MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 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 O'Donnell, Branch Chief, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Clara Johnson, Branch Chief, Planning Division (PD), DPD
Kevin McMahan, ZED, DPD
Carl Shumate, ZED, DPD
Sharon Williams, ZED, DPD
Samantha Archibald, PD, DPD
David Stinson, PD, DPD
Natasha H. Schmidt, Wastewater Design & Construction Division, Capital Facilities, Department Public Works and Environmental Services
Thomas W. Burke, Transportation Planning Division, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Gregory Fuller, FCDOT
Meghan Van Dam, Community Development Assistant Director, Department Housing Community Development
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission, Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Michelle Jordan, Deputy Clerk, DCS
Jordyn Crane, Administration, DCS

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., by Chair Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included commission business and six public hearings.

//

Vice Chair Spain MOVED FOR READOPTION OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION POLICY FOR REMOTE PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS AS CIRCULATED BY JILL COOPER ON JUNE 11TH, 2026, AND AS POSTED ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION WEBSITE.

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

//

Secretary Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE FOLLOWING MEETING MINUTES:

- MARCH 4, 2026;
- MARCH 11, 2026;
- MARCH 18, 2026; AND
- MARCH 25, 2026;

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

//

Commissioner Bennett announced that the Land Use Process Committee Meeting would meet on Thursday, June 25, 2026, at 7:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center. She added that the focus of the meeting would be on the work plan for the year.

//

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner announced that the Policy Planning Committee would meet on Thursday June 25, 2026, at 8:30 p.m. in Conference Room 11 of the Fairfax County Government Center. He explained that the meeting would focus on planning the completion of Phase Two of the Comprehensive Plan Policy Plan update. While Phase One had already been recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors in December 2025, Phase Two would address updates to public facilities, housing, economic development, revitalization, environment, the Chesapeake Bay Supplement, parks and recreation, heritage resources, and glossary. He noted that the meeting would focus on establishing the work plan for

completing these remaining elements and he added that all committee meetings were advertised, open to the public, and would be televised on Channel 16.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. 2232-2024-MV-00010 - JONES POINT FACILITIES UPGRADE
2. FDPA-2018-HM-020-002 (CONCURRENT WITH CDPA-2018- HM-020, FDPA-2018-HM-020-003, PCA-2018-HM-020 (RZPA-2025-HM-00055) - TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC
3. CDPA-2018- HM-020, FDPA-2018- HM-020-003, PCA-2018-HM-020 (CONCURRENT WITH FDPA-2018-HM-020-002 (RZPA-2025-HM-00054) - TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC
4. RZ/FDP-2024-MA-00013 - 6200 WILSON LLC
5. RZ/FDP-2025-DR-00012 CONCURRENT WITH PCA-85-C-008-04 (RZPA-2025-DR-00087) - CPA COPPERMINE 3 LENDER, LLC
6. SSPA 2023-III-5UP (PA-2023-00029) - LINCOLN PARK

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

2232-2024-MV-00010 - JONES POINT FACILITIES UPGRADE- Application 2232-2024-MV-00010 to consider the proposal by the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services requesting 2232 approval to replace the existing Jones Point pump station and force main at 5800 Hunting Creek Road, Alexandria, VA 22303. Tax Map: 83-1 ((1)) 58, 83-1 ((27)) A, 83-3 ((1)) 101, and Fairfax County owned right-of-way not assigned a parcel number. Mount Vernon District. Area IV.
MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Stinson, 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 2232-2024-MV-00010.

Natasha H. Schmidt, Wastewater Design & Construction Division, Capital Facilities, Department Public Works and Environmental Services, and Sarah Shay, Senior Principal Engineer, Hazen and Sawyer and James Newbold, Senior Associate, Hazen and Sawyer, gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Stinson, Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Newbold, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the project involved replacing the existing pumping station;
- Explanation that the existing station would remain operational while construction of the new facility was underway;
- Explanation that the new pumping station would be constructed within the existing right-of-way area;
- Clarification that most components of the new pumping station would be located below ground;
- Explanation that above-ground features would be limited to:
    - A standby generator; and
    - A small control building that would house operational controls and storage space.
- Explanation that the facility would be enclosed by a chain-link fence with privacy slats;
- Explanation that very little of the new infrastructure would be visible from outside the fenced area.;
- Explanation that the project was primarily an internal replacement and modernization of the existing pumping station rather than a significant expansion of the site;
- Explanation that the project may temporarily impact four parking spaces at the Riverside Apartments;
- Explanation that the apartment complex would regain four parking spaces that were currently reserved for the existing pump station;
- Explanation that the County had been coordinating with the apartment complex regarding easements and future redevelopment plans;
- Explanation that the Riverside Apartments had plans for future redevelopment that may include additional apartment buildings with structured parking, although the timeline for that work was unknown;
- Explanation that construction activities would comply with County noise ordinance requirements;
- Clarification that construction work was not anticipated outside of permitted construction hours;
- Explanation that any request for after-hours work would require County approval;
- Explanation that staff did not currently anticipate the need for construction outside normal hours;
- Clarification that the estimated project duration was approximately 18 months from notice to proceed through substantial completion;
- Explanation that the timeline included:
    - Design submittals and shop drawings;
    - Equipment procurement;
    - Site preparation and construction; and
    - Installation of the new pumping station components.
- Explanation that the design included provisions for future odor-control equipment if it became necessary;

- Explanation that the wet well was designed to be relatively deep, which helped minimize odor concerns;
- Explanation that there had been very few, if any, odor complaints associated with the existing facility;
- Clarification that based on current conditions, odor-control equipment was not anticipated to be necessary at this time;
- Explanation that the project included infrastructure to accommodate future odor-control systems if needed;
- Explanation that space had been reserved for equipment, including conduit connections and a concrete pad large enough to support an air treatment or odor-control unit appropriate for the size of the pump station; and
- Explanation that if odor issues arise in the future, the equipment could be installed relatively easily without major modifications to the facility.

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

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 Clarke to make a motion.

//

Commissioner Clarke MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE APPLICATION 2232-2024-MV-00010, BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND REASONS:

- THE SUBJECT PROPOSAL BY THE FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES TO REPLACE AND UPGRADE THE EXISTING JONES POINT PUMP STATION, LOCATED AT 5800 HUNTING CREEK ROAD, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, INCLUDES CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW WASTEWATER PUMP STATION, ASSOCIATED UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE, ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS, LANDSCAPING, AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN RELIABLE WASTEWATER SERVICE AND TO ACCOMMODATE PROJECTED FUTURE DEMAND.

- THE PROPOSAL 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 ON PAGES 11 THROUGH 13 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 9, 2026.

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

//

FDPA-2018-HM-020-002 (RZPA-2025-HM-00054) - TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC - FDPA Appl. to amend the final development plan and conditions for RZ-2018-HM-020 to permit 58 single-family attached dwelling units on Block N1 and 61 single-family attached dwelling units on Block W2 at a 0.92 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) inclusive of bonus density. Located on the W. side of Wiehle Ave. (Rte. 828) and N. of Sunset Hills Rd. (Rte. 675) on approx. 7.54 ac. of land zoned PRM. Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 17-4 ((43)) 1, 2, 5 (pt.), 6 (pt.), and 7 (pt.). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PCA/CDPA-2018-HM-020/ FDPA-2018-HM-020-003 (RZPA-2025-HM-00055) - TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC- PCA, CDPA and FDPA Appl(s). to amend the proffers, conceptual development plan, and final development plan for RZ-2018-HM-020 to permit 24 single-family attached dwelling units on Block N3 at a 0.81 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) inclusive of bonus density. Located on the W. side of Wiehle Ave. (Rte. 828) and N. of Sunset Hills Rd. (Rte. 675) on approx. 1.54 ac. of land zoned PRM. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Mixed Use. Hunter Mill District. Tax Map 17-4 ((43)) 4, 5 (pt.), and 7 (pt.). HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Andrew A. Painter, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, P.C, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 28, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Kevin McMahan, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Development, presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended approval of FDPA-2018-HM-020-002 (RZPA-2025-HM-00054) (CONCURRENT WITH CDPA-2018- HM-020, FDPA-2018- HM-020-003, PCA-2018-HM-020 (RZPA-2025-HM-00055).

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

There was a discussion between Mr. McMahan; Mr. Painter; Michael P. Saale, Peter Lawrence of Virginia, Inc.; Christopher W. Myers, Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. t/a Urban Ltd.; Gregory Fuller, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Concerns regarding temporary closures of the Wiehle Avenue trail during construction;

- Clarification that the project team became aware of concerns approximately one and a half weeks earlier when test pits bored by a contractor along Wiehle Avenue resulted in a temporary trail closure for safety reasons;
- Explanation that upon learning of the issue, the applicant immediately directed the contractor to fill the test pits, repave the affected portion of the trail, and reopen it;
- Explanation that any future closures of the Wiehle Avenue trail or other trails adjacent to the site would be coordinated in advance;
- Explanation that maintenance of traffic plans would be developed and coordinated with both Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and FCDOT;
- Explanation that portions of the trail located within VDOT right-of-way or subject to public access easements would require VDOT approval before any closures could occur;
- Explanation that the proposed language had been submitted for consideration as a development condition to ensure these requirements were formalized;
- Explanation that future trail closures would not occur without an approved maintenance of traffic plan;
- Explanation that coordination with VDOT and FCDOT would help ensure that pedestrian and bicycle access was maintained throughout construction whenever possible;
- Explanation that the project team was committed to minimizing disruptions to trail users and improving communication and coordination for any necessary temporary closures;
- Explanation that the sediment issue arose during construction associated with previously approved road and infrastructure improvements within the larger development;
- Explanation that erosion and sediment control measures were properly designed, approved by Fairfax County, and installed by the contractor;
- Explanation that the affected area included a ravine and intermittent stream located adjacent to the property;
- Explanation that a Fairfax Water main break on December 31 caused a minor sediment release into a nearby ravine;
- Clarification that Fairfax County determined the applicant was not at fault, and the incident was unrelated to construction activities;
- Explanation that the applicant removed the sediment, implemented additional erosion and sediment control measures, stabilized the affected area, and reported that no further issues had occurred since the corrective actions were completed;
- Explanation that staff still recommended increasing the proposed $15,000 contribution for the trail connection due to the steep slopes in the area;
- Explanation that staff continued to recommend additional noise mitigation measures for Wayside Park, although projected noise levels were only slightly above the County's preferred standard;
- Explanation that staff continued to recommend further consideration of the Workforce Dwelling Unit (WDU) distribution;
- Explanation that there were three primary pedestrian connections to the Metro station:

    - Wiehle Avenue which provided a direct connection along the eastern side of the site;
    - Isaac Newton Square, which connected across Sunset Hills Road to Reston Station Boulevard on the western side; and

  - The Washington & Old Dominion (W&OD) Trail, which provided east-west connectivity at the southern end of the property.
- Clarification that the site was directly connected to the W&OD Trail through an opening in the berm that was established as part of the 2019 approval in coordination with NOVA Parks;
- Clarification that the property boundary extended to NOVA Parks property at the southern end of the site;
- Explanation that the recently completed W&OD Trail pedestrian bridge had significantly improved safety at the Wiehle Avenue and Sunset Hills Road intersection;
- Explanation that the project included a proffer which conducted a traffic signal warrant analysis at the Sunset Hills Road and Isaac Newton Square East intersection;
- Explanation that additional pedestrian safety improvements were proposed at the Isaac Newton Square West and W&OD Trail intersection, including upgraded signage and traffic-calming measures such as rumble strips;
- Explanation that multiple pedestrian routes and planned transportation improvements were intended and provided safe and convenient access between the site, surrounding trails, and the Metro station;
- Explanation that Sunset Hills Road was maintained by VDOT;
- Explanation that most public roads in Virginia were part of VDOT's secondary road system, with relatively few maintained by Fairfax County;
- Explanation that the project included construction of a new, wider trail along Wiehle Avenue;
- Explanation that the new trail would provide improved pedestrian and bicycle accommodations compared to the existing sidewalk;
- Explanation that these improvements were intended to enhance pedestrian safety and connectivity between the development, surrounding trails, and nearby transit facilities;
- Explanation that the Fairfax County Public Schools memorandum included in the staff report projected South Lakes High School at approximately 101% capacity;
- Clarification that Fairfax County Public Schools reviewed and supported the application;
- Explanation that the applicant had committed to the required school funding contributions through its proffers;
- Explanation that the project was meeting the school-related requirements typically requested by Fairfax County Public Schools;
- Explanation that the 32-acre development was approved for 2,100 residential units in 2019;
- Explanation that the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) was intentionally designed to allow units to be shifted between blocks as market conditions change;
- Explanation that the development documents included flexibility to redistribute units throughout the site while maintaining the overall approved unit count;
- Explanation that the ownership team intended to retain all 2,100 approved units and had created a development bank which tracked unit transfers between blocks;
- Concerns related to the proposed park's proximity to the adjacent golf course;
- Explanation that the playground was approximately 225 yards from the golf course tee box and sat at a higher elevation than the golf course;

- Explanation that proposed landscaping buffers and tree plantings would provide additional screening and protection;
- Clarification that the adjacent buildings, which were approximately 45 to 50 feet tall, provided another physical barrier between the golf course and the playground;
- Explanation that ownership had monitored the area for many years and had observed very few golf balls reaching that location;
- Explanation that site visits conducted by the project team identified only two golf balls in the area over approximately two years of inspections;
- Concern about residential units near Metro stations that remained unbuilt;
- Explanation that the project had been in development for approximately 10 years;
- Explanation that while no vertical construction had occurred yet, infrastructure improvements were currently underway, including roads and stormwater facilities;
- Explanation that the first multifamily building was expected to begin vertical construction once building permits were issued;
- Explanation that additional development blocks were being prepared for future construction;
- Concern that the site was in a prime transit-oriented location and should support higher-density development;
- Explanation that ownership intended to retain all 2,100 approved residential units;
- Explanation that the development plan was intentionally designed to allow units to be shifted among blocks in response to market conditions;
- Explanation that the market realities and financing challenges had influenced development decisions, particularly on smaller blocks with physical constraints and utility easements;
- Explanation that the applicant remained committed to maximizing the site's development potential;
- Explanation that development conditions now required a tracking table at the site plan stage showing how unused residential units and gross floor area were reassigned among development blocks;
- Clarification that this condition addressed staff's concerns regarding density transfers and provided greater transparency throughout the buildout process;
- Explanation that the previously identified lighting issues had been resolved;
- Explanation that ownership had made a significant investment in the project's infrastructure, including approximately $18 million in improvements;
- Explanation that the streets were being developed as privately maintained facilities with public access easements to ensure a higher level of long-term maintenance and design consistency;
- Explanation that ownership had placed a strong emphasis on architectural quality, tree placement, and cohesive site design across all development blocks;
- Explanation that a streetscape furnishings package had been developed that established standards for items such as lighting and other streetscape elements and would be required for all future contract purchasers; and
- Explanation that the streetscape package was updated in May and had been incorporated into the project's conditions of approval.

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 Carter to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter emphasized that the project's placemaking elements including its pedestrian-friendly streets, open spaces, and recreational amenities would help create a cohesive and active neighborhood consistent with the Reston Area Plan. He noted that the proposal provided a variety of parks and open spaces, including a soccer field and connections to the W&OD Trail, which enhanced the community's recreational opportunities. He acknowledged the significant infrastructure investments required before construction could occur and recognized that school capacity remained an ongoing countywide issue. Commissioner Carter commended the applicant for its thoughtful design and thanked County staff and agency representatives for their collaborative efforts in resolving project-related issues, stating that the proposal advances the broader vision for the Reston community.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter requested that the applicant confirm for the record agreement to the proposed development conditions consistent with those dated June 23, 2026.

Mr. Painter affirmed agreement to the proposed development conditions dated June 23, 2026

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

- PCA/CDPA-2018-HM-020, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 12, 2026; AND

- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 2105.5.B(2) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WHICH REQUIRES A 200 SQUARE FOOT PRIVACY YARD ON EACH SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLING UNIT, IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE PLANS.

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 12-0 TO APPROVE FDPA-2018-HM-020-003 AND FDPA-2018-HM-020-002, SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED JUNE 23, 2026.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner and Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 12-0.

//

RZ/FDP-2024-MA-00013 - 6200 WILSON LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from R-20 and CRD to PRM and CRD to permit a mixed use development with retail, a new multifamily residential building and the retention of the existing multifamily residential building at a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 2.0 inclusive of bonus density and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the N. side of Wilson Blvd. W. side of McKinley Rd. and the southern terminus of North Ohio St. bounded by Arlington County on the E. and City of Falls Church on the W. on approx. 5.58 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential mixed use option to permit up to 520 multifamily units and up to 20,000 SF retail. Mason District. Tax Map 51-3 ((1)) 43. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

Sara V. Mariska, Applicant's Agent, Odin Feldman Pittleman, P.C., reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 19, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Sharon Williams, 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-2024-MA-00013.

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

There was a discussion between Ms. Williams; Ms. Mariska; Gabrielle M. Duvall, Applicant, 6200 Wilson LLC; Meghan Van Dam, Community Development Assistant Director, Department Housing Community Development (DHCD); Gregory Fuller, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); Aaron M. Winson, Civil Engineer, Walter L. Phillips, Inc.; Maria C. Lashinger, Transportation Consultant, Gorove/Slade Associates Inc.; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that while there had been previous instances in which lenders had worked cooperatively with similar projects, the applicant could not state that approval was likely;
- Explanation that lender approval ultimately rests with the lender and that the applicant could not speak on behalf of larger entities such as Fannie Mae;
- Explanation that opportunity zones were separated from affordable housing commitments;
- Explanation that Fairfax County was not currently aware of other County projects that had utilized opportunity zone financing;
- Explanation that County staff had recently been discussing potential changes under opportunity zone 2.0 legislation;
- Explanation that staff was comfortable with the applicant's current financing proposal;

- Clarification that staff's primary concerns had been obtaining lender consent and ensuring that an appropriate financial backstop was in place;
- Explanation that without those protections, the project would not have provided the anticipated preservation benefits;
- Clarification that based on the applicant's commitments and the information presented, staff believed those concerns had been adequately addressed;
- Explanation that staff was in agreement with the applicant's approach and supported moving forward with the proposal;
- Explanation that bird-friendly design standards were typically intended for buildings with large expanses of glass, such as office buildings;
- Explanation that the proposed residential building did not contain significant amounts of glass that would present the same bird strike concerns;
- Explanation that the project's unique opportunity zone financing structure created strict cost and timing constraints;
- Explanation that the applicant was carefully limiting project commitments to those that were necessary and financially feasible;
- Explanation that based on the building's design and limited bird strike risk, the applicant did not propose a bird-friendly design proffer;
- Explanation that the site design was developed to balance pedestrian connectivity, landscaping, and existing infrastructure constraints;
- Explanation that an existing cooling tower and generator were fixed elements that could not be relocated;
- Explanation that providing sidewalks on both sides of the private street would require narrowing the travel aisle and reducing landscaping areas;
- Explanation that the applicant instead widened the internal travel aisle from 20 feet to 22 feet and provided a wider sidewalk and enhanced landscaping on one side of the street to create a more comfortable pedestrian experience;
- Explanation that the design prioritized the primary pedestrian routes throughout the site based on where residents were expected to travel;
- Concerns with stormwater quality associated with the proposed tennis courts;
- Explanation that the tennis court's impervious surface area was included in the overall stormwater management calculations;
- Explanation that while the tennis court was not treated directly by a stormwater facility, the site's overall stormwater design significantly exceeded the County's minimum water quality requirements;
- Explanation that the stormwater management system had sufficient capacity to account for the tennis court's impacts;
- Concerns about sanitary sewer capacity;
- Explanation that the site had two potential sanitary sewer connection options one through Fairfax County and one through Arlington County;
- Explanation that capacity analyses had been completed for both systems;
- Clarification that if the project connected to Fairfax County's system, certain downstream sewer improvements would be required and were addressed through the project's proffers;

- Explanation that if the project connected to Arlington County's system, Arlington County had confirmed that adequate capacity existed to accommodate the development without additional upgrades;
- Explanation that the project's primary goal was to move forward under the original affordable housing plan;
- Explanation that the applicant had committed in its proffers to formally seek lender approval;
- Explanation that obtaining lender consent would involve a detailed presentation and review process, including costs associated with lender approval;
- Explanation that the backstop proposal was intended only as a contingency if lender approval could not be obtained and was not the preferred option;
- Explanation that the applicant publicly committed to working with both the lender and county housing staff throughout the process;
- Concerns regarding traffic backups along Wilson Boulevard and the status of a proposed road diet;
- Explanation that two transportation design options had been developed for Wilson Boulevard, including a preferred road diet alternative developed in coordination with FCDOT.
- Explanation that an alternative design had been included should the preferred road diet option not be approved during site plan review;
- Explanation that both options were included to avoid project delays and provided flexibility during the approval process;
- Explanation that traffic impacts from the development were relatively small and fell within the lowest tier of transportation analysis requirements;
- Explanation that traffic generated by the project dispersed quickly once it entered the surrounding roadway network;
- Explanation that by the time vehicles reached existing congestion points farther west along Wilson Boulevard, the project's contribution to traffic volumes was negligible;
- Explanation that the development was therefore not expected to materially worsen the existing traffic backup conditions along Wilson Boulevard;
- Explanation that the applicant had engaged Dominion Hills Civic Association early in the process and provided information about the application;
- Explanation that the applicant had shared the comprehensive transportation analysis;
- Explanation that the applicant remained committed to ongoing communication and would continue working with adjacent communities throughout construction;
- Explanation that the applicant was committed to incorporating public art and was open to recommendations regarding artists and organizations; and
- Explanation that the applicant intended to build upon relationships established through other projects in Fairfax County to implement meaningful public art elements.

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 thanked county staff and the Department of Housing and Community Development, as well as the applicant team, for their work in navigating the complexities of the project, which involved multiple jurisdictions and a unique financing structure. She stated that she was pleased the parties were able to reach an agreement that supported the County's housing goals by providing both new residential units and affordable housing opportunities. Commissioner Wang also highlighted that the proposal exceeded the County's open space and stormwater management requirements and praised the project's design elements, including the proposed public art and park spaces. She expressed her support for the application and noted that it represents a thoughtful and well-designed approach to delivering much-needed housing in Fairfax County.

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

- RZ-2024-MA-00013 AND THE ASSOCIATED CDP, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 16, 2026;

- WAIVER OF THE INTERPARCEL ACCESS REQUIREMENT IN SUBSECTION 8100.7.E OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE; AND

- MODIFICATION OF THE STREET FRONTAGE LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENT ALONG WILSON BOULEVARD IN SUBSECTION 5108.3.A(2) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP.

IN A RELATED ACTION, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 12-0 TO APPROVE FDP-2024-MA-00013 SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF THE CONCURRENT REZONING APPLICATION.

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

//

RZ/FDP-2025-DR-00012 - CPA COPPERMINE 3 LENDER, LLC- RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from I-5 to PDH-20 to permit up to 98 single family attached and stacked townhouse dwelling units with an overall density of 21.39 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) inclusive of bonus density and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the N. and E side of Sunrise Valley Dr., and S. of Coppermine Rd. on approx. 4.71 ac.

of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed Use. Dranesville District. Tax Map 15-4 ((1)) 22A2. (Concurrent with PCA-85-C-008-04 (RZPA-2025-DR-00087)). DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PCA-85-C-008-04 (RZPA-2025-DR-00087) - CPA COPPERMINE 3 LENDER, LLC - PCA Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ-85-C-008 to delete land area. Located on the N. and E side of Sunrise Valley Dr., and S. of Coppermine Rd. on approx. 4.71 ac. of land zoned I-5. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed Uses. Dranesville District. Tax Map 15-4 ((1)) 22A2. (Concurrent with RZ/FDP-2025-DR-00012).
DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

David R. Gill, Applicant's Agent, Wire Gill LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 19, 2026.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

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 staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP-2025-DR-00012 concurrent with PCA-85-C-008-04 (RZPA-2025-DR-00087).

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

There was a discussion between Mr. Shumate, Mr. Gill; Mr. Fuller; William O'Donnell, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD; Gregory Fuller, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); Ankur Walia, Engineer, Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc.; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the units were Affordable Dwelling Units (ADU), not Workforce Dwelling Units (WDUs), and therefore were intended to serve households at or below 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI);
- Clarification that ADUs were restricted to households earning 60% AMI or below;
- Concerns about gaps in the sidewalk network;
- Explanation that some of the apparent sidewalk terminations were intended and provided direct access from parking spaces;
- Concerns regarding the fragmented sidewalk network and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant curb ramps had been raised throughout the review process;
- Explanation that while site constraints limited the ability to achieve the preferred pedestrian network, there were opportunities to improve the current design;
- Concern that the landscaping appeared concentrated around the site's perimeter rather than being more integrated throughout the townhouse development;
- Explanation that the site met all required tree canopy and landscaping requirements;

- Explanation that existing utility and gas easements significantly constrained where trees could be planted;
- Explanation that the landscaping plan was revised during the review process to increase plantings and screening where feasible;
- Explanation that the applicant was willing to consider additional perimeter landscaping to create a more townhouse-oriented environment;
- Explanation that utility easements along Copper Mine Road limited tree placement opportunities;
- Explanation that the landscaping calculations demonstrated compliance with County requirements;
- Explanation that additional landscaping enhancements may be possible as the design continued to be refined;
- Explanation that the applicant was willing to address the ADA curb ramp issues and work with staff to resolve any outstanding sidewalk connectivity concerns;
- Explanation that the specific sidewalk deficiencies identified by staff were not entirely clear based on the current plan layout;
- Explanation that the proposal already included pedestrian connections throughout the site, including lead walks from visitor parking spaces and north-south pedestrian routes;
- Explanation that the applicant was committed to refining the plans to ensure the pedestrian network functions as intended;
- Concerns regarding a letter submitted by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) related to aircraft noise impacts on the site;
- Explanation that residential developments already existed closer to the airport than the proposed project;
- Explanation that the site's proximity to airport operations was an existing condition in the surrounding area;
- Explanation that the applicant was willing to disclose the site's proximity to the airport in homeowners association documents;
- Explanation that the property was located outside of the airport's adopted noise contour areas;
- Explanation that noise attenuation measures had already been incorporated into the project design due to its proximity to nearby roadways; and
- Explanation that a noise study had been completed as part of the application review process.

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 there was further discussion regarding the following:

- Explanation that the remaining issues were relatively minor and primarily involved sidewalk terminations, ADA-compliant curb ramps, and pedestrian crossings;
- Explanation that some sidewalk segments currently end abruptly and should be revised to provide better pedestrian connectivity;
- Explanation that additional pedestrian improvements, such as pavement markings at travelway crossings, may also be appropriate;
- Explanation that staff initially stated that the issues were intended to be worked through during the review process but later clarified that they should not be deferred to site plan;
- Explanation that without approved plans or proffer commitments, there would be no mechanism to require the proposed improvements during site plan review because the applicant was entitled to construct what was ultimately approved;
- Explanation that staff was willing and would meet with the applicant and work collaboratively to revise the plans before the Board hearing;
- Explanation that updating the plans now would provide certainty that the improvements were incorporated into the approved development;
- Explanation that the property was not located within the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority's airport noise contour areas and was therefore not subject to the County's additional airport noise mitigation requirements;
- Explanation that the applicant had already committed to interior noise mitigation standards for the project;
- Explanation that the applicant was willing to include a disclosure in the homeowners association documents informing future residents of the property's proximity to the airport; and
- Clarification that the applicant had no objection to providing that disclosure as part of the project's commitments.

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION FOR RZ/FDP-2025-DR 00012 and PCA-85-C-008-04TO A DATE CERTAIN OF JULY 8, 2026, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS.

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

//

SSPA 2023-III-5UP (PA-2023-00029) - LINCOLN PARK- Site Specific Plan Amendment 2023-III-5UP (Lincoln Park) concerns approx. 26.88 ac. generally located southwest of the intersection of McLearen Road and Centreville Road (Tax Map Parcels 24-4 ((1)) 6D3, 6D5, 6D6, 6E, and 6F) in the Sully Supervisor District. The area is planned for campus-style office uses, up to a maximum of 1.0 FAR, with optional training or hotel/conference uses. The amendment will consider adding an option for residential use at 18 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified.
SULLY DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING

Samantha Archibald, Planning Division (PD), Department of Planning and Development (DPD) presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that staff recommended adoption of SSPA 2023-III-5UP.

David Gill, Nominator's Agent, K Hovnanian Homes, made a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Ms. Archibald; Clara Johnson, Branch Chief, PD, DPD; Thomas W. Burke, Transportation Planning Division (TPD), Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that Skyview High School would be identified as one of the schools serving the development;
- Explanation that while the comprehensive plan continued to envision office, hotel, and conference space for the broader area, the application currently under consideration was for a 100% residential development;
- Concern about Carson Middle School's projected capacity;
- Explanation that Fairfax County Public Schools' (FCPS) capacity projections were based on a limited planning horizon and may change over time;
- Explanation that FCPS capacity impacts would continue to be evaluated as future development applications and rezoning requests were submitted;
- Explanation that FCPS would reassess school enrollment projections which would determine whether additional mitigation measures were necessary as the development progressed;
- Explanation that remaining two parcels totaled 11 acres;
- Explanation that both their size and configuration made certain uses, including data center development, more challenging;
- Explanation that existing industrial zoning on the parcels allowed a variety of by-right industrial uses that remained a concern for nearby residents;
- Clarification that the recommendation for a 15-acre coordinated development or parcel consolidation would allow greater flexibility in site design, buffering, and transitions between uses;
- Explanation that the County's policy plans already included guidance requiring appropriate transitions and compatibility between adjacent land uses;
- Explanation that existing retail uses could benefit from additional nearby residents;
- Explanation that increasing the number of residential units within walking distance may help support existing businesses rather than introducing new retail within the project itself;
- Explanation that previous plans for retail development within the larger Discovery Square area had not materialized because there had not been sufficient residential density to support those uses;
- Clarification that rooftops referred to the number of households and potential customers living near retail establishments;

- Explanation that one of the remaining adjacent parcels was owned by Dominion Energy and served as an active operations facility that was unlikely to redevelop;
- Explanation that another parcel was occupied by a secure government-related facility that was also unlikely to redevelop in the foreseeable future;
- Explanation that the future plans included:
    - Extending the trail network along Centreville Road;
    - Creating pedestrian connections to surrounding developments, including Discovery Square;
    - Incorporating a publicly accessible park near the new school site, potentially including amenities such as a splash pad or water feature; and
    - Utilizing the site's street grid and open spaces which provided physical separation and buffering between residential and existing industrial or office uses.
- Explanation that the proposed residential option was intended to strengthen the surrounding community by increasing housing opportunities, supporting existing retail uses, and improving pedestrian connectivity and public amenities.

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

Further discussion between Ms. Johnson, Mr. Burke, Mr. Gill, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Explanation that the proposed option currently under consideration was limited to residential development at a density of up to 18 dwelling units per acre;
- Explanation that future development proposals for other parcels could potentially be evaluated under the applicable comprehensive plan guidance at that time;
- Explanation that retail uses were not permitted under the current zoning regulations for the site;
- Explanation that detailed transportation and public safety analyses would occur during the rezoning and development review process;
- Explanation that future rezoning applications would compare existing site conditions with proposed development impacts;
- Explanation that the County's Active Transportation and Trails Plan would be applied during future development reviews;
- Explanation that the proposed residential development was expected to generate fewer vehicle trips than both the existing office buildings and the office uses currently allowed under the Comprehensive Plan;
- Explanation that because of the reduced traffic impacts, staff focused its review on improving pedestrian and active transportation facilities rather than roadway capacity improvements;
- Explanation that the proposed plan guidance specifically encouraged pedestrian improvements, including safer crossings and connections to nearby schools, retail destinations, and surrounding developments along Centreville Road and McLearen Road;
- Explanation that future development applications would undergo additional transportation and public safety reviews to ensure that appropriate pedestrian, traffic, and connectivity improvements were incorporated as the project moved forward;

- Concerns that future traffic analyses should account not only for traffic generated by the proposed development but also for existing and anticipated regional traffic patterns;
- Explanation that transportation analyses considered both existing traffic conditions and regional traffic forecasts when evaluating development proposals;
- Explanation that Centreville Road was already planned in the Comprehensive Plan as a six-lane roadway, and future development was expected to dedicate the necessary right-of-way improvements to accommodate that long-term vision;
- Explanation that the County's transportation modeling incorporated anticipated regional growth and future traffic volumes when conducting transportation analyses;
- Concerns that widening roads also raises significant pedestrian and bicycle safety; and
- Explanation that the proposed comprehensive plan language already included recommendations related to active transportation and off-site pedestrian improvements;

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 Spain to make a motion.

//

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Spain acknowledged the concerns raised by members of the community, particularly regarding public safety and transportation. She noted that the Planning Commission was currently considering only the Comprehensive Plan amendment and emphasized that future rezoning applications would involve a more detailed review of transportation, public safety, and related issues. Staff confirmed that those matters would be addressed during the regulatory review process, which provided a more comprehensive evaluation than the current planning-level review.

Commissioner Spain stated that the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment provided an opportunity to expand housing choices near existing services, amenities, and employment centers while advancing the vision of the Dulles Suburban Center. She noted that the amendment encourages coordinated development, cohesive site design, improved pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, and compatibility with surrounding residential, commercial, and employment uses.

Commissioner Spain MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT SSPA 2023-III-5UP, FOUND ON PAGES 16 AND 17 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 3, 2026.

Commissioner Cortina seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 11-1. Commissioner Batchelor-Causey voted in opposition.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 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: 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