



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee, Tuesday, November 26, 2024

Date Tuesday, November 26, 2024
Place Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 47m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): <https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3611>
- 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] I'm still dealing with terrible renovation of my house. I'll call the Land Use Policy Committee meeting to order. Yep, we've been renovating our bathroom since May. Okay, I'll tell you, it has been an adventure.

[00:00:19] It's all permitted, though. Oh, yes. The permits are still on the window of my house. Okay, any corrections or additions to our minutes from the last meeting? Okay, hearing none, we have three topics on the agenda, And I am going to turn it over to Bill Malin to begin.

[00:00:45] I see you're ready for the presentation to pop up, but thank you. William Malin is a part of planning and development. I am joined here today with Tracy Strunk, the director at DPD, Leslie Johnson, the zoning administrator, and Kathy Belgium, the zoning evaluation division. We're here to present a potential amendment related to the PRC plan exceptions and minor modifications.

[00:01:03] A detailed white paper was provided to the board and has been posted on a dedicated webpage for this potential amendment. With readoption of zoning ordinance in 2023 the board directed staff to review the PRC plan exceptions Particularly as related to community facilities in open space This amendment largely focuses on when a PRC plan would not be required when a site is requested in minor revisions In 1962 the PRC district was created. It was the first plan district in Fairfax County

[00:01:36] Communities arrested in Burke and Cardinal Forest are the only three RP PRC districts in the county when a site rezoned to PRC a development plan is approved by the board a PRC plan is required similar to a final development plan which provides additional detail prior to 2007 the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services approved the PRC plan administratively in 2007 the board made changes to PRC plan and a legislative process has been is required for development plans our PRC plans this is because when many PRC plans were not subject to proffers and

[00:02:13] and development plans were not specific in terms of the number of units and layout, amongst other things. Given that redevelopment could occur in unanticipated locations without a public forum, due to the blob nature of these approved development plans, the Board amended the zoning ordinance to change the process from an administrative approval to a legislative process with public hearings for PRC plans.

[00:02:32] When a PRC plan process was changed, there was no update to the provisions related to when a PRC plan was exempt. The current provisions largely mirror those that have been in place since 1994. Essentially, what staff will be proposing is that PRC districts use the same process as other districts when minor changes are being requested administratively.

[00:02:52] The Zoning Ordinance requires that all uses have a PRC plan, with some exceptions. Staff reviewed these exceptions and started to compare how they relate to minor modification provisions in the Zoning Ordinance, which is how non-PRC districts are permitted to make administrative approvals for modifications.

[00:03:11] In a PRC district, a site may be exempt based upon the provisions on this slide or if they meet the minor modification provisions. When staff begin to review and compare the PRC plan exceptions and minor modifications, we determine that they're very similar and reach a conclusion that instead of expanding the PRC plan exceptions, instead we should consolidate many of these provisions with minor modifications.

[00:03:34] Minor modifications are administrative approvals that are reviewed by a zoning evaluation division in accordance with provisions of the zoning ordinance. These applications are coordinated with the district supervisor and require formal submission to staff.

[00:03:51] PRC permits building additions of the lesser of 10% or 2,000 square feet, whereas a minor modification permits a building addition of the greater of 500 square feet or 5% up to 2,500 square feet, or an addition equal to 1% of a building for developments over 250,000 square feet.

[00:04:10] Minor modifications require a notice when a building addition is proposed to adjacent property owners, but it is not the same requirement for the PRC plan exceptions. Staff recommends removing the PRC plan exceptions related to additions, since most of these additions can still be approved using the minor modification provisions.

[00:04:27] This will permit the same building addition as every other zoning district is allowed. On here you'll see an example of where a PRC plan would permit versus the minor modification provisions for different building sizes. Buildings under 5,000 square feet or over 40,000 square feet get bigger additions using the minor modification provisions, Whereas between 5,000 and 40,000 square feet, a PRC district could get a bigger addition than any other zoning district.

[00:04:56] Staff proposes remove this discrepancy and use the minor modification provisions only. PRC plans are not required to increase parking areas or changes to transistor screening as long as the change does not exceed 10% of the element.

[00:05:12] Whereas minor modifications can also approve changes to transistor screening and other site elements. Both require a review of the impact on adjacent property owners. In staff opinion, these non-structural site elements can be adequately reviewed using the minor modification provisions and the separate PRC plan exceptions could be removed.

[00:05:30] PRC plans permit minor accessory structures to open space, and a corresponding minor modification would also permit minor accessory structures and changes to open space. Again, in staff's opinion, eliminating the PRC plan exceptions language would still permit these additions under the modern modification provisions.

[00:05:52] Finally staff is proposing a new change to minor modification which would be countywide impact and this would allow for Changes of active recreation with other active recreations of similar type size and impact this is consistent with current Consistent with past approvals for minor modifications again as I mentioned We have a dedicated web page that provides information on this topic as well as some upcoming community meetings We would have it over the next month And we'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you. Thank you bill supervisor Alcorn

[00:06:29] Yeah, so the community. Thank you very much bill to the community meetings coming up in the next month or two When do we expect? Authorization to come to the board so as I mentioned we have a meeting with the Planning Commission December 12th We have two community meetings which are a virtual meeting set up. We're meeting directly with Burke executive Burke conservative executive management team After those group of meetings will kind of reevaluate staff to see what additional meetings may have we've talked about having a meeting with Reston and 100 mil, specifically in January.

[00:07:03] And at that point, we'll kind of regroup, decide what next steps are. At the earliest, we'd be looking at spring of 2025, moving forward with any type of amendment. Okay. So the authorization wouldn't come to the board until the spring? Yeah, February, March, you know, I'm at the earliest. All right. Thank you.

[00:07:19] Thank you. Supervisor Walkinshaw. Thank you, Madam Chair. One of the questions that could come up in that outreach is, Do we have any sense of how many additions would fall in that category of PRC plan exempt but not meet the threshold or exceed the threshold for a minor modification?

[00:07:49] So, for example, in a 20,000-square-foot building, an addition of 1,500 square feet would be below the PRC plan-exempt threshold, but above the minor modification threshold.

[00:08:08] In the respective PRCs, has that happened four times, 40 times, 400 times? Do we have any sense of that? We'll see if Kathy Bellagio and Zone Evaluation has any answer to that. I sense it is closer to four than 40 or 400.

[00:08:25] I would say in the time I've been in zoning administration, I have not had that question ask me for what PRC plan exam is related to a building addition that would be in that gap that would fall under PRC plan exam versus minor modification. So my answer at this point in the last five years is closer to zero than four, but I'll see if Kathy has other experience.

[00:08:47] Kathy Belgian with zoning administration. I would concur with Bill that I don't think it's a problem that has come up very often. But it wouldn't come up because if you're in a PRC and you want to do a 1,500-square-foot addition to a 20,000-square-foot building, nothing would come up other than you would get the administrative approval to be PRC plan exempt.

[00:09:12] However, under this change to shift to minor modification, it then would come up because you would be over the new threshold. So what we would have to look at is go back through and see how many in the PRCs are 1,500 square feet, you know, between 1,000 and 2,000 square feet for a 20,000 square foot building.

[00:09:34] We would have to proactively look for it. It wouldn't have come up, I don't think. It would have been a question certainly asked, either a zoning administration or a zoning evaluation about is this addition permitted in accordance with the past approvals and the zoning ordinance. So as I said, I've never been asked that question in the past five years.

[00:09:53] So, you know, I haven't heard or seen that in-between gap where someone in a PRC wants to use a PRC plan exemption and they can't use the minor modification because they're in that in-between area and they've asked zoning administrations, like, is this okay?

[00:10:10] Because it would have been a question, I assume, Land Development Services would have asked us, like, is this appropriate? And I'll turn over those. But we can certainly search it closer, but it's just something I've not seen. I was just going to say, we can take a look at that so that maybe we have a better understanding.

[00:10:29] Leslie Johnson, zoning administrator, when we meet with her conservancy and when we meet with Reston to kind of get the scope. But I've been here a long time, did a lot of Reston cases, and it has not come up. I mean, we've been able to either, because, you know, I think we're, some of the concerns that we've been hearing have been from the umbrella, like HOAs, like Burke Conservancy is an umbrella HOA, Reston Association is an umbrella HOA.

[00:10:59] The builders, you know, they know the rules, and so they, you know, they can deal with it. But, and their buildings are typically larger anyway, right? But some of the smaller, you know, your bathhouses, your smaller facilities, you know, I think that we really haven't seen that, but we can research it.

[00:11:20] You know, the one that comes to mind is Walker Nature Center, where they rebuilt the whole thing. They needed a PRC plan to do that. So you're good? Supervisor Alcorn? So, yeah, just quickly, I guess I would encourage folks coming to these workshops to bring some specific situations so that we can flush out where there might be an issue relating to that gap.

[00:11:51] and, frankly, we can all go in knowing what any changes would actually mean and how it could help. So hopefully, Burke Conservancy, Reston Association will do that. So thank you. Okay.

[00:12:06] Well, thank you for the work on this. I'm going to move us on to our next topic. All right. Again, William Mayhem, Department of Planning and Development.

[00:12:23] I'm joined here today with Tracy Strunk, the Director of Planning and Development, and Leslie Johnson, the zoning administrator. We're here present a potential amendment related to secondary uses in the planned development housing pdh and planned development commercial PDC districts as well as a submission requirement change for final development plan amendments the topic for you standards for

pdh districts have been on the work program since 2012 and the pdc district was added in 2017 these items are elevated party two to party one with the last work program Sony administration has been working with zoning evaluation staff to review the current standards to best determine what revisions

[00:13:03] are appropriate to recommend changes for PDH district which commercial uses but limits the land area at these are based these uses based upon the number of residential dwelling units these restrictions in places is 1969 again the restrictions on the land area the commercial uses which includes parking and not in the square footage of the buildings these commercial uses include retail and offices the other non-residential uses are not in a commercial category like a religious assembly our schools are not from are permitted to be shown if permitted if shown on found a moment plan do not have

[00:13:39] the same land use restrictions on area staff reviewed over 240 develop PDA developments over the past 20 years and found approximately 20 developments had commercial uses and staffs are paying the current provisions provide for a reasonable restriction on impact of secondary commercial uses in a residential community there are currently additional restrictions on offices within these commercial land areas the staff does not feel necessary retain but otherwise staff recommends retaining the current provisions with limiting commercial land area the board does have the ability to modify these

[00:14:18] commercial land area restrictions on a case-by-case basis as staff recommends them adding some additional flexibility and some other minor changes related to improving readability of this section whereas the PDC district staff does recommend changes to the secondary use provisions the principal uses in the PDC district include offices hotels and secondary uses include residential retail and other impersonal services. The current provisions restrict residential uses to 50% of the principal uses and other secondary uses to 25% of the principal uses. These are not

[00:14:55] restrictions based on a total development, but based on principal uses, and can be difficult to understand and enforce. Staff reviewed PDC approvals over the past 10 years and found that the Board has modified these provisions in over 60% of the cases. The example shown here is how a million square feet of development could permit secondary uses. Instead, staff proposed have submitted up to 75% of the total development to be residential or other secondary uses.

[00:15:20] In staff's opinion, this proposal is easy to understand and is consistent with PDC developments that we are now seeing. To address issues related to partial final development plan amendments, staff does recommend adding a new requirement for a legal description, including meets and bounds descriptions with submission of plans in addition to the current requirements of variance and distance. Currently, staff will ask for this information. It is normally provided by applicants, but on occasion, this request is denied because it is not required by the zoning ordinance.

[00:15:53] Again, we also have a dedicated webpage for this amendment, which includes upcoming community meetings, as well as information related to the white paper. We'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you. Thank you, Bill. I appreciate the white paper and the research you did on this and going back and looking at cases.

[00:16:09] Do we have any questions or comments? Okay. So we will move forward on this one, too. Thank you very much. We are ready for our third topic, an update with the policy plan amendment.

[00:16:37] Okay, Salem, you going to take it away for us? Sure. Good morning, Chairperson. Smith and good morning to the rest of the committee. I am Salem Bush. I'm from the Department of Planning and

Development and I'm joined here by Tracy Strunk and Kelly Atkinson from DPD as well as Karim BaBeck, who is the project manager for the overall policy plan.

[00:17:05] And so we are here to talk to you. As you know, staff has been working on various updates to the various elements of the policy plan. And one of those is the entered preface chapter or we've been rebranding it, the introduction chapter. And so we're here to talk to you about that and more specifically the goals And possibly land use vision for that comprehensive plan and land use planning that we do so with that just briefly the Agenda for today. I'll talk about the introduction chapter. We'll go over the draft land use vision and goals Korean will talk to you and give you a little overview of the overall project schedule for the policy plan

[00:17:42] And then we'll have time for board discussion and questions. So the introduction chapter is important again I'd wanted to reiterate we're looking at rebranding this from the preface to the introduction It's important it lays out the framework for the entire policy plan It sets the the goals And then for the for the overall policy plan, but then for the rest of the elements those objectives and policies themselves as well, so We have been looking at various sections to update in the introduction overall So I wanted to kind of go over some of those before we get into the land use vision and goals one thing we do feel like there's an opportunity with this introduction to

[00:18:21] To really right now the introduction is primarily focused on just the policy plan But there is an opportunity I think to look at the overall comprehensive plan and discuss that in the policy plan how the conference plan works How it works for us the development review? and land use planning so we're looking at really making that connection between The policy plan itself and then the actual through the concept for a future development into the the actual area plans of the conference of plan another important section that we've been discussing a lot internally is the history of land use planning in Fairfax County it will get into the goals in a

[00:18:58] bit and you'll see that we've really structured the the new goals around the countywide strategic plan in the 10 community outcome areas and so those all provide topics related to land use planning in the county and so we really want to do is tell the story the history of why those topics are so important in the county and why we've really prioritized those and kind of how that relates to land use planning and that was actually a comment we got from the Planning Commission was make sure that we really contextualize these goals and the things that have changed and why they're important and so I think a really good place to do that is in that history section a good example of that is discussing equity we are looking at adding a lot more policy on equity in

[00:19:36] the in the plan and so there really hasn't been sort of that storytelling of how equity has been important in the county wise an important goal for us now And so really telling that story is important But there's other topics that we need to talk about to you like housing transportation environment and the others as well another section that we're looking at is the implementation and plan Monitoring and citizen participation and we'll bring all this back to the Planning Commission and to the board as we work through it and have Actual the edits to the overall introduction, but today I wanted to focus more on the land use vision and goals Again because that really provides a framework for the rest of the elements

[00:20:13] Policies going forward. So we just want to make sure we're on the right track with that So just briefly the existing goals what they're like how they how they were identified in 1973 The Board of Supervisors adopted 16 interim policies. Those were then later brought into the actual comprehensive

plan of 1975 in 1988 The Board of Supervisors put together goals commission and they came up with 18 new revised goals and then ultimately 20 of those goals were adopted I do want to point out one one paragraph that's in the comprehensive plan today in the preface

[00:20:52] chapter and it says the goals are comprehensive encompassing every aspect of Fairfax County government not limited merely to the planning function implementing some aspects of the goals is beyond the legislative mandate of the Planning Commission and the purview of the comprehensive plan however because the planning function is so far reaching it is critical to use these goals as a basis for forming countywide planning policy therefore the goals for Fairfax County have been provided the strategic focus for the objectives and policies of the conference plan so these are the 20 existing goals in the comprehensive plan still like these goals are still very relevant for what we do however it's been a long time since they've been updated a lot in the county has changed there's been a lot of population growth change in

[00:21:31] demographics changes in the way that we plan and do land use studies and things like that so we think it's a good time to take a look at these goals and also like I said earlier the Board of Supervisors did adopt the countywide strategic plan and we believe these 10 community outcome areas provide a really good framework for updating the goals going forward so using this the 10 community outcome areas is the basis for revising those goals and then looking at the existing goals and still pulling from that and what still works in those

[00:22:04] so I just want to talk about staff process kind of how we got here so far there's been a lot of review a lot of agency we've been coordinating with internally we've been coordinating a lot in dpd we've been working with the planning commission and we've had a lot of community input meetings so i just want to point out some of those things that we've been doing we do have an introduction staff review committee um that we've been working with so we've had a series of meeting initially to kind of discuss the strategies for this um what what we need to really concentrate on what deserves looking at and deserves to be revised and edited and what things we might need to add we also have been working very close to the planning

[00:22:42] commission as you know the planning commission has um uh selected liaisons for each element and topic area so as part of the introduction we do have uh the chairman and the vice chair of the planning commission are the liaisons for the introduction effort so we've been meeting with them regularly for this we also have concluded outreach phase one which was on this past summer we did have four in-person meetings and those meetings really focused on the overall policy plan elements but on the introduction was in there and so we took that to the community got feedback from community about the strategy that we are looking at in terms of updating and got some feedback we also have recently done two more meetings for the introduction chapter

[00:23:22] those were specifically related to get feedback from the community about that that chapter and those those happen over the last few weeks and then we've also been have another internal staff committee that's made up of the policy plan topics uh uh staff and we've been meeting with them to discuss that draft land use vision and get comments and edits from them as well throughout the process then of course DPD senior management has gone through reviewing these and we did have a meeting with the Planning Commission on October 24th it was the policy plan committee to take a look at these goals and and land use vision as well and today we're here meeting with

[00:23:59] you all so I want to talk about some of the key themes that have been developed through all that process of review and editing one thing was is everyone was in agreement that we needed to whatever update we were doing we needed aligned with the countywide strategic plan so that was very upfront right in the beginning we all decided that was was key we also do not currently have a land use vision statement in the conference of plans so thought now is a very good opportunity to create a land use vision statement we also felt like the goals should be visionary so a very high level of expectation for what we want the County to be like in the future and then we also wanted to make sure that for

[00:24:39] the start of the goals that we had an overarching land use goal and then we have some new goals based on the strategic plan such as equity and healthy communities so we wanted to make sure those were incorporated into this update and then we also had a lot of conversations about the transportation goals and that they should be more focused on urban design and concepts such as streetscape and multimodal design.

[00:25:01] And then last but not least, we recognize that we need to establish a tone that all the goals are interrelated, and they should not be considered outside of the context of the other goals. And this is a conversation we've had with the elements themselves as well. So that's very important, and so we've really been trying to synthesize these goals together.

[00:25:20] I also want to mention some of the feedback we got from the Planning Commission as well. So we did meet with the Planning Commission in October. They had some comments. again I kind of mentioned earlier they wanted to make sure that when we're presenting this in the future with our staff reports that we make sure that we establish that context and the history of planning and why some of these goals are important what has changed why it's important to point those things out they also had some comments about our goals related to housing and related to like the activity centers and that make sure that we are still if that we're not

[00:25:57] really shifting the focus of development and stuff from the activity centers and then they did have some comments about the vision statement wanted to make sure that we included a reference to a sense of place somewhere in there maybe bolster a little bit more related to the economy and then also making sure that when we're talking about the environment folks on the natural environment not just the built environment as well and then to incorporate the ideas of like resiliency throughout the goals as well so with that I will share the draft land vision first I'll read it out loud for you all the county will plan for growth by providing diverse housing options ample employment opportunities and

[00:26:36] essential services for all people healthy environments and communities will be designed to be safe walkable and well-connected by multimodal transportation options and include vibrant cultural and recreational spaces that ensure a high quality life for everyone and the draft goals so I do have separate slides if we need to get into any questions specifically related those goals because there's narratives built out for each one of these what you what you have before you today none of the changes have have been added to it based on Planning Commission yet or based on feedback we've gotten from community we wanted to present it to you all first get all the feedback from everybody and then take it back internally to our committees and talk

[00:27:13] about potential changes so we do have eight eight goals and the goals are first ones based around land use an equitable goal housing goal a health and communities goal, access to arts, culture,

recreation, and lifelong learning goal, an environmental sustainability goal, and then an urban design and transportation goal as well.

[00:27:35] With that, I'm going to hand it over to Corrine to just talk about the schedule going forward. Thank you, Salem. Before we close, I wanted to take a moment to provide an overview of our anticipated milestones for 2025, just to ensure that we stay on track with the targeted public hearings of fall 2025.

[00:27:53] So for 2025, similar to the process Salem described, we'll be using that draft land use vision and goals process where we take the feedback that we've heard from the community, staff, everyone, and take a stab at drafting policy based off of that. We'll review it with our internal teams, with our planning commission liaisons, with management team, and then bring it back to the planning commission and board committees for discussion.

[00:28:16] We do also want to say that while we've targeted certain meetings to be focused on something, that's not the only time to provide feedback. We will be accepting feedback up until we write the staff report and then again at the public hearing. So this is not the only time to give feedback for parks is not January. It is anytime in 2025 while we're working on this.

[00:28:34] We also wanted to highlight that if we notice that something else needs to be shifted or if we need to talk about one topic before another, we do respectfully request that flexibility just to make sure that we're hitting what we need to as staff. We'll also be doing work in the background during these months to include drafting plan techs, Which will be released on a rolling basis and we'll also be releasing our community feedback report Which will include all the feedback received and how it was was not or will be incorporated and why And also we'll be taking some heads-down staff time during February and during the summer to work on that community feedback report and the staff report as well

[00:29:12] And then before we dive into the discussion about the land use vision and goals I did want to just provide a slide with our contact information as well as the current version of the policy plan We do still have our plan forward survey live. We've been getting great feedback through that. So we've decided to leave it open So I've included a direct link to that on the page. So we encourage people to fill it out There's also a mechanism to sign up to stay informed with upcoming meetings and email blasts So we encourage everyone to sign up for that and fill out the survey if they haven't and then also we have a central email inbox for Comments and considerations about the project and if you have general questions feel free to reach out to me without further ado

[00:29:51] Thank you. I also want to say I think the background paper with the language was really a helpful addition. And I really appreciate the work that you went back and looked at our changes from 73 and 88 and really that focus and connection with the strategic plan.

[00:30:10] I mean, it's important for us to move forward in unison. So I appreciate all that work. I'll turn it to the chairman. Yeah, just very briefly, I second everything that Chair Smith said. This is a major undertaking. I mean, this is, I don't think most people understand the magnitude of this.

[00:30:28] And so I know there were early discussions about whether or not this would come forward to the Planning Commission and Board as one package versus pieces of it coming forward when they are ready. Can you help me understand what the conclusion was on how to handle that?

[00:30:47] just to make sure that, you know, we're being efficient, but also understanding the lift here? Of course. Thank you for the question. So we've decided that it'd be the best approach to have one staff report

and one public hearing for this whole process, but we've broken it up so that we have individual committee meetings to dive deep into each topic with the Planning Commission and the board as well.

[00:31:06] So we're hoping that by the time you guys see the staff report, it'll all be old news, and it'll be a smooth process from there. Okay, so potentially there will be parts of this settled through the process earlier but will be incorporated into the main motion, the main package that comes to the board when everything is ready?

[00:31:25] That is correct. Okay. All right. Thank you. And, you know, I do want to, you know, the chairman of the Planning Commission, of course, is here. And I do want to thank them for this because some folks here who have served on the Planning Commission, they have a plate full all the time.

[00:31:42] But this is massive. and just the amount of time already that's gone in to getting to this point and the amount of time it will take us to make sure that, you know, we stay on this schedule, which I think is important to do given the workload of the Planning Commission. So I want to thank Phil and his team on the Planning Commission for their work on this as well.

[00:32:01] So thank you. Thank you. I have no idea if everybody in the right order, but we're going to start with Supervisor Lusk. Thank you very much, Madam Vice Chairman and Chairman for this committee. Can I... Maybe ask for additional clarification.

[00:32:19] I do appreciate all the work that you've done here and like plan for economic opportunity and resiliency. If you could just talk a little bit about that and I'll have a follow-up after that. Sure. So we actually, I didn't mention this in the presentation, but we're working with the Department of Economic Initiatives and through them the EDA.

[00:32:43] So we actually have a meeting with them scheduled, I think, in January to go over that goal. So they've got the goal now, so they're taking a look at it, and they want to meet with us and talk to us about that goal. So that's probably the goal that's the least flushed out at this point. It's really a combination of what we have in the strategic plan now, and really the existing goal was pretty good, I think, that was in there.

[00:33:03] So we just want to talk to them first and make sure that whatever we're doing aligns with the work that they're doing. Okay. No, I appreciate that, and that's where I was trying to get at, just to understand kind of how you were working with the different departments, but then also thinking about kind of the education and training components.

[00:33:19] I read through the section that you have, and I just didn't know if that was kind of elevated as much. So if there's a possibility to maybe give a little specificity around how we're going to support upscaling, training, and education for members in the community as well.

[00:33:36] So that was number one. And then number two, I've gotten several requests from residents in my district about the feasibility of having a public meeting somewhere in our district and just wanted to find out. I know you've delineated kind of what the plan is, but just wanted to see is there any flexibility if a community is asking, based on logistics in terms of the distance to the other scheduled meeting locations, if something could be done more centrally in the district.

[00:34:14] Hi. Thank you for that question, Kelly Atkinson. Yeah, so we have been in conversation with your office about that request. You know, we did look at, so we have postponed the community meetings to

February. And we have tried to be very targeted in where we've had those meetings to kind of get to as many people as possible.

[00:34:33] And it's kind of like, you know, we move one and then it has other effects. But I think that we could talk to you some more offline about that. We did develop a community outreach process in consultation with the Planning Commission, you know, recognizing all the other great work that has been done through the other plans and policies.

[00:34:50] And so we can have that conversation with you. But we were trying to craft it in a way that it was manageable and kind of hit as many people as possible. And I think once we have these white papers published, there might be some more specific questions that we could respond to your constituents about.

[00:35:06] That's perfect. I appreciate that response. And I'll just say looking forward to seeing the additional language that comes specifically with this economic opportunity and resiliency. And then wish you well in your efforts going forward. Thank you.

[00:35:21] Thank you. Supervisor Peltz? Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Sam, Corinne, and the whole group. This is truly incredible work. And I appreciate that we have the opportunity to be here as you're going through this. I have one, I think, clarification question. So I love in the vision statement, and I think it's so clear and so well thought through, when it talks about providing diverse housing options, the healthy environments, and well-connected by multimodal transportation options.

[00:35:51] I don't see that language in the individual goals, and I don't know if that just hasn't been hashed through yet, but when we look at the housing, it mostly just talks about affordable housing and the topic. And then I don't see as much on the, I think under health, we talk about health through land use, but I don't see that much that connectivity, right, and having access to transportation options and knowing that that has to go along with the land use development.

[00:36:23] Yeah, that's a good catch. I think it's a good thing to add in there. We got some feedback from that from some of the community, too, when we've talked to them, that particular thing as well. And one thing we have tried to really include in the overall goals is the word access.

[00:36:39] And that is something that is really talked a lot about in the strategic plan, particularly with equity. And so I think you're right. So that concept of access, not with just transportation, but with access to services and access to programs that the county provides and things like that, too. So, yeah, I think that's a good thing to take a look at.

[00:36:55] And for the housing, too, that it's right, all types of housing. Housing, yes. Okay, perfect. And then finally, I'm sorry if I missed the plan, but do you have information, I assume you're working with NCS on how to achieve what also is one of the goals that I love is the active, vibrant, the engagement with the community.

[00:37:17] Yeah, so we're working with Zach Lenard with HHS, and he's been pulling together all the folks in NCS and all the other folks that work under the HHS umbrella. And so he's part of the liaison group that staff has. And so, yes, we've definitely been including them in reviewing the goals and update, but also how to look at the human services chapter as well.

[00:37:39] Oh, and I mean how we are doing the engagement with the community, outreach on this. Yes, we are working with NCS on outreach and engagement as well. Okay, thank you. Because I think it's a huge

overarching goal, and we just need to keep getting better at it.

[00:37:55] So thank you. Supervisor Walkinshaw. Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, just two, my two nitpicks. One, maybe along the lines of Supervisor Palchuk and the bullet point that says prioritize access to affordable housing.

[00:38:15] You know, personally, I think we should consider being explicit about the need to increase the supply of housing for all income levels. You might be able to do that by the sentence that says the county will expand opportunities to increase housing supply in order to have affordable housing options and connected, safe, and walkable neighborhoods.

[00:38:42] So I do think that housing supply issue is important for us to memorialize in the goals. And then second, very minor, on the environmental sustainability, the sentence that reads prioritizing energy efficiency and conservation.

[00:39:03] I think we want to find a way to include renewable energy in that, along with efficiency and conservation. Perhaps you can just insert it in there with a comma or there's a way to include it. But I think that's an important part of our efforts as well.

[00:39:21] Sure, we can include that. I'm violating my own rule in suggesting any additions, but I'll get back to you later with some suggested cuts. Okay, thank you so much. Yeah, I think it's a great product, so I appreciate your work. Thank you. Supervisor Elk. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

[00:39:37] Appreciate the comments of my colleagues. I want to build a little bit on Supervisor Palchuk's suggestions. I completely agree. I think we should look maybe to be a little more explicit in terms of particularly on the housing side.

[00:39:55] I guess one thing that we may also want to be a little more explicit, maybe in the vision, maybe in the goals, something we don't really address, and it's the distribution of development across the county.

[00:40:11] So, you know, I mean, we're not looking to be like L.A. All right, we're not looking to do that, you know, with massive, you know, development all the way across the county. I think we're, we've already gone well down the road for transit-oriented development.

[00:40:29] We have activity centers that, you know, ongoing, you know, development, planning around emergence of activity centers. And so we might want to somehow address the distribution issue. It's kind of implicit on the environmental discussion.

[00:40:48] You know, we're talking about green corridors and stuff like that and protecting environmentally sensitive lands. But we might want to be a little more explicit in what where we do want development in terms of particularly focusing more of a priority on the development of communities.

[00:41:07] And we're doing this already. And we've been doing this for a long time with our activity centers. Probably most advanced with our transit-oriented development planning activities. But, you know, we're getting more into planning exercises that are really planning on communities to be transit-ready.

[00:41:29] And I think that's a concept that maybe not for this exercise, but, you know, maybe at some point in the near future, that could be a little bit more of a focus on bringing these together. Because we're talking about activity centers where, you know, where there will be the economic opportunities, where

there will be the diverse housing types, where there will be the cultural amenities, you know, all these things we're kind of planning on now.

[00:41:56] But it would be kind of a good idea, I think, to wrap that up, you know, a little more clearly and explicitly and then at some point show how in the long run these will be connected through, you know, multimodal transportation, thinking about it geographically.

[00:42:15] So this is great. I'm so glad we're having this conversation, and I'm so glad we have a planning commission because this is going to be a lot of work and a lot of discussion to sort through all this and bring it back together. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you.

[00:42:30] Supervisor Beerman. So I want to co-sign what Supervisor Walkinshaw said about supply of housing. Definitely thought that was a great point. And I guess one thing that jumped out to me was in the very first bullet, promote a dynamic, strategic, efficient, and ordered pattern of land uses.

[00:42:56] And I'm reminded of the Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce Innovate Conference I was at with Supervisor Walkinshaw – sorry, not Supervisor Walkinshaw, Supervisor Alcorn just two weeks ago. Efficiency is what I think is really important in this. Speed.

[00:43:12] People keep coming to me, you know, we approved that new plan for downtown McLean three years ago. Why hasn't it all – haven't all the dominoes fallen? Now, as Supervisor Alcorn pointed out at the Dulles Innovate concert – sorry, I guess it was a conference.

[00:43:30] It was a conference, but it was so cool we thought it was a concert. You know, some of that is obviously up to private industry, their perceptions of saturation in the market, their perceptions of what's needed and when. But the fact of the matter is that people are coming to us all the time. They come to me all the time. I'm sure they come to my colleagues saying, we need something. We need more housing. We need more vibrancy in this area. We need things to move faster. The people on the development side come in and say, we need more certainty to do this.

[00:44:04] The people who, even the people who don't like development want to know what's going to happen. Tell me what's going to happen. So I think it's really important. And look, you guys have a really tough job. Planning is really tough. Land development is really tough. A lot of this stuff is really tough. But the thing I'm hearing over and over and over again is, why can't you move faster on this? Or why can't you move faster on that? So anything we can do to move more quickly, I think is a net positive. Even some of the things people don't like

[00:44:37] necessarily, because we get certainty in what happens next. So I would emphasize that even more than you do right here. But I guess dynamic strategic efficient kind of captures it. But speed, I would love speed to be in there. But thank you. Chairman McKay. Yeah, just one final comment. And I don't want to belabor the affordable housing conversation even more. But when I read the language, there is something that jumps out that concerns me. And it's the especially in the county's mixed-use centers. I understand why that's in there, but I also understand that we've built

[00:45:15] over decades a county, and we have fixed this recently, but over many decades we've built a county that allowed concentrations of affordable housing to go in some parts of the county, but not all parts of the county. And we have done way better in the past, I would say, five to ten years with that. And I always remind people when you plot where affordable housing is going, it's a proud moment that you can see it happening almost everywhere in the county, but not quite everywhere. And so I think an emphasis

point here is the need for affordable housing throughout the county. And I would just be careful about putting anything in there that

[00:45:54] could be construed as a potential restriction or barrier to doing that. And it's just a cautionary note, but if we're not serious about doing this everywhere and understand that there needs to be sensitivity to connectivity job opportunities um other benefits to to the people who would live in these affordable units but i just want to make sure we're not tying our hands at all and and putting in place i think something that then can be later used as an example of why affordable housing should not go in a part of the county and what we're really trying to do is be more robust

[00:46:30] with our community and saying if we support affordable housing we should have the political courage to support it anywhere thank you for that comment that's exactly the kind of feedback we need to move forward so i appreciate that well i want to thank you all for all your work i know there's a ton of staff working on this you can hear the board's very positive as you move forward so thank you very much and i am going to adjourn this meeting thank you everybody



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com