MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2026

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chair, 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
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Chris Landgraf, Franconia District
James Thomas, Springfield District
Alis Wang, Mason District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Savannah Murray, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Nicholas Cicero, ZED, DPD
Brent M. Krasner, Branch Chief, ZED, DPD
David Stinson, Planning Division (PD), DPD
Salem Bush, Branch Chief, PD, DPD
Jill Cooper, Executive Director, Planning Commission,
Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Satabdi Samaddar, Administration, DCS
Samantha Lawrence, Senior Deputy Clerk, Planning Commission, 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 announced that the agenda for tonight's meeting included commission business, one decision only, and the conduct of four public hearings.

//

PCA/CDPA-2017-DR-012 (RZPA-2022-DR-00149) CONCURRENT WITH FDPA-2017-DR-012 (RZPA-2022-DR-00150) – POMEROY INVESTMENTS INC. AND THE POMEROY COMPANIES INC.

(Decision Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on July 8, 2026; Decision Only from July 16, 2026; Decision Only to September 16, 2026)

Commissioner Batchelor-Causey MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR PCA/CDPA/FDPA 2017-DR-012 TO SEPTEMBER 16, 2026, OR THE NEXT APPROPRIATE DATE WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR COMMENTS.

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

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. PCA-2023-PR-00010 (RZPA-2026-PR-00013) – TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC.
2. RZ/FDP-2024-MA-00012 – NICHOLAS LRT LLC
3. RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00027 AND PCA-2004-LE-021-002 – K. HOVNANIAN AT MOUNT VERNON GATEWAY, LLC
4. SSPA 2023-III-9UP (PA-2023-00045) – LAKE FAIRFAX BUSINESS CENTER

This order was accepted without objection.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner recited rules for public testimony.

//

PCA-2023-PR-00010 (RZPA-2026-PR-00013) - TRI POINTE HOMES DC METRO, INC. – PCA Appl. to amend the proffers for RZ-2023-PR-00010. Located N. of Arrowhead Dr. to the W. of Rosehaven St. on approx. 12.14 ac. of land zoned PDH-20. Comp. Plan Rec: Mixed Use. Providence District. Tax Map 47-4 ((1)) 5C, D and E. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

G. Evan Pritchard, Applicant's Agent, Wire Gill LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated June 12, 2026.

Savannah Murray, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD) presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of PCA-2023-PR-00010.

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

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

- The applicant's agent stated that significant progress had already been made in ensuring that easement and roadway connections were provided to the other projects;

- Staff and the applicant discussed that connectivity between the proposed project and the project to the north was already in place, much of the work had been completed, and the connections were expected to function seamlessly together;
- The applicant's agent clarified that they wanted to ensure that construction of the first set of townhomes, including all associated construction activities and truck traffic, was completed in time to deliver the first park following issuance of the first Residential Use Permit (RUP) in Phase 2 for the second set of townhomes;
- The applicant's agent confirmed that the proposal was subject to one development management plan, and was being developed by Tri Pointe Homes DC Metro, Inc.;
- The applicant's agent clarified that the conduit was being installed during the last phase of the project, which was considered the most logical time for installation that supported electric vehicle charging stations; and
- The applicant's agent stated that their goal was to construct each phase of the project as quickly as possible.

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

Further discussion between Mr. Pritchard and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- The applicant's agent apologized for the impact the demolition had on the community and neighboring homes;
- The applicant's agent agreed to reach out to the speaker to obtain his contact information and ensure that the contractor was complying with all required County policies, implemented appropriate dust control measures, and took additional steps necessary to mitigate further impacts;
- The applicant's agent stated that the majority of the demolition had been completed, some clearing was taking place on the site, and the remaining work was expected to be fully completed by October 2026;
- Confirmation there had been contact either on site or immediately available to address all concerns;
- The applicant's agent reiterated that the demolition portion on the site had already been completed, and clearing of the demolished structures was expected to be completed by October 2026; and
- Confirmation the Board of Supervisors had approved proffers that addressed construction management responsibilities at the site, which included compliance with applicable County regulations.

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

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Hancock stated that he appreciated the applicant's commitment to working with neighboring properties, and others in the community who may have concerns.

//

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA-2023-PR-00010, SUBJECT TO THE DRAFT PROFFERS DATED JULY 8, 2026.

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

//

RZ/FDP-2024-MA-00012 - NICHOLAS LRT LLC – RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from C-6, HC and SC to PDC, HC and SC to permit a residential development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.75 and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located N. of Little River Turnpike (Route 236), W. of Woodland Rd., generally E. of Hummer Rd., and generally S. of Horseshoe Dr. on approx. 1.81 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Office. Mason District. Tax Map 59-4 ((6)) 10.
MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Kenneth W. Wire, Applicant's Agent, Wire Gill LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated May 13, 2026.

Nicholas Cicero, ZED, DPD presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP-2024-MA-00012.

Mr. Wire gave a presentation on the subject application.

There was a discussion between Mr. Cicero, Mr. Wire, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- The applicant's agent stated that many green building measures were typically incorporated as a conversion project progressed, larger-scale projects were somewhat easier to implement, for example, exposed columns in a building that was being retained;
- The applicant worked with staff to preserve the building's aesthetic, maintained a sense of cohesive development with the surrounding buildings, noting the difficulty of uniformly wrapping insulation around an exposed concrete column;
- The applicant's agent stated that there were also challenges associated with barriers on existing floors, and would not demolish an existing floor to install RAYDON barriers, but would work through the entitlement process;

- The applicant's agent stated that the proffers provided a significant County incentive, addressed energy efficiency measures, and certain green building initiatives included in the proffers;
- Clarification that the challenge associated with a third-party rating agency was the administrative paperwork, the applicant chose to proffer its intent and verify compliance at the County's request, with the expectation that this would achieve the intent of the policy without incurring the expense of third-party certification;
- The applicant's agent stated that most of the energy efficiency measures were focused on the outdoor amenity spaces;
- The applicant's agent stated that it was not common for a developer to assume responsibility for site maintenance when the County or state offered to assume maintenance;
- The applicant's agent also stated that because these were the front-door remaining parcels of the project and maintenance crews were already serving the site, the applicant determined that it would continue to offer maintenance services, including post-construction maintenance, when the right-of-way improvements were constructed;
- Staff stated that throughout the application process, they had not received any feedback from other agencies regarding the loss of office space, and that the only current tenant in the building was the bank, which occupied 8% of the space;
- Staff also noted that there were two office buildings within close proximity, including one to the north;
- Staff stated that they were less concerned about the loss of office space and were instead focused on the opportunity to provide a more diverse housing stock through the project;
- The applicant's agent stated that they were extending new leases, and hoped that the open space amenities being added to the site would increase rents for the office buildings;
- Staff stated that the shared use path would be asphalt, the proposal met the applicable criteria because the applicant proposed to maintain the site, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) design standards were met, the trail or path could be dedicated to the County or VDOT in the future, and therefore felt that the design as shown would meet those criteria;
- The applicant's agent stated that they were willing to construct the shared use path in concrete as a long-term measure. Reference made to the Community Business Center (CBC) Guidelines, which superseded the ActiveFairfax Transportation and Trails Plan; and
- Staff confirmed that the other sidewalks located on either side were maintained by VDOT, with the quality maintained consistently along Little River Turnpike.

Chair Niedzielski-Eichner made the following comments:

- The matter of incremental density did not occur in the manner described because of how the County's planning process operated, and that there was a Comprehensive Plan, including the Site-Specific Plan Process, which considered the overall context of development rather than simply one parcel or property; and
- The Comprehensive Plan was identified as the appropriate place for these concerns to be considered, because this was where the County considered the overall context.

Commissioner Cortina made the following comments:

- These were existing buildings, and feedback received from the neighbors indicated that they would like to see the buildings demolished, and the Comprehensive Plan implemented along Little River Turnpike; and
- The points being conveyed and the process were understood, and it was clarified that the County was not simply seeking a particular outcome, such as demolishing everything and building in a certain manner, but rather that the applicant had submitted different plans that were being evaluated in the context of the Comprehensive Plan.

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

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 for a motion.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Wang stated the following:

- The proposal was considered a good opportunity to adaptively reuse a mostly vacant commercial office building that was currently 8% occupied while producing much needed housing at an appropriate density;
- The application also exceeded the minimum open space requirements;
- The proposal included transportation improvements that improved pedestrian safety and reduced impervious surfaces;
- The concerns raised by the speakers, including feedback provided months earlier, were incorporated into the new proposal that was presented, which had been significantly scaled back from previous iterations, and had appropriate density;
- Any future development on the proposed site would go through the applicable review process; and
- The application was unanimously approved by the Mason District Land Use Committee.

//

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

- RZ 2024-MA-00012 AND THE ASSOCIATED CDP 2024-MA-00012, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS DATED JULY 8, 2026; AND

- MODIFICATION OF THE SECONDARY USE LIMITATION OF 75 PERCENT OF GROSS FLOOR AREA SPECIFIED IN SECTION 2105.4 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO 100 PERCENT.

Commissioner Wang MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP 2024-MA-00012 SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF THE CONCURRENT REZONING APPLICATION.

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

//

RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00027 - K. HOVNANIAN AT MOUNT VERNON GATEWAY, LLC – RZ and FDP Appls. to rezone from PDH-30 to PDH-20 to permit up to 144 townhome/stacked townhome units with an overall density of 19.13 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and approval of the associated conceptual and final development plan. Located on the S. side of Buckman Rd. and E. side of Janna Lee Ave., N. of Richmond Hwy. on approx. 7.53 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential. Franconia District. Tax Map 101-2 ((5)) (2) 5, 7, 8A, 8B, 9, 101-2 ((5)) (3) 3A, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 and a portion of Rolling Hills Avenue to be vacated and/or abandoned. (Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public right-of-way for Rolling Hills Avenue to proceed.) (Concurrent with PCA-2004-LE-021-002). FRANCONIA DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

PCA-2004-LE-021-002 - K. HOVNANIAN AT MOUNT VERNON GATEWAY, LLC – PCA Appl. to delete land area. Located on the S. side of Buckman Rd. and E. side of Janna Lee Ave., N. of Richmond Hwy. on approx. 7.53 ac. of land zoned PDH-30 and HC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential. Franconia (Formerly Lee) District. Tax Map 101-2 ((5)) (2) 5, 7, 8A, 9, 101-2 ((5)) (3) 3A, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 and a portion of Rolling Hills Avenue to be vacated and/or abandoned. (Approval of this application may enable the vacation and/or abandonment of portions of the public right-of-way for Rolling Hills Avenue to proceed). (Concurrent with RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00027). FRANCONIA 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 July 1, 2026.

Mr. Cicero presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended approval of RZ/FDP-2025-FR-00027 and PCA-2004-LE-021-002.

Ms. Reynolds gave a presentation on the subject applications.

There was a discussion between Mr. Cicero, Ms. Reynolds, and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- The applicant's agent stated that feedback received from the community focused on how the County could better integrate parking within the site, improve certain access routes, and that based on this feedback, changes were made that the community appreciated;
- Confirmation the proposal's stormwater management system met the County's stormwater requirements, and integrated into the existing system without overtopping it due to the extended detention system;
- Confirmation the timeline was originally established for the end of 2005, and the applicant subsequently met with the Land Use Committee in May;
- Confirmation the proposed applications were originally zoned Planned Development Housing (PDH)-30 in 2005 and that rezoning to PDH-20 had been requested;
- A concern regarding potential gentrification and displacement resulting from the proposed development was voiced;
- Support for the applicant's contribution to the mobile home community, and for the increased number of Workforce Dwelling Units;
- Concerns regarding the proposed development's proximity to the Gum Springs historic community, the size and scale of the development not being aligned with the surrounding area, the mobile home parks in the area, and the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), which was viewed as beneficial to the surrounding community;
- An opinion that the types of home buyers anticipated for the development would not be individuals who frequently rode the BRT was voiced;
- Staff stated that they spoke with Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff regarding the proposal because it was being developed in an area of the County where there were concerns regarding gentrification;
- Staff also stated that gentrification concerns had not been raised throughout the review process by HCD staff, Commissioner Landgraf, Supervisor Lusk, nor the community;
- Staff stated that they were sensitive to the location of the proposed development and ways of enhancing the existing community, however, the majority of individuals involved in the application process had been comfortable with the sale of their homes,

with the exception of one homeowner with whom the applicant had attempted to engage as much as possible;

- An opinion that the individuals most impacted by these types of developments and decisions were not part of the decision-making process because they were working, might not have been aware of the process, might have experienced a language barrier;
- A suggestion that additional conversations be held regarding these types of proposals prior to public hearings;
- The applicant's agent stated that the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations had not been specifically contacted regarding the proposed development;
- The applicant's agent stated that the Franconia District Land Use Committee voted to oppose the proposal;
- The applicant's agent stated that a preference was made to the Franconia District Land Use Committee for peak roofs, based on some of the site topography, with the goal of ensuring that the committed height limits were met, and that flat roofs might be explored as an alternative;
- Concerns raised by the community regarding on-street parking along Richmond Highway and Buckman Road, including the number, type, and size of utility vehicles parked along those streets, and potential impact on parking in the area;
- Clarification that on-street parking was included on Buckman Road and Jenna Lee Avenue on the public streets, consistent with the street design for those segments and right-of-way, and that staff had complied with what was planned for the area;
- The applicant's agent stated that they were aware of the concerns regarding on-street parking, the parking was not within their development, and that there was limited ability to control users of on-street parking;
- The applicant's agent also recognized that the renderings might not accurately depict the actual impact on the area;
- Support for the proposed development, particularly for components that created a sense of community, safety, and walkability was voiced;
- Further confirmation that all homeowners had agreed to the sale of their homes, with one individual having rented a home;
- Commissioner Landgraf clarified;
    - That positive feedback had been received from the Franconia District Land Use Committee regarding the proposed development until the matter came to a vote;
    - The applicant addressed feedback comments received from the Franconia District Land Use Committee, which included the landscape terraces, sidewalks, landscaping, overwide buffers, and the central park area between the two units that promoted walkability;

- The Committee's primary concern in June 2026 was the peak roof issue, which was followed by several additional unaddressed concerns that were raised in July; and

- A concern regarding density related to downzoning, which appeared to have been a potential concern for the Franconia District Land Use Committee, particularly because Route 1 was part of the Route 1 redevelopment plan, and the BRT Plan for redevelopment along that corridor.

- Repeated concerns from land use committee representatives that their input was not being considered;

- An opinion that the Committee had not played a positive and constructive role beyond making initial comments, that ultimately resulted in a collective opposition vote;

- Clarification that the concern about displacement did not relate to the homeowners who were part of the project, but rather potential impacts on the surrounding area over time;

- The applicant's agent stated that the Workforce Dwelling Units (WDUs) are estimated to be priced in the mid $300,000, while market-rate homes will range from approximately $500,000 to $700,000, offering a mix of housing types targeting buyers interested in transit-oriented living;

  Concern regarding homes priced above $500,000 are unaffordable for most Fairfax County residents, even those earning the Area Medium Income (AMI);

- A discussion on diverse communities surrounding the area being developed, Good Shepherd Housing's role in the community, impacts on the Creekside Village affordable housing community, commitments made by the County regarding preservation, and opportunities for consolidation and new development to add to the County's affordable housing inventory; and

- Further discussion on the BRT component, the proximity of the proposed site to the area, including the ability to travel to and from the site without using one's personal vehicle on a daily basis.

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

In closing, staff stated there was a lot of back and forth throughout the application review process, the applicant was receptive to staff's recommendations, and the community's feedback.

In a rebuttal statement, Ms. Reynolds stated the following:

- The underground detention facility system had been designed to ensure that overtopping and flooding did not occur;

- The applicant worked with staff, including County stormwater experts, and believed planned improvements would not create a causal situation similar to what occurred elsewhere, while recognizing that flooding could be a concern in the area;

- The applicant was willing to coordinate with the community if others had thoughts or concerns about the proposal, conducted all relevant outreach, including sending letters to adjacent homeowners and associations;

- The proposal represented downzoning and provided less density than what was already approved for the site, and was developed under a section of the Comprehensive Plan where Option 2 did not include a nonresidential component; and

- The applicant's intent was to develop the site as a single development, and coordinate with the Mount Vernon Land Use Committee.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Landgraf for a motion.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Landgraf stated the following:

- Appreciation for the input from the speaker who had provided additional information, hoped the applicant could work with the speaker and the Mount Vernon Land Use Committee, prior to presenting the proposal to the Board of Supervisors;

- The Franconia District Land Use Committee had been very informative when providing comments, and worked collectively to address as many of those comments as possible;

- The majority of comments received had been addressed by the applicant and staff, prior to the public hearing;

- The Franconia District Land Use Committee's vote occurred less than two weeks prior to the public hearing, leaving insufficient time to address some of those concerns;

- When the Committee met, efforts had been made to resolve the issues of concern, most of the votes taken had been split, and the motion to deny was not a universal motion to deny the proposal; and

- Many individuals involved with the proposal understood the need to achieve the County's plan for the Route 1 development plan, specifically the improvements along the BRT route.

//

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

- PCA-2004-LE-021-002;

- RZ-2025-FR-00027 AND THE ACCOMPANYING CDP, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF THE PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 16, 2026;

- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 2105.2.B(2) TO ALLOW FOR A PRIVACY YARD LESS THAN 200 SQUARE FEET;

- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 5107.3.A(2) TO PERMIT PRIVATE STREETS LESS THAN 24 FEET IN WIDTH AS SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP; AND

- WAIVER OF SUBSECTION 5107.3.A(3) TO ALLOW PRIVATE STREETS IN EXCESS OF 600 FEET IN LENGTH.

Commissioner Landgraf MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP 2025-FR-00027, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S APPROVAL OF THE CONCURRENT REZONING APPLICATION.

Commissioners Spain, Bennett, and Sargeant seconded the motion which was carried by a vote of 11-1. Commissioner Batchelor-Caused voted in opposition.

//

SSPA 2023-III-9UP (PA-2023-00045) – LAKE FAIRFAX BUSINESS CENTER – concerns approximately 76 acres generally located north of Sunset Hills Road and Washington and Old Dominion (W&OD) Trail and south of Lake Fairfax Park [Tax Map 18-3 ((8)) 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5A1, 6A3, 7A, 8, 9A, 10A2, 10A3, 12B, 18B, A1, F, G] in the Hunter Mill Supervisor District. The area is planned for office, light industrial, institutional, and research and development up to 0.50 FAR. The amendment will consider adding an option for residential mixed-use up to 1.0 FAR with a maximum of 1,250 residential units with supporting retail and office uses. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified.
HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Stinson, Planning Division (PD), DPD presented the staff report, a copy is in the electronic date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of the plan amendment. Mark Looney, Nominator's Agent, Cooley LLP, gave a presentation on the subject plan amendment.

There was a discussion between Mr. Looney; Salem Bush, Branch Chief, PD, DPD; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- The nominator's agent stated that the bonus units would be in addition to the 1.0 floor area ratio (FAR);

- Confirmation that the bonus units had been calculated based on the existing Reston Comprehensive Plan;

- The nominator's agent stated that based on the pending rezoning for the properties, the density, inclusive of the bonus units, would still be below 1.0 FAR;

- Staff confirmed that the Comprehensive Plan supported additional residential development;
- Confirmation that the affordable housing section of the Reston Comprehensive Plan determined how affordable housing was structured, similar to stormwater management, transportation, and placemaking, which were not necessarily part of the Site-Specific Plan Amendment (SSPA);
- Confirmation that there was a maximum of 1,250 housing units, without a specified diversity of housing types;
- Staff confirmed they reached out to Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) regarding the plan amendment and that FCPS performed a study when developing the numbers generated as part of the last SSPA cycle, which represented the culmination of all potential units that could be developed;
- Further confirmation that FCPS's analysis identified three schools in the Reston Comprehensive Plan as future elementary schools, two of which had identified sites, and one of which did not have an identified site in Reston;
- Staff stated that some of FCPS's analysis had been included in the staff report;
- FCPS had forecasted the potential need for one elementary school within 10 to 20 years;
- An opinion that 1,250 new residential units represented a significant number of new residents, which might require additional schools was voiced;
- The nominator's agent stated that as part of the proposed amendment, the goal was to plan for additional schools;
- The nominator's agent provided a brief history of Metro's planning in the area in the early 2000s, which included amendments to the Reston Comprehensive Plan in anticipation of requesting funding for Metro, as well as amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for the three Reston Transit Station Areas (TSAs);
- The nominator's agent stated that the Comprehensive Plan had already anticipated the need for multiple schools to serve the Reston TSAs, and that construction of the new Skyview High School would trigger redistricting discussions and other changes;
- The nominator's agent stated that one potential elementary school site was identified in the plan but had not yet been located, and part of the discussion regarding the proposed amendment had been to identify a location for one of the three anticipated elementary schools, that otherwise did not have a designated location;
- The nominator's agent stated that the number of births per year from 2007 to 2015 had noticeably declined, this decline might have been factored into the amendment, as the number of students projected to enter the system in the future on an annualized basis would be lower than the number that had entered the system between 2000 and 2007;
- Confirmation that the proposed development was approximately one mile from the Metro station, and was located near the Wiehle-Reston East Metro Station;

- Staff stated that development of a data center in that area would have been permitted by-right, which was one of the reasons the area had been promoted for development, and that staff had worked with EYA Development LLC and its associates to encourage residential development;
- Staff clarified that EYA Development LLC did not own all of the property, that other properties were still planned for residential development, and that options remained available for industrial and office uses;
- The nominator's agent confirmed that EYA Development LLC owned one parcel, had other properties under contract, and the co-applicant owned two office buildings in the core area where the multifamily buildings were planned;
- The nominator's agent clarified that the core area was adjacent to the Life Time Fitness facility;
- The nominator's agent stated that in the area where the multifamily building was planned, along with the parcel to the right where the 2-over-2 and townhouse units were planned, The RMR Group largely owned the area in the middle of the development where the multifamily building was planned;
- The nominator's agent stated that EYA Development LLC owned the school site, and had other properties within the development that were under contract;
- The nominator's agent also confirmed that EYA Development LLC had the area where the National Wildlife Federation was located under contract;
- The nominator's agent reiterated that the RMR Group owned the area where the multifamily building was planned, would retain that area as part of its business plan, construct the multifamily building, while the townhouse and 2-over-2 units would be constructed by EYA Development LLC or another entity of its choosing, which would acquire a portion of the RMR Group's property to develop the for-sale units;
- The nominator's agent confirmed that all areas of the site included in the proposal were part of the rezoning;
- The nominator's agent confirmed that the areas that could potentially be an issue were the existing data center, the Life Time Fitness Center, and the Thompson Hospitality Hotel, which had been developed approximately five years earlier;
- The nominator's agent confirmed that the Life Time Fitness Center was the largest parcel with potential by-right development options; and
- Staff stated it was their understanding a special exception would be required for redevelopment of the Life Time Fitness Center, due to its proximity to residential uses and the new regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.

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

In a rebuttal statement, Mr. Looney stated the following:

- Edits would be presented to the proposed planned text, had an opportunity to briefly review the text, and there were some items between the Planning Commission's recommendation and the Board of Supervisors' determination that would be mitigated;

- The efforts undertaken through the rezoning application to provide appropriate transitions to the Equestrian Park neighborhood included maintaining and enhancing tree preservation areas along the common boundary line, and the townhouses fronting the closest units in the Equestrian Park would be front-entry rather than rear-entry units to keep driveways and headlights away from the area;

- Introducing residential uses at the proposed site would have changed the peak-hour trips into and out of Equestrian Park from the existing traffic pattern when the site operated as a business park, which would have benefited the larger transportation network, and provided reverse commute patterns compared with the previous 100% office use;

- Met with the Reston Association's Director and discussed some of the topics raised, including membership of the association;

- Conversations with the Reston Association were ongoing and included street grid connections that were already contemplated by the Comprehensive Plan, implementation of right-of-way reservations, and other items associated with the rezoning application for future implementation; and

- Language specific to traffic, pedestrian connectivity, right-of-way requirements, the street grid network, and recommendations that were area-wide to include the Reston Transit Station Areas, had been addressed in the Comprehensive Plan in other locations, but not in the parcel-specific language from a land use perspective, which involved changing the land use designation from industrial to the possibility of mixed-use development.

Further discussion between Mr. Looney and Commissioner Cortina regarding the following:

- An inquiry on what the nominator proposed remained unresolved;

- The nominator's agent stated that he did not want to obstruct the District Commission's motion, however, the proposed text included language regarding an interim athletic field to be provided on the future school site, and there was language that needed clarification;

- The nominator's agent stated that regarding the Reston Association membership, it was not certain whether the area was originally part of the Reston Master Plan, it had been added at a later date and had been subject to residential and nonresidential covenants, was later precluded by nonresidential covenants that had been terminated decades earlier, and Lake Fairfax Business Center had been part of that set of nonresidential covenants; and

- The nominator's agent stated that part of the Reston Association's request was whether to bring portions of Lake Fairfax Business Center, in its residential form into the Reston Association's set of covenants, to allow future homeowners the opportunity of amenities, and other benefits.

There being no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chair Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Carter for a motion.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Carter provided recommendations focused on the spaces based on the Urban Park Framework, as listed in a memorandum dated July 15, 2026, and also referenced in the motion.

Jill G. Cooper, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, stated that given the nature of Commissioner Carter's proposed revisions, they could be incorporated by reference, based on a memorandum dated July 15, 2026, which was circulated to the Planning Commission.

//

Commissioner Carter MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT SSPA 2023-III-9UP, FOUND IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 24, 2026, WITH FURTHER MODIFICATIONS AS SHOWN IN BOLD AND YELLOW HIGHLIGHTED FONT AS FOUND IN THE PLANNING COMMISSION MODIFICATIONS DATED JULY 16, 2026.

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

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 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, VA 22035.

Minutes by: Samantha Lawrence

Approved on: November 4, 2026

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 9 day of November 2026, by Nicole Blackwell

Signature of Notary

Notary registration number: 7114113

Commission expiration: January 31, 2028

Notary Seal