MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 2026

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair, Commissioner At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Vice Chair, Sully District
Jeremy Hancock, Secretary, Providence District
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: Candice Bennett, Parliamentarian, Commissioner At-Large
James Thomas, Springfield District

OTHERS: William O'Donnell, Branch Chief, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Mary Ann Tsai, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD
Graham Owen, Planning Division (PD), DPD
Thomas W. Burke, Transportation Planning Division (TPD), Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Jeremy Ko, FCDOT
Ciarra Downing, ZED, DPD
Karen Yee, ZED, DPD
Carl Shumate, ZED, DPD
Kevin McMahan, ZED, DPD
Stephen Waller, PD, 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 stated that the agenda of tonight's meeting included commission business, one decision only, and the conduct of six public hearings.

//

Commissioner Hancock announced that Commissioners were emailed copies of the draft minutes for Planning Commission meetings held in February 2026. Commissioner Hancock announced his intent to move for approval of the February meeting minutes during the Planning Commission meeting on June 10, 2026.

//

RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003 - PULTE HOME COMPANY LLC
(Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on May 13, 2026.)

Prior to the motion Commissioner Carter stated that several last-minute revisions should be incorporated into the development plan for the Lofts 2 project. He noted that significant effort had gone into the review process, including multiple hearings, meetings, and discussions with residents, staff, and the applicant.

Commissioner Carter stated the following:

- Regarding Easterly Road, Carter requested:
    - Additional attention to the interim roadway condition between Lofts 1 and Lofts 2;
    - A development plan showing:
        - Correct grading;
        - Stairs where necessary;
        - Below-grade sidewalks;
        - Street trees; and
        - Potential on-street parking requested by residents.
    - Accurate grading, finished floor elevations, and front-door access conditions between Lofts 2 and the adjacent property; and
    - An interim condition that would not depend on actions by the neighboring property owner.
- Requested proffers for:
    - Striping of lanes and crosswalks along Reston Station Boulevard;
    - Striping of internal parking areas serving the stacked townhouse section of the development;
    - Dust mitigation measures for Lofts I residents;
    - Remediation of dust accumulation on adjacent properties during construction; and
    - Requiring snow removal within 24 hours after the end of a storm on Reston Station Boulevard and Easterly Road while the streets remain private.

Brian J. Winterhalter, Applicant's Agent, DLP Piper LLP, responded with the following:

- Explanation that the requested snow-removal commitment could be added to the proffers;
- Explanation that a contribution could be provided to the Lofts 1 Homeowners Association to hire a power-washing contractor for dust remediation;
- Explanation that striping commitments could be formally incorporated into the proffers;
- Explanation that many of the striping improvements would already be required before bond release;
- Explanation that revisions on Easterly Road could be made to reflect previously discussed roadway sections and grading plans;
- Explanation that additional review by the engineering team would be needed before agreeing to any changes beyond those already reviewed by county staff;
- Explanation that the applicant wanted to verify that any requested grading modification could be accommodated before committing to them

There was a discussion between Mary Ann Tsai, Branch Chief, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD); Mr. Winterhalter; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concern regarding the Easterly Road revisions and whether the requested changes would require an amendment to the development plan;
- Clarification that the ultimate Easterly Road section was already shown in the development plan;
- Explanation that there was an older interim roadway section that was never removed from the plans;
- Explanation that the proffers reference the ultimate roadway section, but the development plan still contains both versions;
- Concern that if the development plan and proffers show different roadway configurations, complications could arise during site plan review; and
- Concern that the inconsistency could result in delays or required formal interpretation during the site plan process;
- Explanation that additional trees were not proposed along Sunset Hills Road because the project was dedicating right-of-way for a future roadway widening project;
- Explanation that a future widening could impact or remove newly planted trees;
- Clarification that the timing of any future road widening would be determined by the County, not the applicant;
- Explanation that the project had already undergone numerous redesigns;
- Explanation that significant modifications had already been made to address County comments;
- Explanation that the site had physical limitations, and the applicant believed they had reached the practical limits of what could be accommodated on the property;
- Explanation that no construction schedule currently exists for the road widening project; and
- Explanation that the timing would be determined by the County.

//

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON RZ/FDP-2022-HM-00003 TO JUNE 10, 2026, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS, INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING:

- IMPROVEMENTS TO EASTERLY ROAD;
- STRIPING FOR RESTON STATION BOULEVARD;
- REMEDIATION OF DUST FOR LOFTS 1;
- SNOW REMOVAL WITHIN 24 HOURS OF THE END OF THE STORM; AND
- TREES ALONG SUNSET HILLS ROAD.

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

//

Commissioner Spain announced that the Schools Committee would meet on Thursday, June 04, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center. She added that all committee meetings were advertised, open to the public, and would be televised on Channel 16.

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. FDPA-2003-HM-046-003 AND PCA-2003-HM-046-05 (RZPA-2025-HM-00098) – WOODLAND PARK CROSSING RETAIL, LLC
2. SE-2025-MA-00035 - SJS&W WASHINGTON PROPERTY LLC
3. SE-2024-MA-00023 - LAADAM FAMILY, LLC
4. SE 2025-MA-00025 - SNS28 LLC
5. PA 2021-IV-LP1 - LORTON CORE STUDY
6. RZ/FDP-2025-HM-00018 - OLD RESTON ASSOCIATES, LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

//

FDPA-2003-HM-046-003 (RZPA-2025-HM-00098) – WOODLAND PARK CROSSING RETAIL, LLC -. FDPA Appl. to amend the final development plan to permit additional secondary and principal uses and associated changes to development conditions. Located N. of Sunrise Valley Dr., E. of Corporate Park Dr., and W. of Woodland Pointe Ave. on approx. 6.46 ac. of land zoned PDC. Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 16-4 ((23)) C. (Concurrent with PCA-2003-HM-046-05).
HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PCA-2003-HM-046-05 - WOODLAND PARK CROSSING RETAIL, LLC - PCA Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ-2003-HM-046 to permit modifications to the proffers with no change to the overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.51. Located N. of Sunrise Valley Dr., E. of Corporate Park Dr., and W. of Woodland Pointe Ave. on approx. 6.46 ac. of land zoned PDC. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed use. Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 16-4 ((23)) C. (Concurrent with FDPA-2003-HM-046-003 (RZPA-2025-HM-00098)).
HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Commissioner Carter asked that Chair Niedzielski-Eichner waive presentations by staff and the applicant. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers. Chair inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no callers.

Zachary M. Fountain, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 28, 2026.

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 Carter to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter stated that the site was part of the larger Woodland Park East area, which included grocery stores, small-scale retail uses, and surrounding multifamily residential development. He noted that the application did not propose any modifications to the existing site layout or buildings but instead increased the allowable percentage of secondary uses from 10 percent to 75 percent, consistent with the current zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Carter explained that the additional permitted uses could include pet grooming establishments, veterinary hospitals, restaurant carry-out services, indoor commercial recreation, and craft beverage production. He stated that these uses would help create a more desirable and diverse mix of services within the commercial center while better serving the surrounding neighborhood. He also noted that the proposal would not increase the floor area ratio and would not alter the existing parking supply or parking requirements.

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA-2003-HM-046-05, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 13, 2026.

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 10-0 TO APPROVE FDPA-2003-HM-046-003.

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

//

SE-2025-MA-00035 – SJS&W WASHINGTON PROPERTY LLC - SE Appl. to permit an increase in Floor Area Ratio, add a private school use, modify the site layout and amend conditions. Located on approx. 20.00 ac. of land zoned I-6 and HC. Mason District. Tax Map 80-2 ((1)) 30. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Allison J. Reynolds, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C reaffirmed the affidavit dated April 6, 2026.

Ciarra Downing, 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 the staff recommended approval of SE-2025-MA-00035.

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

There was a discussion between Ms. Downing; Ms. Reynolds; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that Phase 1 was limited to five classroom buildings;
- Explanation that it would be constructed as additions to the exterior of the existing facility;

- Explanation that it would not disrupt activities occurring within the current academic spaces;
- Explanation that Phase 1 was intended to be completed in time for the upcoming fall school term;
- Explanation that Phase 1 only required a minor site plan amendment;
- Explanation that was already moving through an expedited review process;
- Explanation that the goal with Phase 2 was to complete it for the following academic year;
- Explanation that timing would depend on enrollment growth and demand;
- Explanation that the goal with Phase 3 was to complete it approximately one year after Phase 2;
- Clarification that the schedule remained flexible and may be adjusted based on enrollment trends;
- Clarification that the timing of Phases 2 and 3 was less certain than Phase 1; and
- Explanation that future expansion phases would be driven by actual enrollment demand rather than a fixed construction schedule.

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 Wang to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Wang requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

Ms. Reynolds affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

Commissioner Wang MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE-2025-MA-00035, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 21, 2026.

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

//

SE-2024-MA-00023 - LAADAM FAMILY, LLC- SE Appl. to add a drive-through ATM to an existing financial institution. Located on approx. 19,602 sq. ft. of land zoned C-6, HC and SC. Mason District. Tax Map 71-1 ((1)) 102D. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Elmer F. Tolle III, Applicant's Agent, Development Services Group, Inc. reaffirmed the affidavit dated August 21, 2025.

Ciarra Downing, 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 the staff recommended approval of SE-2024-MA-00023.

Mr. Tolle gave a brief presentation on the subject applications.

Commissioner Wang deferred making preliminary comments on the application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Downing; Mr. Tolle; William O'Donnell, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that Annandale was beginning to experience redevelopment activity, including recently approved multifamily residential projects;
- Explanation that existing buildings and sites sometimes present opportunities for adaptive reuse that should be considered individually;
- Explanation that in the current application, the site already contained drive-through infrastructure, and the proposal actually reduced the traditional drive-through function by converting it to an ATM-oriented use;
- Explanation that additional adaptive reuse projects were expected in Annandale, including office-to-residential conversions;
- Explanation that staff did not believe the Annandale CBC Plan required a revision; and
- Explanation that flexibility was important when evaluating redevelopment opportunities within an evolving commercial area.

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 Wang to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Wang requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

Mr. Tolle affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

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

- SE-2024-MA-00023 SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 21, 2026; AND
- MODIFICATION OF ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 8100.7 E REQUIRING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE EXISTING SIDEWALK AND STREETSCAPE SHOWN ON THE SE PLAT.

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

//

SE 2025-MA-00025 - SNS28 LLC- SE Appl. to permit child care with a maximum of 99 children. Located on approx. 38,241 sq. ft. of land zoned R-2 and HC. Mason District. Tax Map 72-1 ((13)) 1. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Shahd Azab, Applicant's Agent, SNS28 LLC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated September 4, 2025.

Carl Shumate, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD) presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that the staff recommended approval of SE 2025-MA-00025.

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

There was a discussion between Mr. O'Donnell; Ms. Azab; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the recommended enrollment capacity was 50 children;
- Clarification that if the applicant wished to increase enrollment beyond 50, a new special exception amendment would be required;
- Explanation that a future application would allow the applicant to demonstrate how the facility had operated under the approved conditions;

- Explanation that the review could potentially be processed as a minor amendment, depending on the circumstances;
- Explanation that from staff's perspective, 50 children was the recommended maximum enrollment at this time;
- Explanation that the facility planned to operate on a staggered schedule between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.;
- Explanation that staggered arrival and departure times were intended to reduce traffic concentrations;
- Explanation that the scheduling approach would apply to both students and staff;
- Explanation that the goal was to spread traffic throughout the day to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood;
- Explanation that the transportation issues identified by staff could be feasibly addressed during the site review process;
- Explanation that the applicant must obtain the appropriate state childcare license;
- Explanation that other than the state licensing requirements, staff were not aware of any additional state review that would determine the enrollment limit established through the County's approval process;
- Explanation that the applicant would still be required to comply with state licensing requirements;
- Explanation that the state licensing process would likely evaluate factors such as staffing levels and the operator's ability to care for a specific number of children;
- Clarification that from the County's perspective, approval also depended on whether the site could adequately accommodate the proposed enrollment, including employees, parking, and operational impacts; and
- Clarification that the County's recommended capacity was based on site-specific considerations in addition to any state licensing requirements.

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.

Further discussion between Mr. O'Donnell; Ms. Azab; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the proposed childcare facility met the County's minimum parking requirements, which required two parking spaces per 1,000 square feet;
- Explanation that childcare operations were regulated by teacher-to-child ratios;
- Explanation that the facility planned to operate with six classrooms;
- Explanation that the planned staffing levels were sufficient to support the proposed enrollment of 50 children;
- Explanation that the parking supply would also have been sufficient for a higher enrollment if older children were included in the program mix;
- Explanation that the site provided two additional parking spaces beyond what was needed for the proposed operation;
- Explanation that the facility would open at 6:00 a.m.;
- Explanation that arrival and departure times would be staggered throughout the day;

- Explanation that early drop-off and late pick-up options would be available for an additional fee;
- Explanation that most children were expected to be present between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.;
- Explanation that morning arrivals would occur over a three- to four-hour period, reducing concentrated traffic;
- Explanation that many parents were expected to use a drop-off process without leaving their vehicles;
- Explanation that staff members would assist children directly from vehicles into the facility;
- Explanation that staff would actively manage traffic flow during peak arrival and departure periods to prevent backups;
- Concerns related to screening and whether those concerns were primarily associated with enrollment levels above 50 children;
- Explanation that the standard screening requirement would normally be 35 feet;
- Clarification that the proposal requested a reduction to 20 feet;
- Explanation that the applicant was providing a denser landscaping buffer within the reduced area;
- Explanation that the resulting screening was expected to be thicker than what would typically be provided within a standard 35-foot buffer;
- Explanation that the enhanced screening primarily benefitted the adjacent single-family detached homes to the northeast;
- Explanation that additional landscaping was also proposed along the property line adjacent to the church to the west;
- Explanation that access would be provided from Fairlane Drive;
- Explanation that the original proposal included access from Braddock Road;
- Clarification that staff directed the applicant to consolidate access to a single entrance on Fairlane Drive;
- Explanation that this change was intended to improve traffic operations and reduce conflicts along Braddock Road;
- Explanation that enrollment of 50 represented the total number of children enrolled in the program;
- Explanation that not all enrolled children were expected to attend at the same time;
- Explanation that some children may attend only during morning hours;
- Explanation that others may attend only during afternoon hours;
- Explanation that attendance schedules would vary based on family needs and work schedules;
- Explanation that the program intended to offer flexible attendance options;
- Explanation that families may choose schedules that aligned with remote work or flexible work arrangements;
- Explanation that the childcare program was designed to accommodate varying family needs;
- Explanation that they did not expect all 50 children to be present simultaneously;
- Explanation that arrival and departure times would vary throughout the day;

- Explanation that the facility was not expected to generate 50 simultaneous drop-offs in the morning or 50 simultaneous pick-ups in the evening;
- Clarification that the development conditions currently before the Planning Commission specify operating hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.;
- Clarification that those hours were carried forward because the applicant's Statement of Justification requested operating hours beginning at 7:00 a.m.;
- Explanation that extending operating hours to 6:00 a.m. would help address traffic concerns;
- Explanation that earlier opening hours would allow arrivals and departures to be spread over a longer period of time;
- Explanation that a longer drop-off window would support a more staggered schedule for families;
- Explanation that reducing the concentration of arrivals during peak morning periods would help minimize traffic impacts on the surrounding neighborhood;
- Explanation that the applicant had agreed to upgrade sidewalks and install curb and gutter improvements along Fairlane Drive;
- Explanation that the applicant would also provide a new sidewalk along the frontage;
- Explanation that current Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) standards called for a 10-foot-wide shared-use trail along both frontages;
- Explanation that due to existing topography and utility constraints, including utility pole guide wires, constructing a 10-foot-wide trail was not feasible;
- Explanation that the applicant had therefore proposed a 6-foot-wide trail and requested a waiver from the standard requirement;
- Explanation that staff did not currently support the requested waiver;
- Explanation that the applicant had committed to dedicating the full 21-foot right-of-way, which allowed VDOT and County staff additional flexibility to refine the trail and buffer design during the site plan process;
- Clarification that because the application was a special exception rather than a rezoning, the review process differed;
- Explanation that the zoning ordinance required only two parking spaces per 1,000 square feet for childcare facilities;
- Explanation that the applicant had the ability to manage parking operations as needed;
- Explanation that employees could potentially utilize off-site or satellite parking arrangements and walk to the facility;
- Explanation that various parking management options remain available to the applicant; and
- Concerns about parking and traffic were common with childcare facilities and emphasized the importance of ongoing communication and good neighbor practices.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no further closing remarks; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Wang to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion Commissioner Wang stated that the application proposed a childcare facility that would help address the significant demand for additional childcare services in Fairfax County. Based on the information presented during the hearing, Commissioner Wang indicated that an enrollment capacity of 50 children appeared more appropriate for the size and characteristics of the site than the originally requested 99 children. Commissioner Wang also noted that the location was suitable for a childcare facility due to its proximity to surrounding schools and residential neighborhoods. While several transportation and access concerns were raised during the review process, Commissioner Wang expressed confidence that those issues could be addressed through the site plan review process and encouraged the applicant to continue working with staff on those matters.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Wang requested that the applicant confirm for the record their agreement to the proposed development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

Ms. Azab affirmed agreement to the development conditions dated May 21, 2026.

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

- SE-2025-MA-00025, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 21, 2026, WITH A CHANGE IN HOURS IN CONDITION 4 TO BE 6:00 AM- 6:00 PM;

- MODIFICATION OF SECTION 5108 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO REDUCE THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING ALONG SOUTHEAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY FROM 35 FEET WIDE TO 20 FEET WIDE; AND

- MODIFICATION OF SECTION 5108 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO REDUCE THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING ALONG WEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY FROM 35 FEET WIDE TO 10 FEET WIDE AND WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENT ADJACENT TO BRADDOCK ROAD.

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

//

PA 2021-IV-LP1 - LORTON CORE STUDY- Plan Amendment (PA) 2021-IV-LP1 concerns the Lorton-South Route 1 Community Planning Sector and Suburban Center, an area comprised of approximately 3,200 acres in the Mount Vernon Supervisor District. The subject area is located in southeast Fairfax County and bounded by Accotink Creek on the north, by Fort Belvoir Main Post and Old Colchester Road on the east, by Furnace Road on the west, and by the Occoquan River on the south. The area is planned for residential uses in areas designated as Suburban Neighborhoods and Low-density Residential Areas, a mixed-use town center surrounding the Lorton VRE station, retail shopping centers, and industrial areas. The amendment will consider updating the Comprehensive Plan guidance to allow for a land use framework centered around a mixed use core area east of I-95 and five activity nodes with recommendations for mixed-use redevelopment, including additional housing and employment activity. Recommendations for urban design, placemaking, and mobility enhancements are also proposed. Changes are also proposed to the Transportation Plan Maps, including but not limited to the revisions to the street network, extension of the Richmond Highway Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) from Fort Belvoir to the Occoquan River, and addition of BRT stations in the study area. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Stephen Waller, Department of Planning and Development (DPD), Planning Division (PD) presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that the staff recommended adoption of PA 2021-IV-LP1.

Nick Firth, Nominator' Agent, Lorton Visioning Taskforce, made a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Waller; Mr. Firth; Graham Owen, PD, DPD; Thomas W. Burke, Transportation Planning Division (TPD), Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that transportation studies indicated that now was not the appropriate time to implement a four-lane change;
- Explanation that future transportation improvements, including potential Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service and Richmond Highway improvements, could alter future roadway needs;
- Clarification that the amendment did not eliminate the possibility of future study of a four-lane roadway;

- Explanation that interim pedestrian and bicycle improvements could be implemented while maintaining the existing roadway configuration;
- Explanation that Lorton Road functioned as a major regional pass-through corridor;
- Explanation that the vision was to transform Lorton Road into a more community-oriented boulevard;
- Explanation that there were many mixed-use areas in Northern Virginia that function successfully without six-lane roads running through their centers;
- Explanation that a more walkable roadway would support:
    - Outdoor dining;
    - Commercial activity;
    - Pedestrian movement; and
    - Community gathering spaces.
- Explanation that regional traffic was already accommodated by major corridors such as:
    - Interstate 95;
    - U.S. Route 1; and
    - Virginia State Route 123
- Explanation that the goal was for Lorton Road to better serve the local community rather than function primarily as a regional through-route;
- Explanation that future roadway changes would depend on redevelopment proposals and rezoning applications for properties along Lorton Road, including sites such as Gunston Plaza;
- Explanation that the long-term vision shifted activity toward Lorton Road and created a more community-oriented environment rather than focusing solely on regional traffic movement;
- Explanation that several businesses had recently closed or vacated space within the Lorton area;
- Examples cited included the departure of grocery, restaurant, and retail tenants;
- Explanation that some commercial spaces had remained vacant for extended periods;
- Explanation that the community would benefit from additional commercial activity, services, and destinations for local residents;
- Explanation that a more walkable Lorton Road could encourage residents to walk to nearby businesses rather than drive;
- Explanation that improving pedestrian safety and connectivity would help support local commerce;
- Explanation that several regional transportation bottlenecks continued to affect traffic in the area, including congestion along:
    - Interstate 95;
    - Virginia State Route 123;
    - The CSX railroad bridge corridor.
- Explanation that these broader transportation issues required attention regardless of future changes to Lorton Road;
- Explanation that the overall goal of the plan was to make Lorton Road function more as a community-serving corridor that supported local residents, businesses, and pedestrian activity while regional traffic continued to be accommodated by the area's major transportation routes;

- Concerns regarding traffic operation near the Amtrak Auto Train Terminal;
- Concerns reducing the roadway from six lanes to four lanes in that area could create substantial traffic problems;
- Concerns that a hybrid roadway configuration, such as three lanes in one direction and two in the other, might warrant consideration;
- Explanation that maintaining adequate capacity near the Auto Train facility would be important to preserve traffic flow through Lorton;
- Explanation that the preliminary evaluation of a four-lane cross-section focused on the segment of Lorton Road between Lorton Market Street and Richmond Highway;
- Clarification that the analysis did not include the section adjacent to the Auto Train facility;
- Explanation that any future lane reduction would require substantial additional study and analysis;
- Clarification that no final decisions have been made regarding roadway configurations;
- Explanation that the roadway segment near the Auto Train would present unique operational considerations that would need to be carefully evaluated;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan amendment currently presented both a four-lane and a six-lane option;
- Explanation that the task force voted overwhelmingly in favor of the four-lane concept, with only one dissenting vote;
- Explanation that if all conditions were ideal, staff would generally support the long-term vision of a four-lane road;
- Explanation that current transportation analyses indicated that a six-lane configuration was more appropriate at this time;
- Explanation that existing traffic volumes and roadway capacity needs did not support identifying four lanes as the only option in the plan;
- Explanation that future transportation improvements, land use changes, and additional analysis could alter roadway needs;
- Explanation that if future studies demonstrated that a four-lane roadway could adequately accommodate traffic demand, staff would be open to reconsidering that option;
- Explanation that the proposed plan included pedestrian, bicycle, and intersection improvements under both roadway scenarios;
- Explanation that the six-lane option could still incorporate many of the same pedestrian-oriented design features envisioned by the task force;
- Explanation that the difference in perspectives stems from the task force's long-term vision for four lanes versus current transportation data supporting six lanes;
- Explanation that the proposed plan sought to preserve flexibility so that future studies and changing conditions could determine the most appropriate roadway configuration;
- Explanation that travel demand modeling was conducted through the year 2045;
- Explanation that under both the six-lane and four-lane scenarios, projected daily traffic volumes remained approximately 32,000 to 33,000 vehicles per day;
- Explanation that the models indicated little change in traffic volumes because there were few alternative routes available in the area;
- Explanation that the modeling did not show substantial traffic diversion to other roadways if capacity were reduced;

- Clarification that some people may believe drivers would find alternate routes if capacity decreases, but the County's models did not predict that outcome;
- Explanation that an existing pedestrian connection already existed between the areas, although many residents may not be aware of them;
- Explanation that a pathway currently connected the commercial area near the former Amazon Fresh site to the library area;
- Explanation that the vision was to strengthen the core activity center and allow surrounding destinations to benefit from increased vibrancy and connectivity;
- Explanation that existing pedestrian routes could be improved and formalized over time;
- Concern that future redevelopment proposals may not automatically provide those connections unless they were specifically identified in County plans;
- Clarification that connectivity and walkability were evaluated as part of the planning process;
- Clarification that the amendment incorporated recommendations from the recently adopted Active Transportation Plan;
- Explanation that existing and planned pedestrian, bicycle, park, and open-space connections had been mapped and integrated into the plan;
- Explanation that future redevelopment projects would be expected to connect to the broader active transportation network;
- Explanation that the goal was to ensure residents could walk not only to parks and open spaces but also to mixed-use activity centers and community destinations;
- Explanation that comprehensive plan language could be challenging because it must remain conceptual and flexible;
- Explanation that illustrations could help communicate ideas, but they cannot fully capture what future redevelopment would ultimately look like;
- Explanation that detailed design decisions would occur later through rezoning and development review processes;
- Explanation that the current amendment was intended to establish a vision rather than approve specific development proposals;
- Explanation that physical constraints, including limited roadway width and the difficulty of acquiring additional land, would influence future design decisions;
- Clarification that any future redevelopment proposals would need to revisit these issues in greater detail;
- Explanation that the Auto Train served approximately 400,000 passengers annually;
- Explanation that many travelers arrived several hours before departure and spent time in the area while waiting;
- Explanation that those visitors represented a significant opportunity for local businesses and commercial activity;
- Explanation that future development could help capture more spending from Auto Train passengers through restaurants, retail, and other services;
- Explanation that the community had worked for years to move beyond perceptions associated with the former prison complex;
- Explanation that the Lorton 2040 planning effort represented an opportunity to redefine how residents and visitors view the community;

- Explanation that the plan was intended to be the beginning of that transformation and helped establish a stronger identity for Lorton moving forward;
- Explanation that staff did not want to eliminate the possibility of a future four-lane roadway;
- Explanation that additional analysis was needed before a definitive decision could be made;
- Explanation that the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements could reduce vehicle trips;
- Explanation that additional roadway connections, included those crossing Pohick Creek, could help distribute traffic;
- Explanation that future transportation investments could change assumptions about roadway capacity needs;
- Clarification that these possibilities warranted further study before selecting a single roadway configuration;
- Explanation that current transportation models were not sophisticated enough to fully account for autonomous vehicle impacts;
- Explanation that significant benefits would likely require a large percentage of vehicles to be autonomous;
- Explanation that mixed traffic conditions with both human-driven and autonomous vehicles may limit potential efficiency gains;
- Clarification that once autonomous vehicles become more prevalent and interconnected, roadway operations could become more efficient; and
- Explanation that staff recognized the potential impact of the technology and expected it to become increasingly important in future planning efforts.

Following the public hearing, which included testimonies from 21 speakers. There was a discussion between Mr. Waller; Mr. Firth; Mr. Owen; Mr. Burke; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns raised about eminent domain;
- Explanation that the proposed roadway connections were never envisioned to be implemented through eminent domain;
- Explanation that future roadway improvements would most likely occur in conjunction with redevelopment opportunities;
- Explanation that staff did not anticipate constructing new roadway connections through existing neighborhoods absent significant future changes;
- Explanation that the existing Comprehensive Plan for the Wildwood subdivision already contained a neighborhood consolidation option;
- Clarification that the policy had existed for many years;
- Explanation that neighborhood consolidation required support from at least 75 percent of affected property owners;
- Clarification that any such redevelopment would be entirely voluntary;
- Clarification that the County did not initiate neighborhood consolidation;
- Explanation that it must be initiated by property owners themselves;

- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan served as guidance for how redevelopment could occur if property owners choose to pursue it;
- Explanation that future redevelopments would be expected to contribute to transportation improvements and community objectives;
- Clarification that the plan established a framework rather than a mandate for redevelopment;
- Explanation that similar principles would apply to commercial properties such as Gunston Plaza;
- Explanation that the plan did not propose redeveloping any specific site;
- Explanation that it provided a roadmap for how redevelopment could occur if property owners pursue it in the future;
- Explanation that any future redevelopment would be expected to advance the broader Lorton community vision;
- Concern about the future of the local post office located in Gunston Plaza; and
- Concerns about the loss of existing community-serving businesses during redevelopment.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner inquired of the Clerk, who confirmed that there were no additional speakers and no callers wishing to speak. With no additional speaker testimony presented, there being no further comments or questions from the Commission, staff stated their closing remarks:

- Clarification that the proposed street grid connections discussed by residents in the Wildwood neighborhood were tied to the existing neighborhood consolidation option already contained in the Comprehensive Plan;
- Clarification that the neighborhood consolidation policy had been in place since at least 1995;
- Clarification that the current amendment did not create the consolidation option; it simply carried forward existing policy;
- Explanation that any future grid street connections would most likely occur only if a neighborhood consolidation proposal moved forward;
- Explanation that a neighborhood consolidation would require support from at least 75 percent of affected property owners;
- Explanation that roadway connections were not anticipated outside of a redevelopment or consolidation effort;
- Clarification that the plan did not contain development proposals for Gunston Plaza or any other specific property;
- Explanation that no demolition or redevelopment was being proposed at this time;
- Explanation that the amendment provided guidance for how redevelopment should occur if property owners choose to pursue it in the future;
- Clarification that future redevelopment should provide more than large parking lots and commercial buildings;
- Clarification that the plan encouraged public gathering spaces, pedestrian amenities, mixed-use development, and improved community connections;
- Explanation that the new development should contribute to a stronger public realm and enhanced walkability;

- Explanation that the goal was to create a community that was walkable for people of all ages and abilities;
- Explanation that while some residents may find Lorton walkable today, many others did not;
- Explanation that narrow sidewalks, limited buffers, and fast-moving traffic could discourage walking and bicycling;
- Explanation that future improvements would seek to make walking and biking safer and more comfortable for a broader segment of the population;
- Explanation that outreach efforts were conducted countywide rather than targeting individual neighborhoods;
- Notifications included:
    - Email distributions to homeowners and civic associations;
    - Community workshops;
    - Flyers distributed throughout businesses and apartment communities;
    - Information posted at the Workhouse Arts Center;
    - Materials translated into English, Spanish, Korean, and Arabic;
    - Advertisements on Fairfax Connector buses;
    - Public meeting notices and task force meeting announcements; and
    - Six signs posted throughout the study area
- Explanation that forty-five task force meetings were also held and were open to the public;
- Equity concerns were raised regarding the division created by Interstate 95, which separates the East and West side communities;
- Explanation that the two sides of Lorton had evolved differently over time;
- Explanation that the redevelopment of the former prison site and creation of the Laurel Hill community significantly changed portions of western Lorton;
- Explanation that historic planning patterns left portions of eastern Lorton with older industrial and lower-intensity land uses;
- Staff explained the following:
    - Future redevelopment opportunities were identified using objective planning criteria;
    - Factors considered included building age, land value, and redevelopment potential; and
    - The plan sought to provide opportunities for revitalization where appropriate.
- Clarification that the goal was not development for development's sake;
- Explanation that future redevelopment should provide community benefits;
- Clarification that redevelopment proposals would be expected to create jobs, training opportunities, and improved amenities for Lorton residents;
- Explanation that growth should support the broader community vision while delivering tangible public benefits;
- Explanation that theoretically it was possible to request removal of the neighborhood consolidation option currently contained in the Comprehensive Plan;
- Explanation that the neighborhood consolidation provision had existed for decades;
- Explanation that the existing Comprehensive Plan had designated portions of the area for:
    - 1–2 dwelling units per acre.

    - 2–3 dwelling units per acre.
- Explanation that since the 1990s, the plan had also included an optional neighborhood consolidation provision which allowed densities of 5–8 dwelling units per acre if consolidation occurs;
- Explanation that the 75% property-owner participation requirement was a long-standing County policy;
- Explanation that maintaining that requirement was one reason staff chose not to modify the existing neighborhood consolidation language;
- Explanation that the policy prevented a small number of property owners from initiating major redevelopment without broad neighborhood support;
- Explanation that at least 75% of property owners must agree before a neighborhood consolidation proposal could even begin moving forward;
- Explanation that the 3.0 floor area ratio (FAR) designation was intentional;
- Explanation that Gunston Plaza was envisioned as the highest-intensity activity center within the Lorton planning area;
- Explanation that the site was planned to be adjacent to a future bus rapid transit station;
- Explanation that the 3.0 FAR threshold unlocked several planning and development benefits which included:
    - Eligibility for certain urban street standards;
    - Potential revitalization district benefits; and
    - Parking reductions associated with mixed-use, transit-oriented development.
- Explanation that state parking reform legislation used certain density thresholds to identify true urban activity centers;
- Explanation that a 3.0 FAR had become an important benchmark for demonstrating urban mixed-use character;
- Explanation that communities such as Reston and Tysons received parking flexibility because they met similar intensity standards;
- Explanation that other suburban activity centers without comparable density had not historically qualified for those benefits;
- Explanation that included at least one area planned for 3.0 FAR in Lorton allowed the community to qualify for planning tools and regulatory flexibility that supported urban-style, transit-oriented development;
- Explanation that the density level was intended to help establish a true mixed-use activity center rather than simply permit additional development;
- Explanation that there were different types of conservation easements;
    - Some conservation easements protect large tracts of land for environmental purposes;
    - Others were established for more limited purposes, such as:
        - Stormwater management;
        - Tree preservation; and
        - Landscape buffering.
- Explanation that certain conservation easements associated with development sites could be modified or removed during a future redevelopment process;
- Explanation that these easements were often intended to preserve site features during the life of a particular development rather than permanently prohibiting all future changes;

- Explanation that the specific easement referenced would require additional review to determine its exact restrictions and requirements;
- Explanation that if a neighborhood consolidation effort moved forward, property owners could petition the Board of Supervisors to modify or release applicable easements as part of the redevelopment process;
- Explanation that eminent domain was never contemplated as part of the Lorton Comprehensive Plan amendment;
- Clarification that the plan did not propose taking private property;
- Clarification that the plan did not compel property owners to redevelop their land;
- Explanation that the amendment was entirely voluntary in nature;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan served as a proactive planning framework rather than a redevelopment mandate;
- Explanation that the purpose of the amendment was to establish a long-term vision before redevelopment pressures arise;
- Explanation that without such planning, individual properties could redevelop independently without consideration of broader community goals;
- Clarification that the plan sought to ensure that future redevelopment would contribute to a coordinated community vision;
- Explanation that redevelopment proposals should consider:
    - Connectivity between sites;
    - Transportation improvements;
    - Community-serving amenities; and
    - Overall land-use compatibility;
- Explanation that the framework was intended to guide how future projects would fit together rather than simply evaluating each property in isolation;
- Explanation that the amendment was designed to help shape future redevelopment opportunities when they occurred;
- Explanation that the plan amendment established expectations for how redevelopment could support the larger Lorton community vision; and
- Explanation that no property owner was required to redevelop, and no land acquisition was proposed through the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Clarke to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Clarke thanked the public for participating in the planning process and acknowledged Supervisor Storck, County staff, and task force members for their years of work on the Lorton Core Study. He stated that the amendment established a community-driven vision for a more walkable, mixed-use, and connected Lorton that supported sustainable growth, economic vitality, housing diversity, and improved transportation options.

Commissioner Clarke emphasized that the plan focused on transforming existing commercial areas into vibrant activity centers while incorporating placemaking, public art, urban design, and

active transportation improvements. He concluded by noting that the amendment provided a long-term framework for creating a stronger and more vibrant community for future generations.

Commissioner Clarke MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2021-IV-LP1, AS PROVIDED IN PAGES 1 THROUGH 90 OF ATTACHMENT I TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED MAY 13, 2026, WITH THE MODIFICATIONS PROVIDED IN THE PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION HANDOUT.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eicher and Commissioners Cortina and Sargeant seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Bennett and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

//

RZ/FDP-2025-HM-00018 - OLD RESTON ASSOCIATES, LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from PDC to PDH-12 to permit 57 single-family attached units and adaptive re-use of the A. Smith Bowman House for residential or office use and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the w. side of Old Reston Ave., N. of Sunset Hills Rd., S. of Stratford House Pl. on approx. 5.19 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed-Use. Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 17-4 ((1)) 1. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Andrew A. Painter, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C. reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 4, 2026.

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 the staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP-2025-HM-00018.

Mr. Painter gave a brief presentation on the subject applications.

There was a discussion between Mr. Painter; Ms. Yee; Jeremy Ko, Fairfax County Department of Transportation; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Clarification that the applicant and staff were aligned on the preferred streetscape design;
- Explanation that the preferred option included the sidewalk, trees, and other streetscape elements recommended by staff;

- Clarification that the remaining concern involved what would happen if Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) did not approve the required waiver or maintenance agreement;
- Explanation that alternative designs were included only as contingency options;
- Explanation that if VDOT ultimately rejected the preferred design, the applicant would have a fallback option that still provided pedestrian connectivity;
- Explanation that the intent was to avoid having to return for a Plan Compliance Amendment (PCA) or interpretation later in the process;
- Explanation that a VDOT waiver review takes about 30 days per review cycle;
- Explanation that staff requested that the applicant plan for two review cycles;
- Explanation that the applicant had already submitted the waiver request and was actively addressing VDOT comments;
- Clarification that the goal was to resolve the matter before the Board of Supervisors' hearing;
- Explanation that if approval was obtained, some of the contingency language and alternative options may no longer be necessary;
- Concerns related to decks and overhangs extending into alleys;
- Clarification that the buildings remain within their property boundaries;
- Explanation that the overhang provision was included as an additional protective measure based on issues encountered on another project;
- Clarification that the preferred alignment was along Old Reston Avenue;
- Explanation that utility conflicts and physical constraints existed within the area;
- Explanation that Coordination with Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NOVA Parks) would be required;
- Explanation that initial discussions with NOVA Parks indicated tentative support for the preferred alignment, pending review of final design plans;
- Clarification that the proffers were written to prioritize the preferred Old Reston Avenue alignment;
- Explanation that the historic retaining wall created significant constraints;
- Explanation that the County recognized the importance of preserving the wall and associated historic resources;
- Clarification that while implementing the full standard streetscape may be difficult, there may be opportunities to add bicycle facilities through roadway restriping;
- Explanation that any waiver request would need to address those constraints and balance transportation improvements with historic preservation;
- Concern was raised that future interpretations of the plan could prioritize transportation requirements over preservation of the historic wall and surrounding features;
- Explanation that preservation of the historic wall would be a significant consideration during any VDOT waiver review;
- Explanation that the historic nature of the corridor provided strong justification for flexibility in applying standard requirements.
- Clarification that the goal was to achieve the desired improvements without negatively affecting the historic resources;
- Clarification that staff had requested sidewalks along both sides of the perimeter road;

- Explanation that some portions of the request were unnecessary because:
  - The road would operate as a one-way facility;
  - Multiple pedestrian connections already exist throughout the site;
  - Additional sidewalks would increase impervious surface area;
  - Additional sidewalks would reduce planned landscaping; and
  - The proposed pedestrian network already provided adequate connectivity.
- Explanation that recommendation was based on the site's location within a Transit Station Area (TSA);
- Explanation that within TSAs, staff generally sought sidewalks on both sides of streets to maximize pedestrian connectivity; and
- Explanation that the recommendation reflected broader transit-oriented development principles.

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.

After testimony from the speaker Mr. Painter stated that the existing office approval on the site for the average daily trip count was a little over 1000 per day. The numbers were about 373 per day so it was approximately a 70% decrease over what was currently approved on the site. He further stated that the hope was with the additional connectivity to the transit station area and the direct connections to the WWE trail and the Stratford trail people would also use transit instead.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks. Chair Niedzielski-Eichner then closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Carter to make a motion.

//

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

- RZ-2025-HM-00018 AND THE ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED MAY 27, 2026;
- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 2105.2.B(2) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE PRIVACY YARD REQUIREMENTS;
- MODIFICATION OF SUBSECTION 2105.2.C(1)(B)3 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM TOTAL LAND AREA DEVOTED TO OFFICE FROM 17,100 SQUARE FEET TO 19,400 SQUARE FEET; AND
- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 5107.3A(3) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW PRIVATE STREETS IN EXCESS OF SIX HUNDRED (600) FEET IN LENGTH.

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

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 10-0 (COMMISSIONERS BENNETT AND THOMAS WERE ABSENT FROM THE MEETING) TO APPROVE FDP-2025-HM-00018.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 a.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: September 16, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 21st day of September 2026 by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary Seal

Notary registration number: 8050379

Commission expiration: 03/31/2027

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