spain described the facility as a state-of-the-art campus with extensive educational and recreational amenities, including science and robotics labs, multiple gymnasiums, an Olympic-sized indoor pool, athletic fields, a large auditorium, outdoor learning spaces, and modern cafeteria and library facilities.

Commissioner Spain explained that the school would help relieve overcrowding at several western Fairfax County high schools, including Westfield High School, Chantilly High School, Centreville High School, Herndon High School, and South Lakes High School. Commissioner Spain noted that Phase 1 would begin with approximately 1,000 volunteer 9th and 10th grade students and that the existing private school building would initially operate without major modifications. She also emphasized that a future Phase 2 application would return with more detailed reviews involving transportation, environmental impacts, tree canopy, stormwater management, and other site improvements. Commissioner Spain concluded by stating that the proposal's location, character, and extent were found to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and expressed strong support for the project.

Commissioner Spain MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF APPLICATION 2232-2025-SU-00010, AS OUTLINED IN PHASE I ON PAGE 15 OF THE STAFF REPORT, WHICH PROPOSES UP TO 1,000 STUDENTS AT THE NEW PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL, BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND REASONS:

- THE PROPOSED PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL LOCATED AT 2949, 2950, AND 2954 EDUCATION DRIVE 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 APRIL 22, 2026.

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

//

SE-2025-DR-00027 - SWEETGREEN DUPONT, LLC- SE Appl. to permit a restaurant with drive-through. Located on approx. 25,929 sq. ft. of land zoned C-6. Dranesville District. Tax Map 31-3 ((1)) 113. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sheri Akin, Applicant's Agent, McGuire Woods LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 21, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Karen Yee, 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-DR-00027.

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

There was a discussion between Ms. Yee; Ms. Akin; Mary Ann Tsai, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the Sweetgreen format was a pay-ahead pickup model where customers simply arrive and collect their orders rather than waiting in a traditional drive-through line;
- Clarification that this would be the first Sweetgreen location in Northern Virginia;
- Explanation that there were currently three other Sweetgreen locations, including one that had opened earlier that day;
- Explanation that the applicant presented their proposal to the Mclean Citizens Association, and that no concerns were raised during that presentation;
- Explanation that a nearby resident contacted them regarding possible vehicle circulation behind the shopping center, and the applicant provided information clarifying the location and circulation pattern of the Sweetgreen lane;
- Explanation that different uses generated different traffic impacts, particularly restaurants compared to banks;
- Explanation that because restaurants could create significantly higher traffic volumes, the county reviewed those requests on a case-by-case basis; and
- Explanation that the adjacent tenant space was currently vacant and therefore there were no concerns or discussions with a neighboring tenant.

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 agreement to the proposed development conditions consistent with those dated April 29, 2026.

Ms. Akin affirmed agreement to the proposed development conditions dated April 29, 2026.

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

- SE-2025-DR-00027 SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED APRIL 29, 2026;

- MODIFICATION OF THE MINIMUM LOT AREA REQUIREMENT FOR THE C-6 DISTRICT;

- WAIVER OF THE INTERIOR PARKING LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENT;

- WAIVER OF THE PERIPHERAL PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENT ALONG OLD DOMINION DRIVE AND BRIAR RIDGE ROAD;

- MODIFICATION OF STACKING SPACE REQUIREMENT TO PERMIT 9 STACKING SPACES IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 11 STACKING SPACES; AND

- WAIVER OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRAIL REQUIREMENT ALONG OLD DOMINION DRIVE.

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

//

RZ/FDP-2025-PR-00014 - 1950 OG JV LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from R-1, C-1, C-3, SC and HC to PTC, SC and HC to permit a multifamily residential development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.79 inclusive of bonus density and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located at the N.W. corner of the intersection of Old Gallows Rd. and Gallows Branch Rd. on approx. 4.00 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Mixed-Use. Providence District. Tax Map 39-2 ((14)) 1 and 1A, 39-2 ((1)) 17, 39-2 ((15)) 3 and approximately 0.40 acres of right-of-way adjacent to 1950 and 1954 Old Gallows Rd. to be vacated/or abandoned. (Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public right-of-way adjacent to 1950 and 1954 Old Gallows Rd. to proceed.) PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Scott E. Adams, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 28, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Sunny Yang, 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-PR-00014.

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

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

- Concerns about difficult pedestrian conditions at the intersection;
- Concerns about improving walkability and streetscape activity;
- Concerns about ensuring the proposed transportation improvements were feasible and constructible;

- Explanation that the applicant felt confident that the proposed improvements were achievable and constructible;
- Explanation that extensive coordination occurred with both county staff and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) during the design process;
- Explanation that the main remaining concern involves the landing area for one proposed crosswalk;
- Explanation that a private easement may potentially be needed for that crossing location;
- Explanation that the proffers included a condition which allowed for a monetary contribution toward future construction if necessary, and easement rights could not be obtained;
- Explanation that the building on site originated as a home constructed in the early 1940s within the Worthington Heights subdivision;
- Explanation that the building had been significantly altered over time and later converted into a dentist office;
- Explanation that in 2019 a historical survey and later an architectural survey both concluded that the building was not eligible for local historic designation because of the extensive modifications and lack of intact historic feature;
- Explanation that the applicant still wanted to recognize the sits history by the following:
    - Including historic interpretation elements within the park space;
    - Coordinating with the History Commission and county historic resources staff; and
    - Naming the future park Worthington Park.
- Explanation that the fire lane included different treatments depending on the location;
- Explanation that near the connection to Old Gallows Road, there would be a more traditional hardscape plaza area;
- Explanation that the remainder of the fire lane would use structured turf or grasscrete material;
- Clarification that the material was designed to support emergency vehicle access while still visually reading as landscaped turf or green space;
- Explanation that the Planned Tysons Corner Urban District normally required a minimum site size of 10 acres, while this project site was only about 4 acres;
- Explanation that a waiver was therefore necessary to allow the project to proceed;
- Clarification that the waiver was supported because the project still met the broader goals and intent of the Tysons Comprehensive Plan;
- Explanation that over time, the county had seen that smaller sites could still successfully accommodate higher-intensity, high-quality development consistent with Tysons planning objectives;
- Concerns about the complexity of the transportation improvements required for the site, noting that the applicant appeared to be committing to improvements on nearly every side of the property, including coordination with the adjacent park area;
- Explanation that the project required extensive coordination and numerous meetings with both Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) and VDOT;

- Explanation that many transportation elements were interconnected, meaning one design change often triggered additional modifications elsewhere in the intersection and roadway system;
- Explanation that installing a crosswalk required removal of a dual right-turn lane because VDOT standards do not allow crosswalks across dual right turns;
- Explanation that the change then required curb adjustments, traffic flow analysis, and evaluation of nearby turn lanes and medians;
- Explanation that although the process was complicated, the extensive collaboration with FCDOT and VDOT gave the project team confidence that the proposed transportation improvements were achievable and realistic enough to include in the proffers;
- Explanation that the dollar figures were based on actual cost estimates prepared for performing the proposed work directly;
- Explanation that the western connector was intended to function as a pedestrian walkway and it was designed to connect Gallows Road with both the Flats at Tysons Park area and Fairfax Square;
- Explanation that the project team had evaluated bollard lighting along the walkway to improve pedestrian safety and that most of the walkway was located on the applicant's property;
- Explanation that the coordination efforts so far had primarily focused on pedestrian connectivity and ensuring the spaces physically connected well;
- Explanation that the team had also coordinated on screening and access points so the park space did not feel isolated or walled off from neighboring developments;
- Explanation that more detailed coordination regarding lighting fixtures and aesthetic consistency between the projects had not yet reached that level of design detail;
- Clarification that the proffers included a public access easement for the park space;
- Explanation that ongoing discussions focused primarily on the park's public operating hours and accessibility;
- Explanation that the discussions with the Park Authority had not been contentious, but rather centered on balancing public use with nearby residential concerns;
- Explanation that the proposed revisions would likely adjust the proffers to establish more specific operating hours instead of simply using dusk to dawn closure standard;
- Clarification that the revisions would also allow for future coordination if operational adjustments became necessary; and
- Explanation that the Board hearing was expected to be deferred until June 9th, providing additional time to finalize the issue.

Following the public hearing, which included testimony from 1 speaker, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers wishing to speak.

Mr. Adams provided closing remarks and acknowledged the speaker's testimony.

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

- Explanation that the applicant was not opposed to incorporating salvaged materials from the house into the park design;
- Concerns that the new public park could attract homeless individuals or increase trespassing onto their property; and
- Explanation that the applicant proposed installing additional fencing and no trespassing signage to help address those concerns.

There being no 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 stated that he appreciated the applicant's continued coordination with the community regarding the site's historic elements and felt comfortable moving forward without a deferral at this time. He described the project site as challenging from both a design and transportation perspective, but also as a significant opportunity to create a more active and connected public space along Gallows Road. Commissioner Hancock emphasized that the proposal would improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transportation connections while helping create a stronger sense of community and a more welcoming entry into Tysons.

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

- RZ-2025-PR-00014 AND THE ASSOCIATED CDP, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED APRIL 27, 2026; AND

- WAIVER OF THE MINIMUM DISTRICT SIZE FOR THE PTC DISTRICT.

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 12-0 TO APPROVE FDP-2025-PR-00014.

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

//

RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003 - PULTE HOME COMPANY LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from I-4 to PRM to permit the development of 112 multifamily dwelling units and 46 stacked townhouse units with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.39 inclusive of bonus density and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located along Samuel Morse Dr., S. side of Sunset Hills Rd. and N. side of Reston Station Blvd. on approx. 5.00 ac. of land. Existing Comp. Plan Rec: office, industrial and institutional uses up to a 0.50 (FAR). Proposed Comp. Plan Rec:

Option for residential development up to a 1.4 (FAR). Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 18-3 ((6)) 7A, 7B and 7C.
HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Brian J. Winterhalter, Applicant's Agent, DLP Piper LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 14, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

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 staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003.

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

Prior to the discussion Commissioner Carter noted that the project had undergone an extensive review process, including consideration through the Comprehensive Plan review, a Site-Specific Plan Amendment, and the current rezoning application. He explained that those earlier reviews established the site's suitability for residential development near the Washington Metro Silver Line and supported the vision of creating a transit-oriented residential community. Commissioner Carter remarked that the project design and architecture had improved throughout the review process and, in some respects, exceeded the expectations set by the renderings.

He emphasized that public feedback from nearby residents and property owners was important and welcomed community testimony as part of ensuring the best possible project outcome. Commissioner Carter also noted that the current discussion focused on the zoning and development plan details rather than the earlier Comprehensive Plan considerations.

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

- Concerns about adding a crosswalk across what was currently referred to as Morse Drive, the internal roadway through the center of the development;
- Explanation that the applicant would take another look at the concept;
- Concerns about whether that location would function well as a pedestrian crossing;
- Explanation that the roadway was expected to carry a significant amount of vehicle traffic;
- Explanation that the proposed location did not appear to be a natural pedestrian crossing point based on the site's circulation patterns; and
- Clarification that the anticipated vehicle traffic and the lack of a natural pedestrian desire line were the primary reasons for questioning whether a crosswalk would be appropriate at that location.

Following the public hearing, which included testimonies from 6 speakers, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers wishing to speak.

There was a discussion between Mr. McMahan; Mr. Winterhalter; Greg Fuller, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); Nina Aamodt, Transportation Planning Division (TPD), FCDOT; Ms. Tsai; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that several parcels along the pedestrian route had not yet fully developed;
- Explanation that existing gaps in sidewalks and pedestrian connections were expected to be filled as surrounding developments were completed;
- Explanation that the pace of development was beyond the county's control;
- Explanation that staff would be willing to meet with residents and provide additional information or guidance regarding planned improvements;
- Clarification that high-visibility crosswalks across Wiehle Avenue at Reston Station Boulevard had already been proffered as part of adjacent developments;
- Explanation that these improvements were tied to specific development triggers and would be constructed when those conditions were met;
- Explanation that although the exact timing was uncertain, the improvements remained committed and were included on approved development plans;
- Explanation that sidewalk connections and crosswalk improvements were already part of approved plans and proffer commitments for nearby developments;
- Clarification that while construction schedules were not yet known, those pedestrian improvements were expected to occur as the related projects moved forward;
- Regarding concerns raised by residents of the Lofts One development, the applicant stated that:
    - They recently met with residents to discuss construction-related concerns; and
    - They were willing to strengthen construction management proffers to help reduce impacts such as dust and debris.
- Explanation that additional mitigation measures may be incorporated into the proffers, although certain requests, such as power washing neighboring buildings, may not be feasible;
- The applicant also addressed concerns regarding the construction of Easterly Road and explained that:
    - The project would complete all roadway improvements south of the property boundary and perform grading and sidewalk work along its frontage;
    - The remaining contribution would primarily cover pavement construction for the section extending north toward Sunset Hills Road;
    - A transportation contribution initially proposed at $145,000 was increased to $182,000 following review and feedback from county transportation staff; and
    - FCDOT reviewed the revised estimate and determined the contribution to be appropriate for the remaining roadway work.
- Concerns about the long-delayed pedestrian crossing improvements at Wiehle–Reston East Metro Station;
- Explanation that the improvements involved more than simply adding pavement markings and would require additional traffic and roadway modifications;
- Concerns about the unresolved responsibility for constructing Easterly Road;
- Explanation that staff encouraged the applicants and neighboring property owners to continue working together to reach an agreement;

- Explanation that similar arrangements had been successfully implemented in Tysons before;
- Explanation that transportation contributions made to the County were earmarked for the specific improvement project identified in the proffers;
- Staff provided additional information regarding the proposed fourth crosswalk near the Wiehle–Reston East Metro Station:
    - The improvement had been under discussion for several years; and
    - The project was complicated by:
        - High traffic volumes;
        - Proximity to the Dulles Toll Road interchange;
        - Signal timing requirements;
        - Pedestrian signal operations; and
        - VDOT control of the roadway
- Explanation that many of the developments responsible for those connections were approved 8–10 years ago;
- Explanation that development had occurred incrementally, resulting in pedestrian improvements being delivered in phases rather than as a complete network;
- Explanation that more recent rezonings increasingly required pedestrian access plans and transportation connectivity improvements to prevent similar issues in the future;
- Explanation that the County has consistently encouraged the adjacent property owners to work together;
- Explanation that the issue involved more than construction costs and included:
    - Grading challenges;
    - Roadway alignment;
    - Sight-distance easements;
    - Retaining walls; and
    - Other engineering constraints.
- The County reviewed cost estimates submitted by one party;
- The County did not independently prepare construction estimates for private development projects;
- The applicants were expected to negotiate a mutually acceptable solution;
- Concerns that completing Easterly Road could be difficult unless the adjacent properties develop on similar timelines;
- Explanation that a construction management proffer was already included as part of the application;
- Explanation that the proffer would likely be updated based on feedback received during the hearing;
- Explanation that a designated contact person would be identified for community members to communicate construction-related concerns;
- Explanation that a pre-construction meeting would be held before construction started;
- Explanation that additional community representatives could be included in the pre-construction meeting process;
- Clarification that construction management procedures were already documented in the proffers, but could be further refined based on community feedback;

- Explanation that the construction management plan would include a construction truck routing plan;
- Explanation that more specific commitments regarding truck routes, construction operations, and communication procedures could be added to the proffers now rather than waiting until construction approaches;
- Explanation that the applicant was willing to incorporate additional details based on concerns raised by nearby residents;

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner referenced recent housing discussions by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and noted concerns about the significant number of approved residential units that had not yet been built. He emphasized that delays in development affected more than housing production, as they also postponed the infrastructure and transportation improvements tied to those projects through proffers and development commitments. Chair Niedzielski-Eichner stated that the current case illustrated this challenge, with needed pedestrian and roadway improvements dependent on future development activity. He suggested that staff examine the barriers preventing entitled properties from moving forward, as understanding those obstacles could help explain both the housing delivery gap and the delays in associated public infrastructure improvements.

There being no 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.

//

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO DEFER THE DECISION ON RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003 TO JUNE 3, 2026, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.

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

//

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

//

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 7 (STREETS, STREET LIGHTS, PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS) OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL REGARDING STREET LIGHTS – The proposed amendment includes but is not limited to (1) Establishing streetlight waiver criteria and other updates to Section 7-0801 (General Information), (2) Revising, consolidating and simplifying the general requirements in Section 7-0802 (General Requirements), (3)

Revising technical standards and criteria now in Section 7-0803 (Standards and Criteria), (4) Relocating and updating the nonstandard streetlight provisions now in Section 7-0804 (Nonstandard Streetlights), and (5) Relocating and updating the authorization and procedures now in Section 7-0805 (Authorization and Procedures). The amendment proposes revisions to Plates 23-7, 24-7, 25-7, 26-7, 28-7, 29-7, 29A-7, and 30-7, and removes Plate 27-7 from the PFM.
COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Bin Zhang, Assistant Division Director, Site Development and Inspections, Land Development Services (LDS), presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that staff recommended adoption of the Proposed Code Amendment to Chapter 7 of the Public Facilities Manual regarding Street Lights.

There was a discussion between Ms. Zhang; Suzianne Battista, Planning Division; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that non-standard streetlights were addressed at a high level within the Public Facilities Manual (PFM);
- Explanation that the county intentionally chose not to include detailed fixture specifications in the PFM;
- Clarification that approved fixture types would instead be maintained through a separate website and supporting urban design guidance documents;
- Staff noted that this approach:
    - Allowed the county to more easily update approved fixture types as technology evolved;
    - Provided greater flexibility than amending the PFM each time a fixture was added or modified; and
    - Allowed for more visual examples, graphics, and design guidance than could be included in the PFM.
- Clarification that county staff had been working on non-standard streetlight policies for approximately six years;
- Explanation that the amendments were intended to improve lighting within urban centers;
- Clarification that the goal was to provide lighting that supports:
    - Roadway safety;
    - Pedestrian safety;
    - Placemaking; and
    - A higher-quality pedestrian environment.
- Explanation that developers would now be responsible for demonstrating compliance with streetlight requirements;
- Explanation that developers may use one of two methods:
    - Submit a photometric plan demonstrating compliance with required lighting levels; and

  - Use a simplified spacing methodology for certain street types.
- Explanation that under the current process, developers often submitted plans and county staff later determined streetlight placement;
- Explanation that under the proposed amendments, developers would be responsible for integrating streetlight design into their projects earlier in the review process;
- Explanation that the streetlight design was often one of the final streetscape elements addressed during development review;
- Clarification that required lighting standards remained unchanged;
- Explanation that developers must still balance and coordinate:
  - Streetlights;
  - Street trees;
  - Sidewalks; and
  - Other streetscape elements.

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.

//

Prior to the motion Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated that the proposed Public Facilities Manual (PFM) amendment would clarify and consolidate the County's streetlight standards while shifting responsibility for streetlight design from county staff to developers, with staff continuing to review plans for compliance. He noted that the amendment established specific criteria for evaluating streetlight waiver requests, providing clearer guidance for the Director of Land Development Services when considering modifications or waivers.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner further explained that the amendment incorporated Tysons streetlight standards and expanded the use of non-standard streetlights within development centers. He noted that approved non-standard streetlight fixtures and poles would be maintained on the county's website rather than within the PFM, which allowed updates to be made more efficiently as technology evolved and products changed. He added that keeping detailed fixture specifications outside the PFM provided greater flexibility for staff to develop more comprehensive, area-specific guidance through the Urban Design Guidelines, including specifications and visual examples.

//

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL AS ADVERTISED AND SET FORTH IN THE

STAFF REPORT DATED APRIL 14, 2026, AND THAT THE AMENDMENTS BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JULY 1, 2026.

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

Prior to the vote of the follow-on motion Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner stated that while streetlights were essential for ensuring the safety of motorists and pedestrians, they could also enhance the appearance, character, and cohesion of neighborhoods when thoughtfully designed and located. He explained that the purpose of the follow-on motion was to capitalize on the transition from a staff-led streetlight design process to one in which developers were responsible for designing streetlighting. Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner noted that under the existing process, streetlights were often located late in site review after other streetscape elements had already been designed, which could create conflicts, delays, and design compromises. He stated that the proposed approach would provide an opportunity for streetlighting to be integrated more deliberately and concurrently with other streetscape features, promoting consistency with Urban Design Guidelines, supporting placemaking objectives, improving coordination among streetscape elements, and enhancing compatibility between adjacent developments.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALSO VOTED 11-0-1 (COMMISSIONER SARGEANT ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE) TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE FOLLOWING FOLLOW-ON MOTION:

- TO DIRECT STAFF TO IDENTIFY OPPORTUNITIES DURING THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN STAGE TO BETTER INCORPORATE STREETLIGHT DESIGN AND LOCATION IN RELATION TO OTHER STREETSCAPE ELEMENTS, SUCH AS UTILITIES, TREES, STREET FURNITURE, SIGNAGE AND SIDEWALK PLACEMENT; AND, AS PERTINENT, COHESION WITH ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOODS.

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner resumed duties of the Chair.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:09 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 22, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 27 day of July 2026 by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 8050379

Commission expiration: 03/31/2027

Notary Seal

JESSICA NATALIE FUENTES-MARTINEZ
NOTARY PUBLIC
REG. #8050379
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 31, 2027

