



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Policy Committee, Tuesday, March 10, 2026

Date Tuesday, March 10, 2026
Place Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 45m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): <https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/4075>
- 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 2026-10-28. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:05] Okay, good morning, everybody. I am going to call the Land Use Policy Committee meeting to order. We have our meeting summary. Does anyone have any additions or corrections to that? Okay, seeing none, we are going to get right to it.

[00:00:23] And I am just going to turn right to Drew. All right, great. Thank you. I'm Andrew Hushauer, the Assistant Zoning Administrator in the Department of Planning and Development. And I have also Tracy Strunk, Director of Planning and Development, And then Jennifer Tran, a planner in the Zoning Administration Division.

[00:00:40] She and I have been working on this project together. So we'll get right into it. All right. So this is related to a proposal to modify the definition of building height. And I can't stress that enough, that we're really looking at one piece of issue that really spans and kind of tentacles into lots of other issues, compatibility, infill development, things like that.

[00:01:05] but we really are just focusing on the building height definition because this is a logical first step. We're bringing this to you because, as you all know, there's been a trend probably the last 12 to 15 years in Fairfax County with a lot of infill development where you see a lot of newer homes that are being built in older established neighborhoods, so a lot of teardown of older homes. The units that are being constructed on a lot of the infill lots are significantly bigger than the neighboring properties.

[00:01:33] Just for a little bit of context, the average home size in the U.S. in 2024, I believe, was around 2,400 square feet. Regionally, sort of northern Virginia, it's slightly higher, probably around 3,000, maybe a little bit over 3,000 square feet. When you start getting into custom homes, which we do see a lot in infill development, the goal really for, I think, the builders in the market is really delivering a home even bigger than that, maybe on the lines of 4,000 square feet.

[00:02:00] Then you also have areas of the county, State Falls is an example, where it's not uncommon to see homes that are, you know, 8,000 to 10,000, even 12,000 square feet. So all of these, you know, this effort and this desire, you know, for the bigger homes, you know, working up against setbacks, and then, you know, the bulk requirements, which will also include the height, have really pushed, you know, the limits of the existing definition of building height, which we haven't really, you know, really looked at too much, certainly not amended it in nearly 50 years.

[00:02:31] And so as a result of all this, there was a January 2025 joint board matter by Supervisors Stork and Beerman that really specifically addressed infill development. And, you know, staff was directed to, staff of multiple agencies was, you know, directed to look at maybe some different opportunities and tools, you know, to, you know, look at to possibly deal with the infill issue.

[00:02:54] The building height was one of them that DPD staff have identified, and that's why we're bringing forward the matter today. There's another related item that I'll just quickly mention based on a new home that's under construction in the county that's made the national news. Everybody's aware of it. I won't say the street name of it.

[00:03:11] But there was another joint board matter by Supervisors Smith and Herity that was done back in December that also directed staff to look at that issue. That one's a little more complex because we really were tasked at looking at the full bulk requirements as it relates to compatibility and infill development, which would include setbacks, not just the height.

[00:03:34] So this, again, is really, it's the first step. It's a logical first step. It's a building block, and I think it helps us get better to the other amendment, which will come later on, actually. And you'll be talking about that specific amendment on the work program when you review that in a couple months.

[00:03:51] So how do we measure building height today? So really, I think the main point is that we're talking about the average height. And so when we talk about average height, it's the measurement of the highest ridgeline of a roof. And then we're going to look at that point, which is the uppermost limit of the home. And then, you know, the eave associated with that roof, and we're going to draw at the midpoint. The reason that you do that is for, especially for architectural design,

[00:04:25] when you have a pitched roof, if you can imagine, the impact of, you know, the steeple, let's say, the pointy part of the roof, probably the least impactful of most of the structure on the property. And so a lot of jurisdictions we found in our research apply similar method, taking it to the midpoint. So the height of the house would actually be measured at the midpoint. So that's where we draw our 35-foot maximum height line.

[00:04:48] But it gives, you know, a little bit of ability for design, you know, attic space, whatever, that doesn't get counted towards the height. And so when we talk about the maximum height of 35 feet, we're measuring that to the midpoint of a roof. But the effect of height, which is what is actually the height of that structure, you would actually measure it to the uppermost limit of the roof.

[00:05:08] That is all in the ordinance today. What you don't see in the ordinance is a lot of, or codified at least, a lot of interpretations that we've done over the years uh most importantly uh one in 2019 that dealt with multiple roof lines we're seeing a lot of dwellings uh in the last 10 to 15 years that are pretty intricately designed with a lot of different roof lines different roof structures even and so when we're looking at something with multiple roof lines uh you have to pick well which of these if they're varying heights are you going to use to to calculate your building height and in that case the the interpretation we we did in 2019 states that it's the one with the highest ridge line and so that's important to know

[00:05:48] as well oh and in the case of a flat roof it's just the highest point of the roof we don't actually define what we mean by a flat roof when we do the reviews as they come in you know usually most of the time you don't have a true flat roof it's usually you know it's got some angle to it to shut off water and then we'll take it to the highest point of that flat roof so whichever side has the highest is where we're going to draw the height limit real quickly just the background i mentioned this before, the 35-foot height, that actual number, 35 feet, was actually established

[00:06:21] in 1959, and it hasn't changed in all that time. And so not really sure. We tried to research why 35 feet in 1959 seems wild to think about, but, you know, it certainly served us somewhat well today because we do see the limits getting pushed so much. And so I think really the only other important part about the background is when you look at really where did we start, when was the counties starting to get pressure, you know, to maybe change it. If you look really in that 2006 timeframe, that's when we started doing letters to industry. All that corresponds with, you know, the building boom that happened in the early 2000s following sort of that technology boom in the late

[00:07:01] 1990s. And the homes were just getting bigger. People could afford a larger home. That's where the market was driving it. And so, you know, you and then when that crashed in 2008, 2009, you get into the bottom of that Great Recession in 2012, everything sort of bounces back to what we call sort of that infill period. And that's what we've really been in for like the last 12 or 15 years.

[00:07:26] And so when you look at the timeline, what's going on in 2006, 2009, 2018, 19, that's staff, the county reacting to what the market is asking for. It's much bigger homes with a lot more intricate architectural design that are really pushing the limits of the current regulations.

[00:07:46] This slide just shows you some of those emerging home trends that we just talked about. These are all pretty typical of what you would see really being constructed today. Some of these actually are houses that we have permitted in the last two years and have now been constructed and are being occupied.

[00:08:02] Sort of the top one, again, you see those gable roofs, which is pretty popular. But there's a large footprint house. But then looking at the bottom ones, We are starting to see more, you know, modern design element in home construction, you know, a lot of straight lines, flat roofs, a lot of metal and glass incorporated into it.

[00:08:23] And these can be challenging because they really do push the limit, not just of the setbacks on the property, but now they're really exercising the full amount of the height and it just results in like a much bulkier residential unit. So the current standards, again, we're not proposing to change that number.

[00:08:42] we've already been asked this several times with people interested in the amendment it is currently 35 feet that's for pretty much most single-family detached dwellings throughout the county we

do have an amendment that was done i think in 2018 2019 for if you're located in re and rc you do have the ability to go up to a 40-foot building height but you have to in return you have to step the building back and you have greater setback requirements of 50 feet the p district as you all know the heights for those units always get set you know when the associated rezoning on the development plans that number can maybe vary somewhat

[00:09:22] but we never really see a variation any kind of proffers or development conditions that really deal deal with how we're calculating the height it's usually just the number that's being modified height certifications anything that's within proposed to be constructed within 33 feet so within two feet of the height limit we do ask for a certification that's done at the end of the building process prior to the issuance of the RUP and we're not proposing to change that as part of this amendment so the challenges this this slide actually that the house that you see you've seen it you're gonna see all throughout the presentation is probably one of the strongest samples I can give

[00:09:58] you about creative home design really pushing the limits of the ordinance so the multiple roof line I mentioned probably our biggest challenge in permit review on new home construction so you can see in the bottom left you know a a more traditional gable roof and you can see the 35 foot line where we measured it um and then you look at the bulk that's going on above the 35 foot line so that's allowed to encroach uh into the height and it goes up to 43 feet so there's eight feet and it's just that triangular area that's really above that little window kind of what we'll call the attic space that is the that is the only

[00:10:34] and that is the only encroachment area above the 35 feet so from a bulk perspective uh not so significant of an impact. But then when you pivot over to the example on the right, and I'll point to the graphic below that's done in red and green. So I mentioned before about when you have multiple roof lines, which one are you calculating the height off of? And it's always going to be one with the highest ridge. This unit was specifically designed where the green area, the green outline, which is the front part of the house with the gable roof on it now, was intentionally designed

[00:11:09] with the ridge of that roof sits two inches above the middle portion of the dwelling sitting behind it with the more flat shed roof design. So that is where we ended up assessing the height for that unit. So 35 feet was taken at the midpoint of that roof, but then you have nearly seven feet of additional area now that they've built up to, and they've done it in a very bulky manner with the section behind it. So you really almost get an entire floor of living space above the limit of what the ordinance actually intended to do as far as the maximum height.

[00:11:46] So the potential revisions that we're looking at today, we did look at a lot of different jurisdictions, obviously in the region, but also throughout the country to look at what different groups and local governments are doing in order to kind of come up with what we propose today. We're going to give you three different, you know, note or ideas, sets of regulations to consider. We really did focus on ones that we could really build off of what we have now, but maybe, you know, with the emphasis on maybe doing a better job of truly capturing and regulating the true height of a dwelling. We also wanted to look at methods that were easier to

[00:12:24] interpret and administer. We do get a lot of questions about that 2019 letter of dentistry in particular that dealt with the multiple roof lines. It's not codified. It is confusing. And so we do get lots of questions about it and we just want to make it easier for the public and the industry to understand. So option number one, which is always option number one, which is you maintain the current method. What

we would do here is we would clean up the definition but keep, you know, the essence of how it's calculated. So, you know, average grade to the average midpoint on

[00:13:00] the roof with the highest ridge. We would, but we would codify all of the provisions that we are working off of from the various letters to industry and interpretations over the years, we codify that. We would also put in and clarify what we mean by a flat roof, which is anything with a pitch 312 or less. And if you can imagine how flat that is, if you can imagine a triangle, the angle at the eave would be around 14 degrees. So it's nearly

[00:13:30] flat. Option two builds off of option one, which we would clean up the current regulation and then deliver everything that you would see in option one, but then take it a step further. And so we would do that by applying what's called a cap height. And we've seen other jurisdictions that have successfully done this. And so the notion here is that you would still, you know, calculate the roof height the same. So it's a 35-foot maximum. But then to the extent that any part the structure is allowed to go above that 35-foot line, you cap that height limit.

[00:14:08] So any of the portion of the roof, any type of roof, regardless of its design, that's above 35 feet, you could cap it. We're proposing around 38 feet. Most jurisdictions you see going usually between 35 and 40 feet with the cap.

[00:14:24] We hit it right in the middle, 38 feet. You could certainly -- you would have the flexibility, though, to do it different ways. And certainly when you play with the numbers, you can see the various impacts of doing that. This actually has a benefit of really dealing with the architectural issue that challenges us.

[00:14:41] This sort of equalizes things across the architectural design because regardless of the design of the unit, everybody is going to be subject to that same hard, fast line, 38 feet, nothing above that. The third option would be to use the highest eave to calculate height rather than the ridge of the highest roof point.

[00:15:04] So this is that same example that I keep going back to. And so here, this method actually gets probably the truest representation of regulating height in bulk, like in a residential unit, out of the three that we're proposing today. And so when we would look at then the unit, whether it just had a single roof line or if it had multiple, we would then look at, well, which one has the highest eave?

[00:15:29] And then we're going to use that particular roof structure then to establish the evaluation for where the 35 feet is going to be calculated off of. We want to give you some comparisons of what this actually looks like.

[00:15:45] These, again, all units in Fairfax County, we wanted to apply the different methods to see what they resulted in. The comparisons are definitely important, but I really want to stress how, you know, each of the methods really obviously is going to give you a very different result. And certainly when you throw in then the variable of like different architectural designs, it will impact other design types more than possibly others.

[00:16:10] So it is somewhat of a mixed bag in that regard. So when you look at this particular example, so under the second option where we capped the peak height, because this unit came in 35 foot based on that, again, that front portion of the dwelling.

[00:16:27] but then you have the additional six or seven feet of height added into it. So this would actually bring the height of this unit down by nearly three feet from around 40 to 41 down to 38 if you cap the peak. Under the third option, you get about the same result.

[00:16:47] You know, again, we would then be looking appropriately, I think, in this specific example that, you know, the roof and the section of the home that has the most impact in the bulk at the height is that middle portion, and we would then be able to evaluate and assess the height on that section. And you get almost this similar result that you see in the second option where the height gets reduced by two and a half to three feet. Second case study, obviously for this one, no change in how we did it before. So for the second one, though, we do see a little bit of a height reduction, the most significant, you know,

[00:17:25] nearly four feet when you apply that method but then when you look at option three with the the highest Eve just based on how the home was designed there is no net change in the height at all compared with the current method today so again just to give you an idea of how mixed the results can be here next steps it's a this is a pretty technical amendment it's one obviously that the the building industry is going to be very interested in so we have actually already started scheduling meetings with industry groups i believe we're on nvbia already i think

[00:18:03] for april we're going to be talking to the planning commission thursday night but we will be reaching out and meeting with a variety of home builder groups obviously to to pitch the idea to them and then similar outreach plan that you see with a lot of our amendments we'll do an open house We'll do community outreach on it, but we would expect to maybe bring a draft back for consideration in the fall would be the goal.

[00:18:29] That ends my presentation. I'll open it up to questions. Thank you, Drew. It is very technical. I appreciate how you showed the effect of the different options, and I think the industry outreach is going to be an important piece of this.

[00:18:48] I mean, just at a quick glance, it looks like option two might get you the best effect. But we'll see where we go with that. And I do think that the white paper is very helpful explaining the process. And with that, I'm going to turn it to the chairman. Yeah, I just have one brief question, and I'm not in any way advocating for this, but I feel like it needs to be asked.

[00:19:07] When I look at the picture in page 13 at the bottom right corner there, and then I look at the picture in 14 in the bottom right corner, they're two very different things in terms of impact to the neighbors.

[00:19:22] And so if you can go back to 13 for a moment, clearly that house on the right has a pretty high impact from this. And so my question is, and again, I'm not advocating for this because it might be difficult to do and that might be why it's rejected, but have any other jurisdictions that we've looked at considered the grade of the properties around it in terms of influencing the height?

[00:19:45] because what you see on 13 is what really gets our community upset. It's not what you see on 14 where there's some level of, you know, impact almost seems like it was considered even though it wasn't intentionally. So do you know of anyone who does that and what the complications and challenges with that might be?

[00:20:05] Oh, definitely, yeah. We found examples where jurisdictions were doing that. We came up with our list. We had, I think, what, seven or eight different methods that we sort of zeroed in on. One of the

ones that really sort of addressed specifically the topic you're talking about, because this is an infill lot that you're seeing here.

[00:20:22] And so, you know, part of the impact is, you know, you can see it right next to the old house in the neighborhood, right? So one of the methods looked at, you know, taking the height as measured from the curb line. And then that way you can sort of create and maintain sort of that height line of an entire block in that case.

[00:20:44] The challenges and why we steered away from – and that's just one example. There are others, and we're happy to provide them if you're interested. One of the reasons we steered away from that, though, was that it just – it does get more complicated. It does become more costly for a builder, but even for a homeowner in, like, an addition situation.

[00:21:03] It's just a little bit harder to calculate. And we were just – even with ZMOD and a lot of the ordinance amendments that we've done, you know, really since then, have really looked at maybe just trying to simplify the ordinance overall and so it really just comes down to that just making it less complicated. Okay I mean I pointed out just because the difference between the impact on the neighbor in these is pretty pretty clear. If you look at these two we're likely to hear from one here and not the other and I think you know you're applying pretty much the same standard in height without relationship to what's going on around it And I understand the complication of doing that.

[00:21:41] I just feel like it's a question that needed to be asked. I mean, the last thing I think we want to do, in my opinion, is add to the complication of this. And so I think simplicity is important for a lot of reasons. One, sure, for industry understanding and, you know, the cost of doing all the calculations obviously will drive up the cost of their ability to construct other things.

[00:22:06] But I think also for the public to understand, how would you possibly understand? And so this is highly technical. I would just say that wherever we land, and I'm interested in the community and industry's feedback on this, wherever we land, and I say this a lot of times with zoning enforcement, is that let's make sure we land in a place that's easy for people to understand from the building industry and the community, easy to enforce. And from that standpoint, less technical and more uniform is better. But I think we also have to acknowledge that no two lots in this county are alike. And what you see in this

[00:22:43] presentation and the difference between those two photos that I've emphasized is probably the best indication of the problem that we have here, is that those units in terms of height, not dissimilar the new ones that are being built. But the impact of them is very not similar. And that's the hard thing, you know, for us trying to balance those, especially in an environment where we know we have a massive housing shortage. And so I appreciate all the work that's been done on this. I appreciate the responsiveness. And I absolutely think we need to go out and get some feedback. The last

[00:23:19] comment I'll make, and it's in line with that simplicity, is whatever we're presenting to the public you know the more we can simplify the presentation to them to understand it you've done a good job here for us but we see a lot of this stuff some of the people that are beginning going to be getting this presentation they're not home builders they're regular residents they don't deal with this all the time and so as simple as we can make those presentations to them is going to be helpful in terms of getting meaningful impact but look forward to you know what what feedback we get and then going on from there.

[00:23:53] And I noticed the return with the draft text fall of 2026, that's aggressive, but that's also good, I guess, in terms of the community outreach in person and virtual open houses. Are you going to, assuming there's no other problems with putting this out for community input, is it your schedule to go out immediately starting after this meeting to start the community feedback pieces so that you will be able to come back with a draft text this fall?

[00:24:25] Correct, yeah. That's why we've already been scheduling some of the meetings. So you've already been scheduling them. Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. Thank you. I have Supervisor Bierman Palczyk, then Lusk. Thank you for this presentation. A lot of these houses are in the Draydensville District.

[00:24:43] This is kind of a constant thing that we're seeing in the Draydensville District. I'm very happy to see this coming forth. I think if you put it out to just like a general poll, people would probably be like, oh, 25 feet's enough in the Drainville District. I'm just kidding.

[00:24:59] The people who bought their house within the last five years would say they need their house to be as big as it is. But I do think that this is very much a step in the right direction. I kind of want to actually speak to the industry that will be commenting on this and tell a little story about why I've talked so much about infill development. I remember if you look at the house that Chairman McKay was just talking about, I remember knocking on the door of a house when I was running for office about within walking distance of downtown McLean that looked a lot

[00:25:34] like that smaller house. And we were talking about my predecessor who'd worked on a very, very ambitious, comprehensive plan review to allow for redevelopment in downtown McLean, which looks for the most part exactly as it did when I grew up there 40 years ago. It's very much ripe for redevelopment. And this woman was complaining about that plan because she said that Fairfax County is a wholly owned subsidiary of the developers. And so she sort of started railing on just developers, developers, developers. And why was she doing that? When you really

[00:26:12] drill down on it, she wasn't actually upset about having more restaurants to walk to in a mixed-use development. She wasn't really upset about the benefits of having something newer in downtown McLean. She was mad that she'd seen a lot of houses in her neighborhood be torn down have trees come in have things towering over her smaller house and she felt like that was unfair or not good or not the way things should be so while i am assuming when you take this out to the development community some people are going to say no no no just just throw

[00:26:47] the you know don't don't put any rules in here i want to urge the industry to understand that when we figure out regulations that allow the development to have a slightly less impact on how people are feeling in their community, it's actually going to help us add more housing later. It's going to help us redevelop areas later. So I very much appreciate that you brought this forward. I think option two is great. I think option three is great. I think option one is probably not the way to go. So thank you very much for that. Thanks. Thank you. I have

[00:27:26] Supervisor Powcheck, Luskin, and Stork. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you so much, Mr. Hushower. This was an incredible presentation. I very much appreciate both the breakdown in the report and the slideshow and the different options that you've given up.

[00:27:42] So, you know, I think it's ready from my perspective to take out to industry and the community. I would say on the industry piece didn't see NVAR listed. We've got their excellent representation. Always

good to see Josh. So making sure that we think maybe a little bit more broadly about who's part of the industry and whose feedback we want. I also would say very much appreciate that the outreach will include virtual in-person open houses and engagement. I would, again, I think is a good opportunity to work with our Chief Equity Officers team as we try to improve how we do equitable engagement and outreach in the

[00:28:22] community to get more of the voices, both existing residents and those who are, you know, perhaps looking to purchase or build a home in the near future. And then finally, you know, I think a little bit to what the frustration we're seeing, because this is happening next door to me, and in Providence District as well, is, you know, we've made it very legal to build McMansions. Well, it's a huge challenge, right, to build housing that is more manageable for different sizes, different families, you know, middle income, call it, and multi-generational families. So the hope is that

[00:28:59] this would allow more people to be able to live in our community. I know we see that's not always necessarily the case, right? So I think it's more to think about guardrails, you know, and also I think, as the chairman mentioned, ease of understanding, not just for the community, but I would say for your current and future staff, right? So I think my big question would be is, what is the plan in addition to this, to ensuring that we have clear descriptions that are really easy to understand, but also the training. I don't know if there's been a look at

[00:29:34] the training at how we, when we update and clarify our codes, how new staff are trained into implementing those codes. So I don't know if that's something they've already looked at or something just to consider. Oh, yeah, for sure. Yeah, I actually receive the permitting group in the zoning permit section, so it's my responsibility to train all the technicians that are doing the reviews.

[00:29:55] And so, yeah, any time that we would have an amendment like this, once it's adopted, yeah, there'll be pretty significant training. But then also having the benefit of being able to tap into that group, you know, being on the policy and working on the amendment with Jennifer, you know, we have been talking with the people actually doing the reviews.

[00:30:14] Hey, what are your challenges? What do you think is wrong with the ordinance? Where could you see improvements? So, you know, getting that engagement of staff is part of the training process, actually, as well. Okay. Oh, that's actually critical, getting their feedback on it. Absolutely. Thank you. Thank you. I have Supervisor Lusk, Stork, then Harity.

[00:30:32] Thank you very much, Madam Vice Chairman. I will say first, I appreciate the presentation and really like the case studies, the explanations, the graphics there made it really understandable. So nicely done there. One thing I'm going to say is, and this is reiterating the words of many on the Franconia Land Use Committee, They are very concerned about this issue and the looming and the point that the chairman made as its impacts on those existing structures.

[00:31:03] I would ask if under the community outreach, and I'm not sure if this is what you were deciding or you have yet to decide, but the Franconia District Land Use Committee should be the body, at least in my district, that we include in that community outreach because they're the ones who are going to, you know, they're working on pretty much all the land use cases that are coming through my district and they're very focused on this particular issue and I think they're going to have some thoughts that will be helpful.

[00:31:34] And then the last point I'll make, channeling my colleague down the aisle here, is option one, I would say no, but option two and three certainly open to seeing how we proceed on the analysis from the community with regard to those.

[00:31:53] So thank you very much. Thank you. I have Supervisor Stork, Herity, then Alcorn. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I think this board matter started because of what I would call looming and aesthetic proportionality.

[00:32:15] And I don't know really how to fix those other than the evolution of neighborhoods. And I see that that will only, you know, 30, 40 years from now, people will have a different perspective of that because the neighborhoods have changed some. But in neighborhoods that were built and have very similar kind of, if you will, proportionality, and then we're bringing in infill that's changing that.

[00:32:40] And particularly when you have in the Mount Vernon District, we have a number of situations where we have a house built on a, if you will, a plot that really is two or three different actual units of property itself.

[00:32:57] So I see that that's really – and when you build three versus one that was there before, that changes that perspective. So I'm always looking for that, and the grading, I think, ties into that. I know the chairman mentioned that, but I think those are the key things that I think somehow or other we have to weigh in this process.

[00:33:17] And I don't have an easy answer because if it's not simple, then it will not, I think that will create more problems. So I would just urge that be part of the calculation. So maximum building highs, absolutely the grading that ties into that.

[00:33:34] And something that you had in here under page six of the staff summary, I was curious about the Falls Church has a story limit. I don't know how that would work, but I could understand how that could be a perspective. But even more importantly, in Montgomery County had a graduated maximum height based on lot size.

[00:33:56] And I think that especially in Mount Vernon District, I think that's what we're talking about are houses that were built across two or three different lots. And now, you know, the house gets bought, and they literally will build homes on each of those lots. So you reference it in here.

[00:34:14] I don't know what the possibilities are of that, but I see those as being particularly impactful. Any thoughts on that? Yeah, I think that actually gets more into or deeper into, I think, that sort of the whole infill and compatibility issues.

[00:34:33] And I do think that the other amendment that we've been tasked with that came from the board banner back in December definitely draws maybe more into that sort of a discussion. But it's obviously I would agree with you. I think it's definitely appropriate to consider with what we're proposing today.

[00:34:52] It certainly informs, you know, the amendment that we're working on today. But, yeah, I would say that they are a bit different. Because, again, this is just one piece of sort of – when you're talking about compatibility in particular, you know, the height is just one part of that formula.

[00:35:09] And we're even looking at one part of that definition, right, because we aren't considering things like the grading. You know, we're looking at just how we calculate it. And so, you know, it's just that

one piece of this – you know, the larger equation. But I do think you – I do think it's correct to start with this amendment because I do think we need it to move on to the other one.

[00:35:29] Because it just shows more confusion in the discussions on any of these amendments when you have a definition that doesn't really work the way that we think it even does. It's certainly not the way that the public expects it to work. I think it's reasonable for a homeowner, I think it's reasonable for them to know, well, I'm living in my home, there's a new one being built next to me.

[00:35:51] I call Fairfax County, and they assured me it's not going to be over 35 feet. Well, then it gets built, and it's like, well, no, it's actually 43 feet. So, I mean, I think there's a reasonable expectation that, you know, how we calculate it truly represents what actually gets constructed in reality. I don't know if that answers your question. Is graduated lot size, is that something that you looked at more intensively, or is that just you didn't find that to be something as?

[00:36:14] We thought that it delved a little bit more, a little bit further, more involved with the amendment related to the December board matter. It was just, it was, you're adding now bulk, the other bulk piece, all the broker requirement, the setbacks into the discussion, and it was just going beyond the scope of what we were going to look at here. But we definitely have looked at it, and just by virtue of looking at different jurisdictions and how they regulate, hey, you know, we're learning about it, we're seeing where other jurisdictions are doing it.

[00:36:43] And, you know, some jurisdictions even, you know, there's different standards. I mean, you could make an argument, I'm not suggesting that we do it here in Fairbanks County, but you could make an argument that infill could really use its own set a regulation is completely separate from new construction because just impacts are very different.

[00:37:01] And architectural design maybe matters a bit more, but that's just not what we were looking at with the scope of the specific amendment. And I look forward to seeing the virtual meetings, the virtual tours that are on page 16, virtual open houses.

[00:37:20] So I'm not really sure how that is or how that works, But I think our community would, that would be what would probably get their attention is they could physically see, or at least not physically, but at least virtually see the issues and concerns that they have.

[00:37:38] Thank you. And I think you raised good questions there, Supervisor Stork, because we know there's a bigger issue to look at. And this is really, we have to take care of the height issue first and figure that out. So there's clarity over that. And we will get to the other issues to deal with.

[00:37:55] Thank you. Supervisor Herity, Alcorn, then Sizemore, Heiser. Yeah. Incredibly difficult topic. I mean, it just is. And I go, you know, start with where the chairman was, and those two pictures kind of say it all.

[00:38:11] But you go to what Supervisor Stork said, too. You don't want to keep that house next door from redeveloping either, and we don't want to keep those houses from, I mean, I just don't see this as solving the issue. I think the looming piece is going to do more to solve what we see in the picture at the bottom of slide three.

[00:38:33] I agree with the chairman. We need to keep it simple and not complicated. I mean, unfortunately, you can't legislate common sense. I think common sense would say you don't build that

next to that. But I like your thought about whether we really need to look at something separate for infill development, And then you'd still want to balance that so it doesn't keep the rest from developing along some guidelines.

[00:39:04] Any of these, my big question is, are you really impacting the size of the houses with the max height in terms of square footage? I mean, I think it really doesn't impact what they can do.

[00:39:19] It's just how they can do it. Am I right in that? Or am I asking, should I be asking industry? You might be better asking industry because it comes down to how it's designed, honestly. And so in some cases, yes, you would see it would absolutely reduce floor area without a doubt in certain of the homes that you're seeing.

[00:39:38] Or at least ceiling height and stuff like that. Correct, yeah. And so it's going to drive absolutely the way that things are designed. I can't predict what would happen. And, like, if you adopted one version over another or one option over another, you could very well see that people, if they felt like an option too, like with the cap, that, you know, then maybe it's going to push – you're going to see more flat roof homes.

[00:40:02] I don't know. I mean, it's certainly a possibility and something we've been actively thinking about. Like, what would the result be? Well, I'll be interested to see industry's reaction because I think it's, and that's one of the things that I would ask them is what the impact really is going to be on the ability to develop the housing we need because that's what the balance is here.

[00:40:23] It's we want to develop it in an affordable way, but also we don't want to impact the community to a too large an extent like slide three clearly shows. So I don't know if that was any help to you or not.

[00:40:40] Supervisor Alcorn and Sizemore Hayes. Thank you. Very good discussion on this really complicated issue. And I was going to sort of approach it similar to that slide. You know, probably the biggest problem with that is not height. It's just a completely different style and also the bulk of, you know, the home next to it.

[00:41:02] And I appreciate the fact that that's like a future discussion. But I guess along those lines, I guess as you go out and do outreach, are there any additional tools that you might be able to use?

[00:41:18] Because what I'm frankly thinking, it would be really helpful for people to understand specific to the height question and how height is measured and what the levels are, to be able to actually adjust that real world digital photo and show what basically it would look like under option two and option three. So I don't know if that's possible, but maybe with a little bit of AI, you might be able to show that because honestly, I don't want people's expectations

[00:41:50] to be, you know, too high because I think this is just a little piece, I think, of a much bigger discussion so if there if there are tools out there and jen i don't know if you know anything about yes that is very helpful i think we've seen that a lot with community outreach is people want to see real world pictures models are helpful but they want to see what they're seeing in their neighborhood on the street so we can use some photo editing tools and some of our 3d modeling to apply this to the real world and and say what would the neighborhood look like with these changes

[00:42:23] thank you that's fantastic thank you very much supervisor size more heiser just a couple quick questions um i think this is really helpful the white paper was very helpful to see what other jurisdictions do as well it would have been helpful i think for me and maybe especially when you go out to the public to

say you know arlington has this it's closely related to option one or option two so then we can sort of see all right you know or this is the challenges they have it's similar to what we have or their ordinance helps resolve some of the concerns we've heard right so kind of have some analysis around so you know we can say oh if we go with option two it's similar

[00:43:00] what I'm just making this up. Arlington is doing. This is why. You know, and the same with when you present option one, two, and three, having a little bit of pros and cons, right? This may option one pro is this, option one con is this, you know, and I know you had a recommendation in here about doing 38 feet, but I think understanding how that got to that recommendation, what was the reason for that, and how that might address some of the concerns we're hearing from the community, and also what implication that recommendation may have, right? To, I think, Supervisor Stork's point, you know, there's a balance between ensuring that a renovation or a new, you know, infill house fits with the character of the neighborhood, but you also, is the character

[00:43:40] of the neighborhood eventually going to change, right? And, you know, it's a balance. So I think having some of those pros and cons and analysis of what each of those options might get to for those two factors, especially when you go in the community, would be helpful. I know it would be helpful for me as a newer board member to kind of wrap my head around, well, I think this is a good path to go down or this is not a good path to go down. Or at least have questions around each path. Thank you.

[00:44:04] Thank you. I think this was a really great discussion. You helped us with this technical work. I do want to talk on slide 16 about our community outreach. One of the things we've really focused on is not limiting community outreach to just specific groups that if we have a virtual meeting for the community or one in person. We don't want to limit it and say, okay, it's only for this group or that group. And I think that's representative of us being one. Fairfax, it reflects on staff's time to

[00:44:43] go out and do these meetings. And so we're kind of trying to change how we do community outreach to be more open to different groups as we go forward. And so that's part of the focus that we're doing going through this process too. I just I want to thank you all for all your work and if there's no Tracy oh Tracy I'm sorry thank you. No I was just going to mention on that one of the things that we've sort of talked about potentially developing to kind of address your last point about about are we sending staff to individual committee meetings everywhere and what's the impact of that and are we reaching the right people is developing some sort of like meeting in a box where we could provide for any

[00:45:22] group that wanted it, which would be sort of the materials to look at all this stuff and here's the feedback we need from you. And that is then staff doesn't have to necessarily go out, but we can really reach all those different groups. I like that idea.

[00:45:38] That's really good. Okay. So if there's nothing else, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you, everyone.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com