MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Policy Committee, Tuesday, July 23, 2024

Date	Tuesday, July 23, 2024
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 20m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3453
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-31. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:02] Good afternoon. I am going to call the Land Use Policy Committee meeting to order, and the first thing on the agenda is the acceptance of our minutes from the last meeting, so unless I see any questions or corrections, those will stand as accepted.

[00:00:20] We have three presentations today. A lot of them are following up from board matters and information the staff wanted to get. So we're going to get right into Parking Reimagined. Michael, are you going to kick us off? Thank you.

[00:00:36] So after Parking Reimagined was adopted by the board in September of 2023, as a follow-on motion, staff was asked to look at accessible parking as questions came up about the supply of accessible parking and what the effect of the new minimum requirements would have on that.

[00:01:08] So after that motion was adopted by the board, we started to look at this more specifically and tried to, first of all, see what effect that would have, the changes in the rates would have on accessible parking supply.

[00:01:26] So we assessed that there could indeed be a difference associated with that and then set about getting some information together to make a recommendation to the board. So we first made an assessment about, as I said, about accessible parking and the supply circumstance.

[00:01:48] We wanted to get some information, some survey data, both field surveys as well as citizen surveys. So in January of this year, we initiated both of those projects.

[00:02:04] We started doing field surveys of high-demand uses, such as grocery stores, restaurants, public facilities, and those types of things where we'd expect more demand for parking generally as well as for accessible parking.

[00:02:26] As the behavior, I mean, it's human behavior. People are going to shop at Walmart whether you need accessible parking or general parking. So with the field surveys that we took, we found that capacity was generally available for accessible parking. There was, in 92% of the sites that were surveyed during the peak demand times and general demand times, we avoided surveying during a time when we knew that there would be no parking demand, that 92% of the time there was an accessible space available.

[00:03:01] And we also, as part of that, were looking to see if there were any sort of violations of accessible parking in the sense that there was no display card in the vehicle or no accessible license plate.

[00:03:17] And that we found was very minimal circumstance or probably only about, on average, about 60% of violations over the sites that we surveyed. And we surveyed over 300 time points between January and May 31st.

[00:03:34] The other thing that we did was we worked with Human Services to put together a community survey. And that was available, put the survey together, and we made it available online.

[00:03:52] And we had that up from March to April 15th. We had a significant amount of feedback on that, not only from respondents to the survey itself, but a lot of comments as well. And we made an effort to ensure that, you know, there was a press release associated with it and it was information was provided to the supervisor's office.

[00:04:17] So we did get a very good response. I was very happy with that. And the feedback that we got really kind of reinforced where we were heading with maintaining the supply of accessible parking. Because if you make changes to parking, the accessible parking spaces are based on the number of overall spaces that are provided on the site.

[00:04:40] And so with the changes that we made to Parking Reimagined to require less parking, that could conceivably lead to less accessible parking within areas of the county. the non-tiered framework areas, if you recall how we set that up.

[00:04:57] There were also concerns expressed in the comments about accessible space design and accessibility concerns associated with parking and accessing buildings. So we're still continuing to look at that as well. One of the things that we are considering is there have been some issues with the hatched areas next to van accessible spaces and people parking on those areas or crowding those areas.

[00:05:26] And so there could be some signage or pavement markings that we could put into place that would discourage people parking on those areas. So the recommendations that we have are to increase the accessible parking ratio to compensate for the changes that we made to the baseline parking requirements in the ordinance.

[00:05:51] We're proposing generally a 1 to 15 ratio to the 1 to 25 ratio. I know this is all very technical. That is in the current requirement in the Virginia Statewide Building Code.

[00:06:07] So we would propose that the county adopt its own ratio into the ordinance. And then, as I said, we're looking at other potential modifications that may require modifications to the public facilities manual.

[00:06:23] So just briefly, just to give you a quick comparative of the 1 to 25 versus the 1 to 15, you can see generally in the chart that the thresholds for the 1 to 15 on the right side are more readily achieved.

[00:06:41] So, you know, if you have today, an accessible space would be required for anything 25 spaces or less, whereas the new requirement would be 15 spaces or less. And that kind of translates all the way through the 1 to 15 chart.

[00:06:57] So I took a look at a particular use. Just to give you a comparative, we have restaurant use for the baseline parking requirement had a fairly significant change. It went from a 1 to 10 or 1 to 15 or 1 to 11 space ratio based on square footage to a 1 to 8 parking ratio.

[00:07:21] So you can see on the bar chart that for the 1 to 25 in the pre-parking amendment, you see the blue thresholds.

[00:07:38] The gray thresholds would be with the current parking minimum, which in the case of the 10,000 and 15,000 square foot restaurant would be less accessible parking required if you built the minimum amount of parking. And then the 1 to 15 shows that there would be an increase in the 5,000 to 10,000 square foot range for a restaurant if the 1 to 15 ratio was adopted.

[00:08:04] So we've accomplished most of these steps presenting today to you. Our hope would be that the board supports this initiative and wants staff to move forward with it. And with that, we would expect that it would be another six months or so to get back to the board with an ordinance, a proposed ordinance amendment for consideration.

[00:08:32] And with that, my presentation is concluded. Thank you. You know, I think this is a good example of when the community comes to us with a concern and staff can go do the research. I did go through the nip again and to read the comments from people about where their concerns were.

[00:08:52] So I believe we're on the right path to make this change. I'm very supportive of it. And I think that taking that feedback about issues people have with the way the spaces are marked is important, too. So I am very supportive. I'm going to turn to the chairman. Yeah, I am, too.

[00:09:08] I want to thank Vice Chair Smith because we did a joint board matter back in September of 2023. uh to have staff look at this and do this analysis um kind of as a obviously as a result of parking reimagined but i think this was the right thing to do to look at what's actually happening out there and appreciate uh the speed by which uh staff did that because that was less than a year ago when we asked for this analysis and it was was very thorough um definitely uh support uh moving forward forward with the ordinance and i appreciate the the point about the hatched area and how we address that. I think that's going to be an ongoing challenge because I

[00:09:47] do see that often. I see encroachment in that area as if it's okay to park there, but not within the space itself, as opposed to the traveling public understanding that's part of the space and necessary for ingress and egress out of vehicles. And so I do think that's something we're going to have to continue to work on, but support the ordinance, thank the staff for their work. I also want to thank David Smith is here from the Disability Services Board. I want to thank him and the DSB for their advocacy on this too and

appreciate all the work that you've put into this to get us to this point as well. Thank you. Supervisor Palcic. Thank you, Madam Chair. Again,

[00:10:24] just very supportive of this. Appreciate the work that's gone into it. You know, as we talk about a more urban area and making sure that we continue to be inclusive and accessible in One Fairfax policy, both with our older adults and aging community that more and more are definitely in need and accommodations in order to be able to continue to navigate and park safely and appropriately in the community, as well as to our entire disability community.

[00:10:54] So great advocacy work, a gold star example of how to do this well and work with us and with staff to move forward and look forward to the next steps. I have Supervisor Jimenez Linlusk. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to follow up what Supervisor Palachuk said, you know, this is a huge lift.

[00:11:14] parking reimagined and you know i was there working with staff on this as a in a different role and remember all the meetings we did on this what is great though is the speed at which this county has been able to identify this issue because of the appointees because of the community because we're open to feedback and actually listening but then doing so i think that that's extremely important it shows not only a success from staff and the community but it also shows how quickly uh and willing fairfax county is to uh help work on issues that that are important into

[00:11:49] the to the community thank you madam chairman i'll just say i appreciate this uh as well and just want to note that um i'm going to thank uh former planning commissioner jim hart for sending lots of photographs and expressing kind of the need and the issue in more than one instance so clearly this is something that needs to be done and I just want to acknowledge the work the staff has done. Thank you. Thank you. So we are all in support. I am going to totally say that and so

[00:12:25] move forward and great job and we look forward to getting it to the board. Thank you. Excellent. Okay. Our next presentation is about contractor's office shop and construction vehicles and this came after our vote on ZMOD with a follow-on motion.

[00:12:44] And I see Phil Nijewski-Eichner is here. And I know this is something that the Planning Commission brought to the board so that we could have staff look at it. And so, Austin, are you going to kick us off?

[00:13:03] I am. Thank you. My name is Austin Gaster. I'm a senior planner with the Department of Planning and Development. And I'm here today to give an update on a zoning ordinance amendment related to the use contractors' offices and shops. and the topic of construction vehicles and the regulation for construction vehicles and the ordinance so just some background here looking at uh the timeline related to this amendment this this started as supervisor smith noted um following uh the adoption of z mod and uh staff at the time was asked to do research on this project and determine uh if there was flexibility

[00:13:40] needed in the ordinance relating to uh contractors offices and jobs and construction vehicles And so my colleagues, Sarah Morgan, at the time then held community outreach meetings to determine kind of the need here and some of the issues that were seen within the community about contractors' offices and shops and the regulation of construction vehicles.

[00:13:58] And this then was taken to, in May of 2022, to a land use policy committee meeting where it was formally made into a zoning ordinance amendment project. And since such time, we've kind of had a

re-kickstart on this project. Our office was working on things like landscaping and screening and parking reimagined.

[00:14:16] And as such, we kick-started this amendment in the beginning of this year and held multiple community outreach meetings, meetings with some district-specific groups related to kind of our proposal and trying to understand, you know, what is needed here and the issues that are impacting contractors' offices within the county.

[00:14:38] And as you can see on the screen, we went to the Land Use Policy Review Committee or Land Use Process Review Committee in May of this year and are hoping to have a final product authorized likely in September of this year and then hopefully going to board and planning commission hearings before the end of the year.

[00:14:58] So just to talk a little bit about contractors' offices and shops, this use is broad. It covers your HVAC technicians, plumbers, electricians, roofing companies, and it also includes landscape companies.

[00:15:20] And so it includes groups that might be doing landscaping, hardscaping, and it also includes your tree companies, your arborists. And it's currently permitted by right in the C8, I3, I4, I5, and I6 districts and in the PTC districts when shown in a final development plan.

[00:15:40] the existing kind of provisions um and limitations on the use specifically in the c8 i3 and i4 district um it was part of the main conversation that we had with the community um the use is limited to 500 square feet of outdoor storage currently in the c8 i3 and i4 districts and that storage must be screened from view and then another major part of this is that the parking of construction equipment machinery dump trucks things of that nature is not permitted by right

[00:16:15] in the c8 i3 and i4 districts and what i'll note here is that during outreach we heard from contractors across the board a desire to be able to serve their community better and that was something that was pampered by a lack of areas for them to establish these contractors were looking for areas to go to. And currently, they were finding that, you know, there's just really not a whole lot of industrial land that they can establish in. And there was also a desire for a need for objective definitions and clear regulations. So currently we have in the ordinance, we don't

[00:16:54] have a specific definition for construction vehicles and equipment. We have some provisions that talk to what it could be and a desire to see these objective regulations established within the ordinance. And when I talk about kind of the overall trend of industrial, I mean, currently we have approximately 8,000 acres zoned to industrial districts within the county and approximately 3,700 acres planned for industrial. So these are uses that are our contractors that are servicing our homes in time of emergency when we have a water leak at night, as well as people who are coming out to just service our homes and businesses at other times. So

[00:17:32] definitely a very important use within the county. So some of the things we're looking at and the potential changes is addressing the issue of defining construction vehicles. And so during our outreach, we asked community members kind of their general feeling towards certain pieces of equipment. We showed them photos during outreach meetings and talked about these types of pieces of equipment and where they could be kept. And this kind of helped us to form a possible, two possible definitions for light and heavy vehicles and equipment.

[00:18:05] And I'll note that the light vehicles and equipment are essentially vehicles that are commonly seen in association with contractors' offices and shops, and the heavy vehicles are those that we consider now construction vehicles. It's your dump trucks, your tow trucks, your larger vehicles, things that most people were not comfortable seeing in somewhere like a C8 district.

[00:18:26] And so that leads me to kind of where another place we're going with this proposed amendment is allowing for both light and heavy vehicles to be kept in the I-3 and the I-4 district. And so currently, you cannot keep construction-style equipment in the industrial 3 and industrial 4 districts.

[00:18:44] This was a major concern we heard from contractors of where. A lot of our contractors may actually not need a physical office space. They're looking for a place to keep their equipment and without having the I-3 and the four district to do that and they're limited to i-5 and i-6 storage yards to keep their equipment or if they have an established contractor's office and shop and then further looking to preserve the intent of the ordinance which is to prohibit construction vehicles and equipment and the heavy vehicles and equipment in the c8 highway commercial district and less approved through a special exception and the example i'll give with this is that a good example is a tree company a tree company a lot of times has a vehicle that might be larger than what normally would be allowed they

[00:19:23] They may not have a bunch of these vehicles. They may have two, three, four of these vehicles. And we are looking at the possibility of allowing for a special exception to process to keep a specific amount of vehicles and type of vehicles on the property. And when we talk about the definitions, we talk about the proposals for these things like light vehicles and equipment.

[00:19:42] Again, these are vehicles that we commonly see in association with the use and oftentimes are the subject of violations. We're looking to add objective standards that deal with things like length, height, Gross vehicle weight, number of axles, and then rated operating capacity for equipment.

[00:19:59] And I'll speak to gross vehicle weight rating. This is a standard that all vehicles have. The proposal of 16,001 pounds is based on both our county code as well on federal highway classifications of vehicles. It's the class 5 vehicle rating.

[00:20:16] And once you get above that, you start to get into things like dump trucks. And we know we have previously in the ordinance determined those are considered construction vehicles and would like to keep it kind of around that range of that 16,000 pounds or less, you know, for the definition here. And then further, when it comes to things like height, length, these are the things that we've seen in other parts of the ordinance.

[00:20:34] We see it for use standards, for uses such as a goods distribution hub, and this kind of style of breakdown is seen throughout the ordinance. And then lastly, rated operating capacity. This is not just equipment. they're not just vehicles this is equipment so a contractor might have a bobcat a skid steer a ditch witch something of those in that nature and we're looking at adding this rated operating capacity which is an industry standard for pieces of equipment that are made to pick things up the expectation is that this equipment will be stored within screened areas but but a possibility to keep these things within a c8 district so when we talk about heavy vehicles

[00:21:10] our heavy vehicles are again our traditional construction vehicles our dump trucks solid waste collection vehicles. And what I'll note is that with the light and heavy standards, and I should have noted

this in the previous slide, is that if a vehicle meets or exceeds any one of the light standards, it would be considered a heavy vehicle.

[00:21:30] And at that time, then subject to this. And heavy vehicles and equipment, again, we're looking to not permit buy right in the C8 district and then change the ordinance, hopefully, to look at keeping of these vehicles in the I-3 and the I-4 district to allow more space to keep them in the county.

[00:21:46] And so potential changes as it relates to outdoor storage associated with the use. So we're looking at the possibility of increasing outdoor storage by right in the C8, I3, and I4 district. The white paper that I wrote in relation to this presentation talks about 1,000 square feet of outdoor storage for a C8 district.

[00:22:06] And this is, we'll touch on in another slide, kind of the overall, you know, footprint of what that looks like and what currently is permitted. But looking to also establish a special exception process, establish an SE process in the C8 district to allow for increased outdoor storage.

[00:22:22] So one of the things that we heard during community outreach on this was support for contractors, support for knowing that we need some of these uses in these areas, but also wanting to establish regulations that protect the commercial nature of these properties and also take into consideration the effect they can have on residential abutting properties.

[00:22:43] And then in the I-3 and the I-4 districts, we are looking at the possibility of allowing for storage yards as a principal use. Storage yards currently are not permitted in the I-3 and the I-4 district by right. It's only through special exception and only when in conjunction with a self-storage use. And so this would be a limited storage use that would be allowed, limited to 10,000 square feet by right.

[00:23:04] It would need to be screened in with something like a six-foot tall fence. And then also establishing a special exception process to permit larger storage yards over that 10,000 square feet in the I-3 and the I-4 district. And then lastly, the outdoor storage related to these uses would not be permitted in any front yards.

[00:23:22] So as mentioned, we talk about overall square footage. The left-hand side of the screen shows 10,000 square feet. This is what we're talking about when we're talking about your I-3 and the I-4 district, the buy-right allowance. And then on the top right-hand side of the screen, you see that blue area.

[00:23:37] That's about three and a half parking spaces. That's what 500 square feet looks like. And that's what's currently allowed for a contractor's office and shop to keep equipment and materials on their property. So this is things like stone. It's pieces of equipment that are needed for the use. And we feel that, you know, allowing for an increased outdoor storage of some by right and then the special exception option really does allow for flexibility for these contractors to establish and have an area to work in.

[00:24:05] Now, I will say the increased outdoor storage is subject to site plan approval that would be required to get site plan approval for anything over 500 square feet. And we're also, as part of this amendment, looking at regulations related to approval of that outdoor storage.

[00:24:21] Currently, there is no limit of the amount of outdoor storage that can be permitted by site plan. And this amendment looks to kind of put guardrails on the amount that can be permitted by right and the amount that's permitted through special exception. As always, we have a zoning ordinance web page,

amendment web page related to this amendment that includes a list of previous engagement and future engagement as well as materials related to the amendment.

[00:24:45] I wanted to thank you for your time today, and we'd be happy to answer any questions you may have related to this. Thank you, Austin. You know, I think it is important that we want these contractors to be able to be in our county, right? Because when you have an emergency, you don't want them coming from far away. I appreciate the slides that have the description to show us what the size would be and the process.

[00:25:08] So I'm looking forward to moving forward, and I'm going to keep my comments short and turn to the chairman. I'm good. Thank you. I saw Supervisor Walkinshaw first, then I'll make a look. Thank you. You know, I think this has been great work, and, you know, like probably everybody I've heard from and met with contractors who are just struggling to find a place to, you know, park their vehicles and their equipment.

[00:25:34] And sometimes decisions that we make here, for good reason, can make that even more difficult. You know, one thing I would point out, I think, Austin, correct me if I'm wrong here, but, you know, we currently restrict parking of a dump truck or other kind of construction truck in an I-4 district on a parcel.

[00:25:58] However, on a public street adjacent to an I-4 district, unless there's some other VDOT restriction, they can park whatever they want and do. Well, that is correct.

[00:26:14] However, if it's adjacent to residential communities, that would not be allowed. In an Australia-adjacent areas, yes. That's right, obviously. And when you look at the map of I-3 and I-4, there's some that's adjacent to residential, but a lot that isn't, quite frankly. So in some cases, our restrictions for what someone can park on their own property are more stringent than what they can park on a public street.

[00:26:38] So that's an argument for moving forward with this process. Just a question on the outdoor storage and the definition of outdoor storage. I presume outdoor storage could presume if I have a 10,000 square foot area, I could use that by renting out parking spaces to others.

[00:27:00] or is it outdoor storage, not of vehicles, but of inventory? This is a common question we've gotten related to this and something that we see, we get questions about in our office. So essentially the 10,000 square feet or the outdoor storage, let's talk about it, it's something that's accessory to the use itself.

[00:27:19] So the intent of that is that it's accessory to the contractor's office and shop. If I'm a contractor that does stone work, I do landscape-type work, and I might have stone that I keep on site as materials. It's expected to be that that outdoor storage is for the use itself. Now, the proposal to look at the I-3 and the I-4 district to allow for a limited storage yard, a storage yard as a use itself would allow for a user to establish a use of a storage yard and then lease that space out to one, two, multiple contractors to keep their equipment and materials.

[00:27:50] And so that's kind of something that we've seen. So there's a distinction between outdoor storage and storage yard. Correct. Correct. Got it. Thank you. That answers the question. All right. Thank you, Madam Chair. So, our large area community parking districts, how would this square, or is that totally irrelevant because it's on-street parking as opposed to on-site?

[00:28:16] It's a tough question to answer. I would say that... Maybe Leslie has a different answer. I don't know. Well, we don't have jurisdiction over the right-of-way.

[00:28:32] under that scenario for the zoning ordinance. So -- but I would -- getting back to Austin's point about the storage of vehicles and equipment being accessory, I -- you know, if those -- and I'm just going to -- if it's a rental truck company -- we won't put any names on it, but it's a rental truck company, and they rent large trucks, you know, if those trucks are parked on the street, to me, that's part of the use and those it's part of the use those trucks should be parked on the lot and not on the

[00:29:06] street so and i know we have had some um success maybe it's been a while in the past with notices of violation for that but if it's a i mean you know i drive on wayples mill road coming into work every day and you see all the dump trucks that are parked there those are you know i've even taken pictures of license plates but i haven't done anything with it just in my own little

[00:29:30] But those are probably independent operators, you know, who don't have a place to park those vehicles, which is different than, you know, the use itself spilling out onto the public street, because I think that we can deal with.

[00:29:46] It's the other types of things where you might have somebody just parking their boat or their other, you know, their dump, you know, a big dump truck that they might use as a contractor, you know, for I-66 work. so that that to me is a distinction there but you do have chapter 82 of the code which austin mentioned which is the you know you can't have it adjacent to residential and that's also where some of the permit parking stuff is so so yeah go ahead is there anything else here because so there is one thing i just note is that while this is not going to fix that issue um allowing for

[00:30:24] areas to keep pieces of heavy vehicles and equipment more than what we allow now conceivably can help with that issue uh it's a step in the right direction to allow for more locations for users of those types of vehicles to store them within the county okay so they so just so i understand so let's say this goes through the way it's discussed today so you have an i-3 parcel and it's in an area in a large area part community parking district area they would they would be able to park on the street if it's basically associated with that use on the public street, is that correct? Through Parking Reimagine, we had a

[00:31:02] provision in the ordinance that was changed that said that there was not supposed to be parking of commercial vehicles on adjacent or abutting streets, and so the vehicles should be kept on the property if the use is there. Okay. Okay, that's great. And then my only other question is on the outdoor storage associated with contractors' offices in Sharp. I like the screening idea of outdoor storage and materials. Could we also look at, there is, most of it's not, but there is some I3 and I4 that is close to residential. I think

[00:31:40] those data might be available. I don't know if we could look at some sort of setback to residential as at least a possibility. I don't think it needs to be huge, but, you know, something there. I know I've got, I know I've got at least some I-3 and Hunter Mill that's at least across the street from residential. So if we could look at that, that'd be great. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Lusk, then Storm. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Just wanted to ask, in terms of the number of operations that currently have more than 10,000 square feet, can you give me a sense of how many

[00:32:18] there are and where they might be located um so most of our uses that have outdoor storage and let's just talk about accessory outdoor storage related to a contractor's office and shop they're mostly

going to be in the i-5 and the i-6 district they're uses that are in your heavier general industrial districts and that's where we're seeing them um and in those cases those uses are along the richmond highway corridor as well out towards the sully district we see some of those as well. Okay. And then just trying to understand if we create this 10,000 square foot

[00:32:49] requirement, how many non-conforming uses will be created? As of current, we know of one application that's going through a buy-write allowance through site plan that would be over 10,000 square feet. Again, in the I-5 and I-6 district, that increased outdoor storage is is permitted, let it be a storage yard, and then when it comes to the non-conformities in those cases, it's something that we don't -- I'd have to do a bit more research to look on active or in-process related to.

[00:33:25] CHAIRMAN BRYANT: Supervisor Lusk, I would think that since we are expanding permissions in the I-3 and I-4, I think -- because right now it's -- we prohibit it, unless it's -- the The only time you can have storage, if you will, outdoor is if it's in an enclosed building, which nobody, you know, build a big structure.

[00:33:49] Same thing with the C8. So I would think that there would probably not be as many, you know, nonconformities because in order to be truly a nonconforming use, it has to be legally established in the first place. So if it was never legally established, then, you know, then that's a whole other issue.

[00:34:07] Okay, so that's not an issue that we're really concerned about then based on what you're saying. We see this as a path forward and in a way to kind of close a loophole in the ordinance when it relates to outdoor storage. Okay, I'll accept that. Thank you. And then last, I appreciate the information you provided on the outreach to the different stakeholders.

[00:34:27] I just wanted to maybe get a sense of how many independent contractors were part of that kind of process as you were doing your outreach and conversations? So Sarah Morgan, my colleague who started this process, actually worked with the community, and I believe it was 20-some independent contractors that we reached out to.

[00:34:50] And then also just organically through this process, different offices have reached out to our office to say, hey, we have a contractor that has an issue. And so I'd say it's probably closer to 30. Okay. No, that's great. I appreciate and thank you for the work that you've done here. And I'll conclude my remarks.

[00:35:06] Thank you. Supervisor Stewart. Thank you, Madam Chair. How did you think about or look at commercial revitalization districts as part of the work that you've done with this? Can you maybe just elaborate a little bit? Yeah. So we did meet with Liz Hague to talk about the CRDs and to talk about the impact on the CRDs.

[00:35:27] I will say this is a use that is permitted currently in the CA district within the CRD. And then the proposal to allow for the special exception we saw as an ability to add that, the special exception for an increased outdoor storage and permissions to keep heavy vehicles, as an ability to have public outreach related to it.

[00:35:46] So we have been in contact with that office, working with the CRDs, and then are open to further conversations regarding possible limitations in those districts. All right. Thank you. Okay. Seeing no further comment, I think you can move forward with this.

[00:36:04] And I look forward to seeing the next step. Thank you very much. All right. Our next topic on the agenda is something we look at every year, our Zoning Ordinance Work Program. And I am sure it's going to be Leslie kicking us off.

[00:36:24] Thank you. Thank you. Again, good afternoon. My name is Leslie Johnson. I'm the Zoning Administrator. And I'm here to present to you all the fiscal year 2025-2026 zoning ordinance work program for your review and consideration.

[00:36:43] With me today is Bill Malin, Assistant Zoning Administrator. So if you don't like it, blame him because he helped me put this together. But anyway, so you have previously received a summary memo that kind of goes into a little bit more detail of where we've been, where we go, where we are, and where we're going.

[00:37:09] And it includes four components. The status update, which kind of tells you what we've done with the last work program that was approved in July of 2023. The proposed work program for the next two years. And the priority two list, which are amendments that are, or topic areas, that are kind of It's our parking lot, if you will, on ideas that we hear from the board, we may hear from citizens, other stakeholders, planning commission, and a lot from our own staff about where we

[00:37:48] might want to look at tweaking the ordinance, and then a timeline table of, you know, where we think we're going for the next year. And as you all know, and we do have some new members of the board this year that this will be their first, you know, zoning ordinance work program process, we do do this on a two-year cycle.

[00:38:11] And that primarily is because, as you all know, sometimes depending on the topic, it may take more than a year, sometimes 18 months, sometimes two years, to get a topic through the process with outreach, with, you know, when you start with doing all the research, you know, getting all the input, it being subject matter experts, talking to stakeholders, then the outreach, you know, then we come to the board sometimes on more than one occasion to get direction to make sure we're meeting our goals and we're on the right track, and then getting it authorized for public hearings, writing the text, and moving forward.

[00:38:47] So that's why it's a two-year work program, and we come back every year to kind of reset. And it also gives you all and the Planning Commission an opportunity to evaluate and kind of reprioritize.

[00:39:02] Maybe there are things that have come up during the year that you all have an idea about, and we want to move some things to the forward burner and maybe a few things to the back burner. And it also will allow us to align our priorities, you know, with the board's strategic plan, with one Fairfax the comp plan and other countywide initiatives that we'll kind of talk about so now I want to kind of we always like to give ourselves a little bit of a pat on the back actually in the speaker notes that Bill had provided for

[00:39:36] me he said wait for the applause but anyway I think as you can see from the fiscal year 2024 highlights we've been kind of busy um the adopted priority one work program included 15 total topics and some of those topics were broken down into a b and c and then we added four um you know during the course of the year so we ended up with 23 individual topic areas and some of the items that were added which

[00:40:11] is course of business things happen we the accessible parking spaces that you all talked about today you know we had as a report to the board and as you will see with our upcoming new amendment

we've put that forward as one of the priority one topic so it kind of they move forward kind of as you will and then we of course had the board matter with gas pipelines that we presented did some research report and presented to the board in May. We also had our the data center amendment which you are going to make decisions on on July 30th it's been

[00:40:51] deferred to that and we did that in a very short timeframe and also the near and dear to my heart are the chapter amendments to chapter 112.1 we had to readopt all the amendments that we had happened since May and so that the The Chapter 112.1 zoning ordinance was operative as of July 1st.

[00:41:13] And we did that in a very short time frame. So we hope we don't have to do that again, but we'll leave that as a possible add-on later. We also prepared a follow-on report for you all for ALUs and HBBs.

[00:41:31] And in this, you know, the last time we did the report, it was kind of right after ZMOD. We felt we needed some additional time to get data. we did that in this last report that was in April. We did provide some possible recommendations and considerations for things that, as a staff, we think might need to be tweaked and other topics that we want to kind of perhaps revisit. So that's been, the report was done, but again, as you'll see on the new, on the proposed work program, we're moving that one forward.

[00:42:08] We also did the application fees. You know, that's still going to continue on the work program so that we don't forget we have to do that every two years and make sure we don't run into the same issue that we ran into this last time, which I think gave everyone some heartburn.

[00:42:28] And we also completed the landscaping and screening amendment, which was, again, one of, you know, we hadn't really looked at that as an update for many years. So that was a real, I think, plug in our cap. We did our minor editorial revisions, and I won't go on the parking, signs.

[00:42:49] And then we did make significant progress, as you heard today, on the contractor's office and shop. We're still working on the short-term pop-up, interim uses. That's kind of, we're looking at our temporary special events language. I had a two-hour meeting with staff yesterday.

[00:43:04] So we're hoping, we're getting close to bringing forward information for you all, and also to start doing some additional outreach on that topic. So, but we, and here's kind of our, so we did, and this is just in a bar chart form, but we, you know, we completed 77% of our priority one amendments.

[00:43:27] And I think that might be a wrecker. I mean, you know, and it's hard because we've got other things that we have to do, and these amendments take a long time. And so I'm really happy that we've been able to, and I will give a shout-out to my staff because they are really experts, and they become experts, and I couldn't do all of this without them.

[00:43:49] So I want to give a shout-out to them. The next is the – I can't read it. What did I say? In progress. In progress. Okay, we have the short-term. We've talked about that, short-term pop-ups and contractor's office and shop.

[00:44:06] The next one is monitoring, and those we gave a title, like climate resiliency. We're still in a monitoring stage on that, but we are participating. My staff is participating in the interagency workgroups that are meeting on a regular basis with other agencies to kind of identify issues and see where, you know, where they might end up and with recommendations.

[00:44:28] so we're very active in in that topic and the landscaping and screening and frankly the parking reimagined did a lot for those topic areas to bring into compliance with our climate resiliency planning

the other one that we're monitoring is the affordable housing which was initially had manufactured housing and we've going forward as you'll see we've broken that out into topics. We are working very closely with HCD. A lot of what we do with our amendments, we're partnering with other, you know, departments like LDS, you know, on certain topics because

[00:45:08] in the ordinance, they're in charge of floodplain, parking, and site plans. So when we need to amend things, we work closely with them. So HCD is looking to, is working on obtaining grants for consultant assistants and to hire a manufactured housing specialist. So we are, you know, going to be partnering with them and being active in that process so that we can determine what changes may or may not need to be made to the zoning ordinance. And then the PRC, things that have not started, and I kind of would not agree with it. Well, it has been partially started, the PRC plan

[00:45:46] That was added last year to look at the exceptions of when a PRC plan would need to be filed to see if we can make it a little bit more flexible, especially for, I know Reston had some issues we've heard from Burke, and so we'll be doing some more outreach with that group.

[00:46:05] We've done some research. We've had a few meetings. So we hope that we will be able to bring that back to the board very early in 2025 to kind of move that forward. So, here we go. Oops, did I just, I need, there we go. I'm not technologically inclined. Anyway, so this is the proposed 2025-2026 work program topics, and I want to really focus on the new ones that we're adding, you know, to this topic.

[00:46:45] Signs is one, and that's under the reports to the board. And that was a new topic we added a couple years ago because, you know, after we do amendments and other things where we're not quite ready to do, data centers was an example, gas pipelines is an example, where we're not really ready to formulate an amendment, the board wants information.

[00:47:03] And so we've targeted that as reports to the board. So you've asked us to come back with signs that we focused, you know, a lot of that was focused on the new SE process in lieu of the CSP and also the electronic display. So, we'll be coming back to you probably next spring with some information on that.

[00:47:23] Accessory living units, again, as I mentioned earlier, we have added that as a topic. We are, from a timeline perspective, we're looking at next spring, maybe coming back to you with some thoughts, ideas, to get some direction and to flesh out some of the recommendations

[00:47:41] that we had. That's new. The congregate living is, if you may recall, under the affordable housing topic, we were looking at, and we made a presentation a couple years ago, maybe a year and a half ago, with housing about how we might expand opportunities for allowing emergency shelters or shelters provided by private nonprofits to go into commercial and industrial areas along with some supportive housing and we've we've been meeting with housing and community

[00:48:18] development and our partners um tom barnett and we've kind of rebranded that a little bit and what we're looking at is perhaps amending the definition of congregate living to be a little bit broader and then expanding the permissions because even our proposal for this um alternative use of commercial buildings was going to be in a special exception process we think it needs some oversight and review so the congregate living is all is a special exception in every district so I think we could do it through that process and in looking at that definition it needs it's it needs to be modernized and looked

[00:48:57] at so that's kind of where we're looking for the congregate living the floodplain that's again an LDS initiative we put it on the work program um they're updating the feds are updating the fema maps so

that all needs to be addressed and so one of the things they may they're looking at is the se provisions particularly for you know single-family dwellings that may not meet some of the grandfather standards that are in the ordinance um and to see whether or not we still need those whether we might want to encourage people to flood proof their home by making it less onerous to come through and get approval

[00:49:37] so that's something that the LDS is going to be leading that was a topic of a lot of top of conversation at the Planning Commission and I think the Planning Commission is looking forward and we've we've talked to our LDS partners about you know doing some initial outreach and they're preparing that to move forward and then another item is that light utility and so this part of there was an item on priority 2 that talked about substations and its impacts on adjacent residential and you know we also as part of the data center

[00:50:15] board matter to look at the data center amendment they also asked staff at some point after data centers to look at substation so that's now been on put on the work program the energy storage is a new use that we uncovered or if you will, was brought to our attention during our data center research. And, you know, we need to look at that because it's going to be the next coming thing. And it may or may not be associated with data centers and substations. So that's something we need to look at. And

[00:50:48] then, of course, the high-pressure gas pipelines is one that in the work program, what we've talked about is moving forward with an initial move toward working with Washington Gas and Columbia Gas to facilitate an agreement. And so I know that there was a lot of discussion.

[00:51:12] I wasn't at that particular meeting, but I think the consensus seemed to be to kind of move forward or look at that. And then the other one, we talked about the accessible parking rates that's moved forward and then um plan district and this is the plan district and this is coming a lot from staff and it's to really focus on some of the um secondary uses that are permitted in a pdh the commercial you know it's measured based on floor you know the the it's

[00:51:44] based on the land area of the pdh district and dwelling units and we think it's a little outdated and we want to kind of take another look at that. There's also secondary uses dealing with the PDC, dealing with the percent of commercial.

[00:52:01] And all of these applications do go to the board. The board has the ability to review. So we're looking at revamping some of those standards to make it perhaps more modern and to reflect what, and I know Bill has already started to do a lot of that research, you know, what has happened over the last 15, 20 years, because that hasn't been updated in a long time. We didn't really focus too much on that during ZMOD. So those are, I think, the main new items for the work program. And this, I'm not going to go into this, but

[00:52:41] you know, it's self-explanatory, but it kind of shows you, you know, the timelines that we're looking at and bringing forward to you. We're trying to kind of make sure that we can meet those timelines, you know, it really is staff, depends on staff and other things that we're also working on. The, not last but not least, is the, is the priority two items. And I know that we've been working really steadily since ZMOD to kind of really turn this into something that we can

[00:53:16] work with and rather than something that's been on the work program for 20 years. You know, we kind of made the last go around last year we kind of used five years as our cutoff to kind of start relooking at things so we took a lot off we continue to remove items we removed we started with 21 we're

at when we all said and done we're at 17. five items were completed with minor editorial revision amendment we've removed eight items and if you go through and I'm not going to

[00:53:52] go through it unless you all have a specific question. I think we've done a pretty good job of explaining why to give people an understanding. We're trying to be as transparent as possible. We're not just trying to, you know, say, oh, by the way, we slipped that out. I mean, we want to really, you know, have people have an understanding of why we don't think it's necessary. But we've also added nine items for future consideration. And to be honest with you, this is part of our ongoing efforts as a staff. And what we promised you all was that, you know, we want to keep this ordinance modernized. We don't want to wait 10 years to deal with topics that we are dealing

[00:54:30] with today. And so these items are kind of, they can be ready to be teed up for next year, you know, and that's what I think we're going to be looking at. What are we going to tee up? And some of those deal with uses. One of the things that we want to look at is we're seeing lot of online sales requests coming in. Vehicles are being sold online. You know, we need to figure out where can that happen? You know, where is the storage? How do we want to handle that? And do we want to be a little bit more permissive? We also want to look at, you know, some of the vehicle

[00:55:06] sales standards because, again, that whole industry has changed so much. We also want to look at, you know at at some point we want to review the highway corridor and the sign control overlay districts we you know we've really updated our sign ordinance and those overlay districts were era 1977 era do we still need them the highway corridor you know that deals with a lot of fast food we have standards in our ordinance already do we really need and are we are they regulations that we still need to have on the book because we have other places in the ordinance where those

[00:55:44] issues can be addressed. So those are some of the things. We also added the parking reimagined report, which is a longer term. It's a five-year report, but we wanted to make sure we had a place for it. So those are just some examples of the Priority 2. And then with that, Bill and I are available to answer any questions. And I will also want to summarize that we did meet with the

[00:56:16] We had a very good conversation. They were very supportive of and gave us an applause for our accomplishments and were supportive of the work program as we have laid it out.

[00:56:33] One thing they did mention to us, and I appreciated that they talked about that because I think sometimes as we're working on things, we get a little bit of tunnel vision and it's like, oh my gosh, we need to be working on the work program. and it's kind of late in the process.

[00:56:48] They did ask that we come to them sooner rather than later, and we can do the same with the board, maybe in the January, February timeframe, to kind of, as we're starting to formulate, you know, the topics we might want to bring to you next, you know, next July timeframe, to meet with them and to kind of have that conversation.

[00:57:08] And, you know, we're happy to do that, although I would, you know, we get feedback from you all all the time, whether in other committee meetings, individually or whatever, but I'm happy to do that. It helps us, you know, keep ourselves ready to move forward and to kind of look at changes.

[00:57:28] And as you noticed, even with the work program that was adopted in July, when I brought it back to you this year, I added all of those things that were kind of entertained midstream because, you

know, I think it is work that we have to do and we should, the board should understand where all that fits in.

[00:57:50] So with that, we're happy to answer any questions. Thank you, Leslie. I do think the document has been greatly improved over the years. We're staying focused. You know, it was important to clean up the priority too. And like you said, ZMOD was an important change for us.

[00:58:07] and we don't want to lose all that work we did there. So I appreciate all the work staff's done. I'm going to turn it to my colleagues for comments with Chairman first. Yeah, I'll just say I think all of us will say this, so I'll save us all. Having to say this is excellent and, as the chair said, really cleaned up and a lot cleaner to us to look at, and, frankly, a lot of progress that's been made tremendous.

[00:58:31] I guess the two questions I have are on the 2024 highlights we have under the significant progress, the short-term pop-ups. And I'm just wondering what is left to do with those, because I know we've had a couple meetings, not necessarily only in this committee, but dealing with this issue.

[00:58:53] And, you know, I still get concerns from people, particularly commercial property owners, about the process, and it might be unrelated to the ordinance restrictions, but just the process of getting proper permits for that. So is there significant work left to be done in the ordinance in your mind there?

[00:59:11] Help me understand how you're defining significant progress in that area. I think, I'll be honest with you, as a staff, we're kind of struggling because it's similar to outdoor dining where we want to, and maybe it's my fault and I'll take responsibility for it, you know, being zoning administrator for so long.

[00:59:31] You know, I like guardrails because I have to interpret and I have to enforce. So I like guardrails. So there's been some push-pull internally, and we're working with some of our partners. But I think we want to be more flexible. I mean, we want to try to find that, you know, spot where we don't have to issue any kind of admin permit, that it's just like, go do your thing, be good about it.

[00:59:59] But as part of that, we want to give people some information of how to be good special event, you know, providers, because, you know, pick up your trash, you know, don't go beyond certain hours and blare your music, and, and so I'm, you know, we're trying to figure out how we do that, allow the buy right, and, and on those smaller, like, duration, you know, is it one day event versus two days, so we're, we're preparing those options, so we're, we're kind of putting those final touches on it, and I mean, our, our goal would be to get something out

[01:00:37] even in a memo format to the board and that we post online saying here's where we're at right now and then if you all are happy with that then we can you know we can move forward with some additional outreach without having to come back to this committee which doesn't meet until october so that's i think we're very very close i think that's really helpful to hear because honestly the more of these we could do without having to go through an application process the better because Some of them, the duration of them is so far less than the time it would take them to go through our process that by the time they do that, the events come and go on.

[01:01:12] And so I do think, you know, this is the new way of the world. It's kind of like outdoor dining. You know, for the longest time, we had pretty strict things in place for outdoor dining. Pandemic changed all that. We realized there aren't significant problems with these. I've experienced the same thing with the pop-ups where we've had them.

[01:01:28] There are not significant problems with them. So I think, you know, some guidelines and some increased flexibility in that area is useful. And related to that, also outside of this committee, but wanting to make sure if it requires any tweak to the ordinance that we know that, is we had gotten a presentation on murals before, then we got another presentation recently at Revite about these and how they're, you know, going up around the county, especially in revitalization districts.

[01:01:57] And we, of course, want to encourage those. I'm just wondering at what point and if there is a point that anything in the ordinance needs to be tweaked to allow those to continue again with guardrails but still allow them to continue. And I know we had a discussion about a contractual arrangement where we could help people understand what a contractual arrangement might look like.

[01:02:20] But are we beyond the point of counting it towards signage or any other elements of the ordinance that might need to be tweaked in order to allow those to continue? We have. I think, and your point is very well taken, and I think we are at the point now where as long as murals, you know, aren't advertising something, they're not a sign. So, you know, have at it. The problem comes in where somebody might, and we have the whole, you know, free

[01:02:54] speech stuff and, you know, content neutrality. I think what the ordinance could use is maybe a definition of what a mural is so that everybody is on board that say, here's what a mural is, you're not subject, you don't need a sign permit, you're not subject to the ordinance, that kind of thing.

[01:03:16] And then, and we could put a few of those kinds of standards in there. So I think that is probably, if we were going to do anything, that's what I would think about doing is maybe defining for the ordinance purposes what a mural is so that everybody knows.

[01:03:34] I think that that would be enormously helpful because I think we all want to encourage these, but we also want to make sure we don't get ahead of ourselves and create an unintended consequence or problem down the road. So I think a definition would go along. We could add that to priority two now if you wanted, and then to be teed up maybe next year to see where we could get that in because it's not a big lift and we could possibly do it depending on with a minor editorial revision, because it's not changing the way we would

[01:04:09] enforce anything, right? It's just clarifying. So we might be able to do that through a minor, the minor editorial, which we always bring to you in, you know, February, March timeframe. I think that would be helpful because right now they're a hot thing. A lot of people want them.

[01:04:25] They've been live in spaces. They've improved aesthetics. And, you know, if this is a passing fad we don't want to be defining what it is after the peak of its popularity and so i do think times are the essence of with this because we're seeing them you know really in all parts of the county and we we just got a presentation from our friends in revite about the value of these in terms of creating places and so we want to be permissive of those um and and you know really eliminate any level of confusion that people might have about what our standards are what you need to do to get permission to do one of those, recognizing most of them have to go through a property owner

[01:05:02] anyway. But I think even among our property owners, there's confusion about what can and can't be done and how we define them. And we've been working very closely with our folks and DPD colleagues and Revite just because they know give us a call if they have some concerns and kind of we kind of can go through and say we might have a few issues and then we can at least have a conversation

about it so that it doesn't turn into a problem after the fact I mean I and I'm all for that and the pop-ups the simpler and the faster okay the two are almost related in a lot of ways the simpler and faster

[01:05:39] we can come up with definition standards and a process or maybe no process at all the recommendations I think would be helpful on both of those because they're growing in popularity which is a good thing but I'm worried that they're growing so fast absent sometimes the proper regulation and process that we could end up having a problem we want to prevent. Thank you. Thank you. I have Supervisor Alcorn, Luskin, and Bierman. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Two things. One, this just came up at a board meeting, maybe it was a couple board meetings ago, child care facilities. So I think,

[01:06:16] you know, if we're spending a lot of time looking at special exceptions there, I think there was some discussion on the board, we might want to look at changing the orders. And frankly, if we're going to approve them, even if the district supervisor doesn't want them approved, that's an area we might want to look at.

[01:06:36] So I don't know if it's appropriate to add that now or maybe staff looks at it and comes back later in the year, but I think that's one where, frankly, we might be able to save some time from another part of DPD for evaluating those.

[01:06:51] So that's one I would put out there. The other piece, we got an email from Mary Payton in the NAACP about notification of renters and adjoining to land use applications.

[01:07:12] Now, I know there's a difference between notification of rezoning-related activities and applications versus buy-write. And frankly, this is something I've been working on this for like 25 years. This is, it keeps coming up and I'm all for notification, just me personally.

[01:07:32] But my question is this, does something like, does notifying renters require a change in the zoning ordinance? If we were going to require it, I think the zoning ordinance, and I have to go back and look at that.

[01:07:51] And I know Tracy's been involved in that. I think it talks about property owners. But I do know that, you know, the board has asked for, in terms of entitlement cases for notice, that in certain circumstances that people in a condominium association or other, like a multifamily, you know, rental apartment, be notified.

[01:08:20] And they are in the process of putting that whole process together. Okay. So as far as the manufactured housing, and I think that was part of the notice was also was for the manufactured housing. Now, as far as by right, you know, that and I think it was regarding a site plan that had been that had been submitted.

[01:08:43] And that's a whole that that is kind of a separate situation. And so I rather than us take a lot of time here because we all got the email, Tracy got the email, I'm emailed with her. I think we need to have staff provide either a memo or get information back to us.

[01:09:01] Okay, that's why I asked. Yes, yes. So we will do that separately here. Because I think the answer is no, that it's not required. But I would, as a board, like to talk about this at some point. We definitely need an answer, so we will get that. Thank you. Supervisor Lust, then Bierman, then Herron. Thank you very much, Madam Vice Chairman.

[01:09:20] I don't know if I missed this, and I apologize if I did. on the work plan you've got the affordable housing initiatives and manufactured housing and you've got that under the tbd um can you just again help me understand to be determined obviously but what does that mean exactly as it relates to that item on the manufactured well we put it as tbd because we're kind of waiting on others and we're waiting that was the one that we talked about where um hcd is hiring uh a consultant i believe and also a uh they've hired

[01:09:56] a liaison that's helping with the manufactured housing they've actually hired that person already okay so i'm gonna let bill answer that because bill's gonna be the lead on that he's been our lead on that manufacturer from the manufactured housing task force right at the time when we were putting together i don't know if they had hired that person so it's good to hear that they've require that person who's working with housing community development to ban the manufacture housing based on the task force was done several years ago they're currently doing a grant plan for grants to help on consultant services that would in addition to help on manufactured housing may other aspects another

[01:10:36] exploring beyond potential tweaks to the comprehensive plan tweaks to zoning ordinance that may help those issues there might be other things that they're looking at in terms of replacing existing housing units in the manufacturing housing community that go beyond zoning ordinance. There's a number of things they're looking at.

[01:10:52] So we'll be working with them closer to have someone on board. Okay. So it's going to be sooner than later is what it sounds like now. So I appreciate you making that clarification and appreciate that this item's in the zoning ordinance priority one, too, since it was such a big issue during the review of that ordinance before.

[01:11:12] So thank you very much. Second, I wanted to ask a question that's kind of related to what the chairman was asking on the murals, just thinking about public art and the idea that you could have signage embedded inside public art. And the question then is, do we need to have some specifics around defining what public art is separate from signage? Because I could see a time where someone would try to maybe put the ability to promote and market inside of a piece of public art, and that might not be consistent, I don't think, with the zoning ordinance.

[01:11:48] So just thinking out loud, maybe that's something that we might want to take a look at as well as we're thinking about these other items. So that's one. And then last, trying to get the sense, and I heard the Planning Commission is asking to have the opportunity to maybe see some of your thinking ahead of this coming to the Planning Commission.

[01:12:12] What do we do around the idea of a community having the ability to have some input and be a part of this kind of deliberative process to decide what the zoning ordinance work plan is? Do we have a mechanism for public comment and input?

[01:12:32] Is that something that we would consider? I mean, we do receive, you know, recommendations. You know, a lot of times it comes about because maybe there was a notice of violation issued and they don't like the provision and they want us to change it.

[01:12:57] I guess, I mean, I have no, going and doing an outreach and opening it up, then I'm concerned about what we would do with that if we got 60 different comments. I mean, we kind of did that with ZMOD.

[01:13:13] I mean, you know, so we kind of reset things with ZMOD. So I... So I'm going to jump in here. You know, it's interesting because you reflect on what we looked at today and what we've done in the

accessible parking and these other issues.

[01:13:31] And I think a lot of the work and what ends up in this work program comes about because our work with the community and in the community, right? And there's always the balance of having enough of an understanding. I think for the community, maybe the regular process, they don't understand, but they know what doesn't work and that comes with that to us and we can get it in the program so i think that's where the value of the community involvement is through what they experience in the community rather than saying what would you like in the work program when you know before i was on this board i had no idea what the work program was or what it did right i mean i think

[01:14:10] that one thing we have done in the past and we could you know we've been talking about it is we used to have some open houses and then, you know, we had ZMOD and, and then we kind of have been working, you know, on doing our, our work, but you know, I, I think it's important to share with the community, you know, what we do. So I think in the context of that, we could, you know, we would share the work program. Here's some of the things. So that's, I think I'd like to take that back to my, um, to my group and, um, see if we can't maybe do some of that again, uh, in the upcoming

[01:14:50] year, um, just to kind of, and it, it helps put our presence out there in the community. They know, but we, I will tell you, we, Bill, how many calls do we answer, um, and we get with our planner of the day? It was like fiscal year 20, 20, plus thousands of calls during a quarter.

[01:15:12] yeah 3,000 9,000 we get 9,000 calls I think it's 4,000 calls and emails during the last quarter during the last quarter I mean so we are sure we are front and center with the community all the time because we're answering their questions I guess the point isn't that I'm going to let them decide necessarily but I think the transparency is for them to at least know what's being considered if they have any input or thoughts even before we get to here it's kind of like what the Planning Commission was asking, just to have that opportunity as you're getting to the place of bringing it forward. I get that the average person's not going to even probably know

[01:15:51] what a zoning ordinance amendment is, so for them to be able to try to come up with some suggestions might be a little difficult, but just where is there that opportunity for the community to at least be apprised and to get some feedback before we get to this place is what I'm asking. Thank you, Mr. or Madam Chairman. Thank you. Supervisor Bierman and Herity. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[01:16:17] We seem to have fewer people watching today than we had last Tuesday. Shocker. Don't know why. But I thought that it would be nice just to get on record that it's really great to see that the substation question is on the priority one list because I think it's important to note that what we were discussing last tuesday was only one component of our approach to data centers another being considering substations another being a comp plan uh the comprehensive plan as well that's not even getting into whether or not we study it as at the environmental level or whether

[01:16:57] or not we consider things for the legislative package it's just important to note that the the zoning ordinance amendment that we will be voting on on tuesday is only one component of the whole thing. And, you know, I doubt that many of those folks are watching on TV right now, but it's worth getting that on the record that we are still working on a broader approach to the issue. And that's my only comment other than be very careful with murals and regulation of speech, just throwing that out there. Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Herod. Yeah, I'm going to go back

[01:17:36] to Supervisor Alcorn in child care, because I think we've got, we all know that we've got a shortage of those. Right before the controversial case, whatever that was, a couple weeks ago, we had two that missed affidavits. We know it's a costly burden and hurdle, and I think it's keeping us from having child care and single family where it probably under certain conditions it'd be all right i i know we've got a question in that i haven't seen an answer back on how many have entered the process and not finished the process and and why um i think that would be

[01:18:14] helpful to know and then i know all the ones that have gotten to the board have been approved so what i'd like to see is are there under certain are there conditions under which we ought to just be allowing them up to 12 by right and single family and we could take pipe stems for instance out of the equation so if they're on a pipe stem they have to go through special exception but i i think that's something that's worth looking at getting in priority one uh because i think it's uh i don't know i'm gonna make a suggestion because this is a new topic to staff

[01:18:49] yeah and so i would like staff before we decided to add it to the work program to take a look at this and just give us a quick perfect top level look of because this has come up with a couple of colleagues i don't know that we're ready to add it to the work program yet i would agree now okay i agree with taking a look first we need to see what's going on so we can follow up afterwards okay because i would just want to know if we're going to you know send you all something information i i you wanted to look at the cases and i just kind of want some because we're going to have to work with zoning evaluation division right you know those who do those so let's not do that here

[01:19:28] but that's something we'll figure out follow up what the path forward would okay okay sounds good okay okay um are there any other comments all right well i appreciate all the work on this uh your department and lds in general i mean dpd in general you're doing a great job and thank you very much okay okay and so i got back some of the time that um we lost before so you can breathe for a few minutes before three o'clock and this land use policy committee is adjourned thank you

