MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Committee, Tuesday, November 24, 2026

Date	Tuesday, November 24, 2026
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 24m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/4347
- 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 2026-11-25. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:06] Good morning. I'm going to call the Land Use Policy Committee meeting to order. I'm happy we have a crowd that we have in here. First thing on the agenda, we have the minutes from the last meeting. Do we have any additions or corrections to them? Okay, those will stand.

[00:00:24] We have three topics on the agenda today, and I am just going to get to it. Building height is the first one, and who am I going to call on? Thank you, thank you. Can you hear me now?

[00:00:42] Perfect. Good morning. Thanks for joining us. Happy almost holidays. My name is Jen Tran. I'm a planner with the Zoning Administration Division. Today I'll be talking to you about the building height zoning ordinance amendment. We brought this topic to you all back in March of this year, and today we'll be discussing the proposed text based on your feedback as well as the industry feedback that we've conducted. A brief timeline of where we've been, where we're going. In 2025, a board matter and the task force regarding infill lots identified building height as a topic for research, and then staff brought the research and concepts to you all in March of 2026.

[00:01:19] After that, we did some industry outreach in the summer, and that brings us to today, where we will be presenting to this committee as well as the Planning Commission Committee, after which we will do more industry outreach back to those same groups of engineers, architects, home builders, as well as

general community outreach. That feedback did help staff refine the concepts, and we will be going to tentative authorization in spring of 2027.

[00:01:49] So these first few slides will be more of a recap in what you heard in March. We are proposing to revise the definition of building height in response to changing home trends. This was confirmed by our industry outreach that a lot of consumers are looking to three- and four-story larger homes, some of them with more complex roof lines. Some of these new homes are reaching overall heights of 35 to 45 feet. And the current definition we have has not been updated since 1959. You can see that little typewritten snippet there, which is essentially the same exact definition we're operating with today. And clearly, homes have changed quite a lot in 60 years. On the

[00:02:26] bottom there, there's a photo of a home, Fairfax County home built in 1951, and then a home built in 2010. So our amendment is aiming to revise and clarify how we measure building height and the intention is to reduce excess height and bulk above 35 feet and provide clarification based on the interpretations that staff has issued as well as numerous letters to industry. I just want to note here that we are not addressing height versus setback ratio for this amendment. That is going to be the topic of a future amendment. So how is building height measured? Most single-family

[00:03:04] detached dwellings are subject to that 35-foot height limit. We're not changing that. And building height is measured differently according to roof type. For a pitched roof, we do measure the building height at the midpoint, which on the bottom there is the dashed blue line, because generally the peak has less impact on bulk. Also, when there are multiple roof lines, we are taking the midpoint measurement from the roof with the highest ridge. So the challenge we face with this current methodology is that some taller homes can have more bulk on those upper floors that

[00:03:39] isn't accounted for by the current methodology. A lot of that is loft space. People want a usable fourth bedroom or an office. And when there are multiple rooflines in a house, depending on the design, there can be excess bulk above the 35-foot limit. This is probably best explained with an example, so you can look at the image. On the bottom right, we're comparing that blue roofline with the red roof line. So under the current methodology, we would measure the building height at the dash blue, which is at 34 feet. However, if you look at the overall highest midpoint, it would actually be the red dash line, and that's showing at 37 and a half

[00:04:15] feet. So the current building height measurement doesn't always capture that bulk on the upper floors. So what are we proposing here? The draft text proposes a slight change in the methodology, where for pitched roofs, we are still going to measure the building height at the midpoint. But when there are multiple roofs, we are going to take the overall highest midpoint. This would generally capture more bulk in those taller home designs. And there is another diagram on the right, which again, the blue and the red. So the blue is the current methodology. That dash line is at 35, whereas the overall highest midpoint is actually that

[00:04:52] red at 40. This, that red higher midpoint line does account for more bulk in the overall home and here that's at 40 this in this example it would need to reduce its height by about five feet gonna skip a little bit here we are comparing the building height measurement for current versus proposed these are just more examples to kind of illustrate the concepts and I want to note that the impact of the proposed change does vary by home design some home designs if they were to be built again they would have to be reduced in height but some

[00:05:29] home designs would not change at all in terms of their measurement so you have seen this example before, again it's the the blue and the red, that current midpoint at blue at 34, and this overall highest midpoint 37 and a half, which would have to come down again if this were to be built again, it would need to come down two and a half feet. For this example, this is a good example of a home design that its building height measurement would actually not change for current and proposed. That's because the highest ridge, its midpoint, is just the same as the overall

[00:06:04] all highest midpoint. So this and many, many other home designs would not technically change. We have also proposed a dormer standard. Dormers are generally used as ornamental features. You can kind of see that at the bottom with those smaller dormers, but when they are at larger widths, they can add pretty considerable bulk to the roof. Neighboring jurisdictions, Arlington County and City of Alexandria, do have similar dormer standards. These jurisdictions have very narrow lots, kind of similar to our infill lots, and a lot of them have additions that are aiming

[00:06:42] to increase the livable space but kind of preserve the existing home stock. So we are proposing that when the total width of all dormers exceeds 50% of the width of the roof, it would be considered an additional roof line when looking at the roof line with the highest midpoint. Lastly, we have got some new graphics to update our existing graphics and show the concepts that we're proposing, And if you're reading the text, we've also got a formatting change.

[00:07:10] Currently, the definition is broken out by roof type, and so our proposed definition just lists them out for clarity. This is similar to the latest technical bulletin that was issued to industry. We will also propose to revise language in Appendix I to address previously approved applications and what is currently in review.

[00:07:31] And that is all I have for you for the presentation today. That QR code has the amendment webpage where all these materials will be posted, as well as any future materials. Thank you for the presentation. And I know you've done outreach to industry, so is there more continued outreach to industry that you'll be doing?

[00:07:50] Yes, of course. We plan to go back to the same groups and kind of bring back our new concepts and get their feedback. It was really invaluable the first time. Thank you. Chairman McCain? I'm okay. I appreciate it. Supervisor Palachan? Thank you. Thank you so much, Ms. Tran.

[00:08:06] I'm comfortable with most of this on the roof. I have more questions on the dormer roof. Sure. specifically in smaller neighborhoods where maybe people are trying to expand space without impacting the lot and the landscaping. So can you explain to me a little bit, let's say you have an existing home and they decide to build an additional room using a dormer. What are the limitations on that? So there wouldn't be any limitations necessarily on a dormer. It would just be that if it's above a certain width, that would count towards the building height. So really

[00:08:42] this would only be a concern if the the existing home is already at like 35 feet or 34 or 8 and then they add a dormer they want to add a little bit of height um that would push their height up but a lot of these you know existing homes maybe are at 28 feet and the dormer wouldn't um bring them above the maximum building height at all okay so it's only for the building height there's no other exception or rule on dormers themselves correct other than how we're measuring complete height. Yes. Okay. I think that it's helpful clarification. And if you could also just go

[00:09:19] back to industry with that, I'm curious if they have feedback on that as well. Certainly. Thank you. We're trying to help people stay in their homes. Absolutely. Thank you. Supervisor Stork. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you all very much for the report. I know that one of the core questions, I think we've asked him before, is where is kind of the base property, the base ground level and how does that get determined and because i know we all i think have seen situations where that's been managed how do you all assess that yeah yes grade is a huge part of

[00:09:55] building height in general and we're not altering the definition of grade for this amendment currently it's an average of points and it would be the lower of either pre or post development We are currently not planning to alter that at all.

[00:10:12] So lower of pre- or post-development? Yes. So we have when they submit site plans, that's indicated on there what that is and then what they're going to, and then you're assessing it based on that?

[00:10:28] Yes, yes, absolutely. That's part of the infill lot process that land development services manages, and so that does prevent people from kind of piling up a lot of dirt so they can get more height in their house because, you know, ultimately it would just be the lower of pre or post.

[00:10:44] Is that information public? So neighbors who want to assess whether or not they look at it the same way that county staff is looking at it, that information would be available. They could look at that and at least recognize that it is or isn't and challenge it if it's appropriate.

[00:11:03] Yes, definitely. I believe we've issued a technical bulletin a couple years ago about grade, And so staff can definitely look into making sure that the public is aware of how all of these measurements work. Okay. And my next question is, and I realize we're talking about single-family homes, but we're also looking at ALUs and other things.

[00:11:26] I know we set separate distinctive height measurements for that, et cetera. But part of what gets me thinking about this is that we're looking at two-by-twos and towns and multifamilies. Those have specific other guidelines or requirements and or limitations or those aren't by right or how how should if I'm asked about it or I'm trying to understand it myself, how should I look at those versus a single family home and the restrictions that we're talking about?

[00:11:58] Sure. That's a really good question. The building height definition would apply to all buildings in general, regardless whether single-family or attached. But typically, single-family attached or any multifamily homes are in different zoning districts, which may have different height limitations.

[00:12:19] The reason we call out single family here is because we're talking about that 35, but a townhome may be in a district that allows up to a 40-foot height, or it may be under some kind of separate entitlement that has negotiated with the board for a higher height.

[00:12:37] So it really just depends on the development, the neighborhood, and the district. It's tied to zoning? Yes. It's tied to specific zoning, so we should, and could you all maybe identify that element with this other, I mean, in other words, R1, R2, R3, et cetera, can you identify how that might change?

[00:12:58] Maybe you've published that before, I'm just not aware of it, but that would be of general use to me. I recall a specific situation where the height was, not only it was going to be townhomes, And then they looked at other ways of approaching that, and that was a big subject of the conversation with the community around it, was that height, and that would be helpful.

[00:13:23] Sure, okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Well, thank you for the presentation. We look forward to your continued work and when it comes back to the board. Thank you very much. Thank you.

[00:13:38] Okay, so next we have accessory structures and Pedram and Jen again. Okay. Okay, great. You're going to hear from me a little bit more, and then I'll pass it off to Pedram. Again, my name is Jen.

[00:13:55] My name is Pedram. And we will be talking about accessory structures, zoning ordinance amendment today. Again, a timeline. We are right at the beginning for committee meetings with the board and the planning commission.

[00:14:12] This winter, we'll be doing community outreach and for tentative authorization and public hearings in the spring of 2027. An overview of topics that we researched for this amendment: accessory structures in the front yard on smaller lots.

[00:14:34] Currently the only pathway forward for accessory structures on smaller lots under 36,000 square feet is a variance, and so we were asked to look at this as an option. Secondly, we looked at standards for accessory structures on large lots over 36,000 square feet, which the zoning ordinance currently doesn't have any specifications for. We also looked at fences on vacant lots. Currently, fences are not allowed as accessory structures without a principal use. And then we looked at pickleball and pickleball courts. As for existing regulations, accessory structures must be subordinate to a principal use and

[00:15:13] located on the same lot as principal use. The setbacks are according to height, and any structures in the rear setback are subject to a rear setback coverage limitation, which is typically 30% for a conventional residential district.

[00:15:30] Any additional standards are actually based on lot size, and that threshold is 36,000 square feet. That is the minimum lot size for an R1 lot. So for lots less than 36,000 square feet, structures are allowed in the rear and the side, but not in the front yard.

[00:15:46] There are exceptions for landscaping, basketball hoops, and gardening. The area is limited to a cumulative maximum of 50% of the gross floor area of the principal dwelling, and the height is limited to a max of 20. There is a special permit option to increase the area and the height, but not to place any accessory structures in the front yard.

[00:16:06] Again, that requires a variance currently, which has much stricter parameters for approval and review. That is unless it's a through lot, which does have a special permit option because those through lots have two fronts and kind of a functional rear. As far as lots over 36,000 square feet, accessory structures are allowed in the rear side and the front, but not in the front setback.

[00:16:30] Exceptions are the same, landscaping, basketball, hoops, and gardening. The area and the height, currently the zoning ordinance has no specific standards. However, it must be subordinate to the principal structure. And that is often reviewed through interpretation.

[00:16:52] Now we'll get started with introducing some of our proposed changes, starting with arbors and play equipment located in the front yard. Currently, the zoning ordinance allows trellises in the front yard as an element of landscaping, However, that allowance doesn't extend to three-dimensional structures like arbors.

[00:17:09] What we're proposing is to update the definition of landscaping to include arbors, while also creating separate definitions for trellises and arbors to better distinguish between the two. In addition, we're proposing to allow up to two arbors in the front yard outside of the required front setback, with each arbor being limited to 10 feet in height, 4 feet in length, and 6 feet in width.

[00:17:32] We're also proposing to allow up to 100 square feet of unenclosed play equipment in the front yard, again outside of the required front setback, which is consistent with existing standards for gardening in the front yard. Some additional context, many of our surrounding jurisdictions already allow arbors and play equipment in the front yard by right. All other structures in the front yard, we're proposing a special permit. Since 2000, the county has received 48 variance applications related to these types of structures, and we've also received 11 appeals since 2019.

[00:18:07] Notably, all the variance applications were approved. To address this, we're proposing to introduce a special permit option for certain structures located in the front yard of lots smaller than 36,000 square feet. This would allow structures such as pergolas, tree houses, detached garages, and potentially larger play equipment to be considered for the front yard through the special permit process. Ultimately, the goal is to provide property owners with an approval pathway while still allowing the county to evaluate these structures on a case-by-case basis. Regarding standards for larger lots, lots of 36,000 square feet and greater applies to lots

[00:18:45] of the minimum lot size in the R1 district and larger. Currently, the zoning ordinance doesn't establish specific maximum area or height limitations for accessory structures on larger lots. Instead, staff has generally relied on an interpretation that limits the size of an accessory structure to 50% of the gross floor area of the principal dwelling.

[00:19:06] Staff receives requests for a variety of larger accessory structures, including detached garages, indoor sports courts, hobby studios, and other similar uses. And the intent of this amendment is to establish more specific standards for these structures, essentially codifying and refining our existing interpretation practice.

[00:19:24] This would give both staff and homeowners a clear understanding of the maximum size of what can be permitted as accessory on larger residential lots. We're proposing to introduce standards for individual and cumulative accessory structures based on tiers of lot size, with additional flexibility available through special permit.

[00:19:43] For lots between 36,000 square feet and under 5 acres, an individual accessory structure would be limited to 50 percent of the principal dwellings gross floor area with a range for the board's consideration shown in brackets in the table while the cumulative the cumulative accessory structure would be proposed at 100 percent of the principal dwellings gross floor area for lots of five acres and larger those allowances would increase to 100 percent for an individual structure and 150 percent cumulatively with the special permit option allowing for those limits to increase further we're also proposing

[00:20:18] a maximum accessory structure height of 35 feet for these larger lots, aligning with the recently adopted accessory living unit standards. These proposed standards are more restrictive than our current interpretation practice, which generally allows accessory structures anywhere outside of the required setbacks without a specific limitation on size. Our final topic of proposed changes is for fences on vacant lots. Fences are allowed on vacant lots in Arlington County, Montgomery County, and the City of

Fairfax by right. Currently, our definition of accessory structures does not allow fences on lots without a principal use. We're proposing to amend that definition to expressly

[00:20:56] allow fences on these properties. Regarding height, we're proposing a standard maximum fence height of four feet on all sides of the property, with the option for a fence height of up to six feet through special permit approval. Additionally, vacant lots of two or more acres in the RA, RC, RE, and R1 districts are permitted seven feet in height, as is allowed by Wright currently.

[00:21:19] The final topic staff has researched for this amendment is pickleball. The concerns raised with pickleball courts is for noise generated with proximity to neighboring properties. Because the noise is associated with the equipment used rather than any singular type of sports court, it is difficult to establish standards to address that. We also wanted to mention some of the enforcement challenges raised by the Department of Code Compliance, particularly regarding noise complaints. Investigators generally need to witness those violations firsthand, and Fairfax County Police Department does not currently carry noise meters, which makes enforcement very challenging.

[00:21:54] For those reasons, staff is not recommending any proposed zoning standards for applicable courts at this time. That concludes the presentation. Staff contacts are listed in the PowerPoint. Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. And, you know, as always, the white paper has wonderful information in it. I appreciate this.

[00:22:15] I think it is good to put some standards in place so we're just not depending on interpretations that people know, have expectations of what to do. And, you know, I appreciate the research you did about Pickleball and where you are with that now. Mr. Chairman.

[00:22:31] Yeah, I appreciate the presentation and support all this. I guess the only question I have, and maybe I just couldn't find it in the background material, but the cumulative accessory structure is maximum percent at 100 and 150 for the 36,000 and above.

[00:22:49] Seems like a lot to me, but I don't know how that compares to other jurisdictions. Did we look at the cumulative piece and how that compares to other jurisdictions? Yes, we have looked at a lot of jurisdictional research, and it's interesting.

[00:23:08] The jurisdictions have a lot of different ways of dealing with maximum area. Some counties don't have any maximum area, whereas like Loudoun County, they do a similar, they do it based on lot size, so they do a tiered kind of allowance. Our proposal for those cumulative sizes and that range is based on interpretations that we've reviewed from our own county.

[00:23:31] So we looked back about 30 years, looked at numerous and what cumulative areas they were kind of coming up to. But that is also why we've offered a range for the board to consider. No, I appreciate that. And when you've looked at the applications in Fairfax, we have 100% is the number because that's based on we see a lot that come in at 100% or we're seeing them below that, and we want to make sure that we allow the extra flexibility?

[00:23:59] We generally see them below that, and then some will come up to around 100%, and that's more for larger lots where, you know, a larger accessory structure like a indoor basketball court has less of an effect and an impact on the neighbors. Okay. Thank you.

[00:24:15] Thank you. I have Supervisor Pelczyk and then Harry. Thank you. I appreciate this research. I do have additional questions, and I've gone through the jurisdictional research, which I do think is very helpful. I do live in an area with older, smaller lots, and so I just want to be cautious when we're looking countywide, as we saw with the accessory living units, right, that I believe we said at 35,000 square feet, that was only about 18% of our existing lots and homes.

[00:24:48] So that's a very small percentage. So I just want us, as we're presenting it to us and to the community, what we're saying, there's a range that we be more clear, right, about what we currently have, what we're proposing, and what surrounding jurisdictions have.

[00:25:03] I'm trying to go through the chart. I believe Arlington accessory structures are allowed in the front yard but require setbacks. I believe City Fairfax is the same. I think it would be really helpful if you could really break down for us in our immediate surrounding jurisdictions.

[00:25:19] I wouldn't necessarily go to Maryland if you want, but to really understand where we are as we have an aging community with people trying to understand how to make their existing homes work for them, right? So I think it's important that we're having this conversation.

[00:25:35] My understanding, this is the beginning of now going out and getting more feedback. We haven't gotten any feedback yet. And so I do think we need to be more clear as we got to, in accessory living units, just what this means. And, you know, it seems very minimal change to me at initial sites.

[00:25:55] And so I think we need a little bit more of the comparison and the metrics of how many lots would actually be impacted, right? And if we could by district, I see the majority of my district being exempted from a lot of this. And those are people who really are trying to figure out how to stay in their homes very often.

[00:26:14] So that's my only concern is that I'm glad we're doing this. But I do have concerns about the recommendation and really having that show specifically how many lots will be impacted and what that means. I think it became clear, I was listening to the questions for the last one, is there are so many regulations, right, that it becomes quite complex to understand not just the impact, but I think as my colleague said in the last one, of what can people do with their own property, right?

[00:26:42] I think if we look at it from that standard of, you know, we've limited a lot of what people can do on their own piece of land. So I just hope we can go a little bit further. You have it here, but maybe better clarifying what these will mean in real life for real homeowners.

[00:26:59] Thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Stork. Thank you, Madam Chair. I mean, I have a number of questions. But first and foremost, I'm trying to figure out why should we broadly or generally regulate what people can put in their front yard as we're doing here.

[00:27:19] And I realize that we don't want them putting, I don't know, maybe their trash compactor or something in the front yard. But aside from that, why are we defining it as narrowly as we have it? Landscaping, in my mind, that should be available.

[00:27:37] And in three-dimensional, I get where does a trellis go to, I guess, an open shed or a carport or whatever. Help me understand the kind of the approach and the reason for that.

[00:27:53] And I realize people are going to complain, in my mind, almost no matter what. But at least I know we need to have a consistency broadly to it. But I want to keep it as open and as not having people to

have to ask mother, may I, every time they want to do something, too.

[00:28:11] So the proposed standards for the front yards are based on interpretation requests that we regularly get. There have been special permit, variance appeal applications that have gone forward. And so, you know, taking all that in, we're trying to add a limited amount of flexibility.

[00:28:32] So currently, as Jen said, in a front yard on a lot less than 36,000 square feet, you really can't have anything. No freestanding accessory structures are allowed except for just a few, like you can have your basketball standard and so forth.

[00:28:49] And that definition of landscaping is very, very tight. We added that you can have a statue, you know, as part of landscaping, as part of ZMOD, so even before that. So over time, as we've seen what people are looking for to do on their properties, we're trying to add some additional flexibility, but not so much that we impact the character of our neighborhoods.

[00:29:15] And so that's where we're like, okay, an arbor is a small step from a trellis, but it is a three-dimensional structure. So let's go ahead and let people have some arbors. But if you want to have a full-on, like, patio with a pergola that might fit, it depends on the lot.

[00:29:35] It may, you know, fit in perfectly, and that would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals. So we're trying to add some incremental flexibility without going too far. So that was our goal. I mean, I appreciate the direction, and I guess I would encourage more direction that way.

[00:29:54] And one of my regrets as a supervisor member, and I know it was many years ago now, is we defined or restricted how much of a garden you could have in your front yard, and that's one of those that I'm looking at that and going, why are we doing that?

[00:30:13] And this is another example where I think we should be more liberal rather than less, and I realize we're going to get the complaints almost no matter what, but it's also more of an aesthetic. I know when I put a shed in my yard that was different than what the neighbor had seen across the street for decades, they were very unhappy with that.

[00:30:36] It was all legal and appropriate, but they were unhappy about it. So some of it is just a matter of change. And, again, I support even more liberal approaches than what we've taken here to letting people do what they want to do broadly.

[00:30:53] And then I see the value, the benefit of a special permit expansion. I mean, I'm concerned about the cost anyway that people incur with this, particularly on something that, for the most part, they're probably going to do anyways unless somebody tells them they can't.

[00:31:13] We don't usually have somebody come by, and we don't have our code police coming by because they don't initiate it anyways. So I definitely want to give people more an opportunity, and so if they do do it, at least keep the costs that they have minimally.

[00:31:29] And then pickleball is, in me, it's all about noise. I have a regular person who contacts me with the latest articles about how to better regulate pickleball because they're deeply impacted by it. So, I think it's a noise issue, and I think we absolutely should take a look at that and do more to help those individuals who, in some ways, pickleball was foisted on them.

[00:31:56] It wasn't part of something we ever imagined, but it's something that clearly has an impact on their lives. I hear about it routinely. So, those are my thoughts. Thank you. Okay. I don't have anybody else

on my list.

[00:32:13] I thank you for the presentation, and I think it's always good for staff to reiterate that you're looking at interpretations, you're looking at the work we've done to try to find the sweet spot with where we go and move forward. So I appreciate the work, and we'll see what you hear from the community feedback piece, but thank you very much.

[00:32:34] All right, we are ready for the last presentation, and that is the update on the housing action plan, and Jen? Yeah, while Bree comes up, just wanted to provide a little context on this, a reminder to everyone, we rolled out the action plan on May 12th.

[00:32:54] And the intent here, we did the quarterly update, but it's accountability and transparency, not just for the board, but also for community members, the development community who participated. We plan to do another live one at the one-year mark where we'll have more metrics because a lot of the action plans, we're still implementing the elements of it.

[00:33:14] So the nice thing is we've incorporated this into our update of the annual strategic plan. So how we're doing on this is there, but it will be in there as well. But the intent here is to make sure that not only the board, but the public and the development community is tracking where we are on track with what we said we were going to do and where we've slipped a little bit and what we're doing about it.

[00:33:33] So with that, over to Bree, who's been leading the collection effort on this. Thanks, Bree. Thank you. Good morning, everyone. My name is Bree Ann Fuller. I'm with the Office of the County Executive, and as Jen mentioned, I will be providing today's update. I will get into some background to start. The Housing Task Force was launched in the fall of 2025 after a board matter introduced by Chairman McKay related to the purpose of recommending ways to boost Fairfax County's housing production.

[00:34:00] It worked alongside and in coordination with the Economic Competitiveness Task Force, which was also introduced through a connected board matter of the month prior, given the interconnectedness of the issues of housing and economic development. The task force met from September 2025 to March 2026.

[00:34:18] They developed and finalized recommendations and checked in with the chairman and land use policy chair strategically along the way. In March, the development industry was engaged through meetings and a survey to gather input in the areas that they thought would be most useful in boosting housing production.

[00:34:35] And the results of that engagement are included in the final report. That final report was delivered to the board in April and presented to this committee on May 12th. And the final recommendations presented span 33 initiatives, and those 33 initiatives have 128 action items associated with them.

[00:34:54] So since May, the various departments involved have been making great strides on those initiatives, and this task force has quarterly reporting to the board with the first update having been in August and today serving as the second update. The 33 initiatives span seven strategic priority areas, and those priority areas represent the various ways that the task force sought to assess and propose changes to the way Fairfax County executes its role in housing production.

[00:35:23] Those areas are encouraging new housing development, reducing the costs to develop affordable housing, improving coordination within the development review process, simplifying development requirements, and increasing transparency in our processes, expanding the suite of tools available to assist the development of affordable housing, optimizing community engagement, and building and sustaining strong economic partnerships. So to date, seven initiatives have been successfully completed.

[00:35:55] 18 are advancing on schedule, and 8 are experiencing minor delays. So overall, 76% of the initiatives initially proposed have been successfully completed, or they are progressing as planned. So as I start to discuss the completed initiatives, I do want to start with the most recently completed one, which is the amendments to the Accessory Living Unit Ordinance, which were approved last Tuesday, November 17th.

[00:36:23] And these amendments make it faster and simpler for residents to get an accessory living unit on their property, expanded eligibility for those as well, just generally makes them much more accessible for residents. The initiative related to understanding barriers to the development of moderately priced homes was completed on May 12th, with those findings having been included within the presentation that presented the task force initiatives.

[00:36:51] And then the Congregate Living Zoning Ordinance was approved last March, expanding opportunities for supportive housing in the county. And this amendment clarifies the definition of this type of facility and expands where they may be located. Housing and Community Development has created a Purchase Assistance Pilot Program as well, which provides loans to assist moderate-income households in purchasing their first home.

[00:37:14] And that assistance may be utilized for down payments, closing cost support, and interest rate buy-downs. That program has received 50 applications, and HCD has closed on 12 new loans, with three more currently under contract. Land Development Services formalized their commitment to 12-month site plan processing by publishing a template schedule and implementation roadmap on their website, and they are tracking their performance through their public-facing metric dashboards.

[00:37:47] And this initiative creates improved predictability, reduces delays, and supports timely project delivery. They are also publishing a list of, or did publish a list of the most common errors in site and building submissions, which frequently delay approvals. And this is to assist industry in avoiding these issues, ultimately reducing the number of review cycles needed to get to an approval. LDS also continues to enforce and educate staff on site plan review guidance, including limiting site plan review recommendations to regulatory requirements.

[00:38:24] That helps improve clarity and consistency in the site plan process. And this is being monitored through their plan review quality control program, which focuses on maintaining high-quality, customer-focused plan review comments throughout the department. So for those initiatives that are still underway, there have been various key milestones that have been achieved.

[00:38:46] Phase one of the evaluation of the public facilities manual concluded with the adoption of modernized streetlight requirements, which consolidated and simplified these standards to improve efficiency and provide clearer design expectations for industry.

[00:39:02] And these changes have been effective as of July 1st of this year. The Department of Planning and Development has launched a customer-facing dashboard on its website to track processing times for zoning interpretations as part of making the interpretation process more consistent and transparent.

[00:39:19] Land Development Services is ahead of schedule as they improve customer-facing metric dashboards. They've successfully developed data requirements for site and building records and created internal dashboards that were completed in October. They are working on the next step, which is making those external.

[00:39:40] And then as discussed at the October 6th Housing Committee meeting, Housing and Community Development is piloting property tax incentives for two initial affordable housing properties. The first is Dulles Green North with 211 units. The second is Columbia Crossroads with 160 units.

[00:39:57] and the public hearing to adopt these ordinances is scheduled for December 8th. Those would exempt the properties from real and personal property taxes for up to 50 years, and this initiative adds to the tools available to the county for affordable housing production and preservation.

[00:40:13] And then the initiative to optimize community engagement is well underway, and that has the goal of implementing a standardized and inclusive countywide engagement framework to make countywide engagement more consistent and effective across the board.

[00:40:30] And phase one of this initiative is complete. The housing solutions portal is live on the county site, and that includes data from the task force, the task force report itself, and a standardized communications toolkit on the topic of housing solutions. Phase two is underway with teams developing countywide recommendations to be implemented across departments as they conduct community engagement as well.

[00:40:51] Both the housing task force and economic competitiveness task force included resource requests for additional staff members. Three positions were approved through the fiscal year 2026 carryover process, including two positions within the Department of Economic Initiatives to support the Real Estate Opportunities Team, and that is a team to proactively execute real estate deals within the county. And then also one position in the Office of the County Executive to lead and implement complex high-priority initiatives, including the implementation of the initiatives associated with both task forces. And while these positions

[00:41:29] did not come out of the housing task force recommendations specifically, they do ultimately support the goals of both task forces. Hiring is also underway and expected to be completed very soon for an additional project manager in the land development services project management team, and that position would provide dedicated support for affordable housing projects from start to finish. Eight initiatives are currently experiencing delays of between one and three quarters for a variety of reasons, including planning for staff and consultant resources, lining up processes with board meetings for key decision points, as sometimes those key decision points

[00:42:08] affect a subsequent key decision point within an initiative, and then additional process adjustments that come with refining those processes that each initiative requires over time. However, all of them are underway and making progress toward their ultimate goals. The first is the evaluation of expectations for affordable housing projects, which is focused on exploring ways to reduce affordable housing costs by amending development expectations.

[00:42:34] The second is instituting special exceptions for affordable housing projects, which speeds up the process for certain affordable housing projects while keeping the opportunity to address site-specific concerns and allow for public input through public hearings. The affordable dwelling unit ordinance amendments would streamline and update the ADU ordinance, and the implementation of comprehensive plan flexibility and alignment aims to shorten the review timeline for those developments that would require both a rezoning and a comprehensive plan amendment. Incentivizing quality development submissions is ultimately aimed at reducing the number of application

[00:43:12] review cycles and overall time to approval. I'm going to go back to number five because I accidentally skipped that one. Improving clarity and understanding during zoning processes will include streamlining and prioritizing staff comments on development applications and standardizing the language that's used. And the seventh is expanding the modified processing program criteria, which would enable the Land Development Services Director to evaluate and expand eligibility for the program. And expanding eligibility would enable more projects to seek the benefits

[00:43:50] from phase permitting and early construction approvals as appropriate. And then finally, the modernizing of the Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act, or PPEA, process. That would make this process clearer and faster for PPEA housing projects. Several board decision points are coming up in the next few months. As mentioned in slide 7, on December 8th, there is a public hearing scheduled for the two pilot properties for tax incentives. And then there are a few decision points that have not yet been officially scheduled

[00:44:25] but are anticipated in the next few months. The first is the authorization of amendments to comprehensive plan area-wide guidance, and that would support greater comprehensive plan flexibility. And this decision point is anticipated at a January meeting. And then between January and March, we are expecting revisions to the PPEA guidelines to come before the board for adoption.

[00:44:46] We anticipate that initiatives will generally be implemented through fiscal year 2029 and we will continue to provide dedicated updates at those intervals that are on the slide.

[00:45:02] The housing task force updates are quarterly with the next dates being February and May in 2027. And then the economic competitiveness task force updates are biannual and the next one is expected in May. We do anticipate an update to industry in May, although we are also making sure to be responsive to requests for updates that we get in the meantime.

[00:45:22] And we also anticipate reporting on metrics starting at year one for those initiatives that have been completed. That concludes my presentation. Thank you all, and I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you for the update, Bree. Good work. It's a lot of work, so we're looking forward to it.

[00:45:40] The one thing that I, frankly, was surprised to see at the board meeting for December 8th is the initiative about the real property tax relief. I was under the impression that after the board had their work session, we had some questions about impact.

[00:46:01] And I don't know if I missed something, but I didn't see us getting any information to our questions. We'll bring up Anna Shapiro from Housing and Community Development to reply to that. Hello. Anna Shapiro from the Department of Housing and Community Development. Subsequent to the Board Housing Committee in October, we provided a NIP to answer some of the questions we received from Board members to explain more about the tax exemption initiatives.

[00:46:35] At that Housing Committee, we did outline the projects that we were looking at and the timelines for those. And then the NIP does outline more on the very specific questions We got at that housing committee answering some of the very specific questions about the affordability tradeoffs, some of the other impacts.

[00:46:52] We are happy to continue to answer questions, and we're able to meet with a few of the supervisors and continue to do that as well prior to the December 8th meeting. The reason for the sequencing is that we do need to know whether the tax exemption will be in place prior to underwriting.

[00:47:08] So then we will be coming to the board for, excuse me, underwriting for the Notice of Funding Availability requests for those two projects in order to meet the tax credit deadline in March. So obviously I missed the NIP. Can you remind me when it went out?

[00:47:25] Sure. The non-package item was sent, I think, on November 5th, but we can make sure that gets to the board again. Okay. I just need to double check. All right. I have a list of people. I'm starting with the chairman. Yeah, first, as Supervisor Smith said, great job.

[00:47:41] This is a lot, but it's really important stuff. And so I appreciate the work and updates on it. Just a comment, and then I do have a couple questions. First, the work at LDS that Bill and his team are working on, I do want to say, is making a difference.

[00:47:59] I mean, you know, at my Builders Roundtable, we've heard this from some of the frequent applicants in the county who are going through the process. And one of the things I want to emphasize and continue to encourage strongly is that is the comments on site plans. And I know we're making huge progress on that, but we had gotten to a point where the comments were redundant, repetitive, sometimes not based on the ordinance, sometimes just opinion, waste a lot of our time, waste a lot of industry's time.

[00:48:27] And so there's been great progress made on that, and I just want to recognize that because that's a policy change, but it's also a cultural change, and sometimes the cultural change is the most difficult part, and we're seeing progress in that area, so I appreciate that. Related to that, I think on slide seven, the evaluation of the PFM in which we took action on some elements of the PFM, but I do know that in the past there had been a, what I would consider to be an over-interpretation of the PFM as the rule of law,

[00:49:03] as opposed to a guide and that again is a cultural piece but i'm hoping that the message that our staff has on the pfm is that the pfm is to be used as a guide but not ultimately a singular determining factor in approvals and i don't need to know the answer to that here because it's highly technical but we had treated the pfm as a guide for the longest time i can remember in this county And then at some point in time, an internal decision was made that, no, you will meet the PFM or you will not get approved.

[00:49:36] And we were trying to unwind that and get that back in being treated as a guide. So I would just appreciate some follow-up on what the culture is around PFM reviews and PFM interpretations and approvals of plans that don't match up exactly with PFM requirements.

[00:49:56] And I don't need that now because of the technicalities of it, but I do want to make sure that we have a chance for that. On the staffing updates page on slide nine, subsequent to these positions being identified, as you all know, at the last board meeting, we approved a board matter looking at already approved residential units and what is preventing them from being developed as part of the housing needs that we have in the county.

[00:50:26] When these positions were envisioned, we talked about having an individual who could reach out to vacant office building owners and try to determine what we could do to try to get something going with vacant office buildings in the county. My hope is that these positions, of course, will also be doing aggressive outreach to the applicants who have had housing developments already approved and are unbuilt, As opposed to, you know, our board matter said we want to come up with a streamlined process for them to come in, which, you know, puts the onus on them to understand that we're doing that and then to come forward with an idea.

[00:51:03] I think we need to be a lot more aggressive and also knowing where these are, which we have a pretty good grasp of right now. Knowing who the applicants were who went through and got approval and having one of these people in one of these positions be aggressively reaching out to them saying, hey, we know these units aren't built.

[00:51:22] We'd like to sit down and figure out why. We'd like to sit down and talk to you about a streamlined process to try to get those built. And I just want to make sure that's on the radar. I think it is. But I just want to verify that. Just a comment on page 10 with the, and this actually relates to the item for January of 2027, too, which is the comprehensive plan piece.

[00:51:51] I'm looking at page 10 where we say comprehensive plan, flexibility, and alignment. And I know you had mentioned looking at where we had concurrent processing opportunities with comp plan amendments and rezoning applications. I, for one, and I may not be – this may not be universally felt on the board, but we have this 12-month goal for reviewing site plans.

[00:52:14] I also think we should have a time review goal for comprehensive plan amendments that have been authorized. I know board members may work on those for a long time before they get to authorization. I'm not telling individual board members or suggesting that they should be on a timeline.

[00:52:31] But once we have accepted a comp plan amendment, either as part of an SSPA process or the board brings forward a comp plan amendment, we also should have a timeline to share with the applicant of how long it's going to take to review that and to get to the board.

[00:52:47] And I know with the 12-month site plan review, I would love to be able to say, yeah, we have a 12-month period of time, too, from which we accept a comp plan amendment to which a hearing on that comp plan amendment is set, because too often I think people have good ideas, they get exhausted with the process, they get delayed, their good ideas go, the economy changes, we miss opportunities.

[00:53:12] And so I would like, as one board member, to see the same aggressiveness in terms of a timeline applied to comprehensive plan amendments that we now apply to site plans. And I will stop and allow folks to give some feedback on those issues, but I think the underlying here is thank you for making a ton of progress on these issues.

[00:53:33] I can't understate how important those are, and we want to make sure we keep up that momentum. Sure, I can address, I think, two of them, and then I'll pass it off to Bill for the PFM. On the positions, yes, the real estate opportunities team is doing a collection of, once we hire them, we have one person on the team right now.

[00:53:49] But we'll look at all existing county properties, like they're leading on the workhouse opportunity and some others where we have county properties that we have the ability to develop. And looking at underutilized office space and the opportunity for develop that is also the intent with this team.

As to the Department of Planning and Development metrics, one of the sub-elements, and that's what we say is the challenge with these 33 initiatives, is there's 120 action items, and one of those is to measure, set, and benchmark, and establish and publish the timeline for review so that we can look where we have an opportunity, and we've talked a lot about the shot clock elements of that.

[00:54:24] And then I'll turn it over to Bill for the PFM discussion. Before, Jen, before we turn it to Bill, I just want to make sure I understand on the positions because we know what we want them to do with the vacant office buildings. I just want to make sure we have a commitment also that they're going to be, once they're filled, that there's going to be space for them to also be reaching out to the unbuilt residential housing units that aren't on county property but are the 40-some thousand that were identified in my board matter at the last meeting that for various reasons, not the county's fault, but tariffs, interest rates,

[00:55:00] It's probably, you know, a lot of reasons why they might not have been built is going back to and looking at where those already entitled units are and having those individuals also reach out to them in a similar way or reaching out to the vacant office building owners. Yeah, absolutely. If there's anything that we can do on the county side to help move those along, once we identify those, the intent will be to do that.

[00:55:20] Whether it will be the real estate opportunities team or a combo of DPD and the real estate opportunities team, we're tracking that and we'll make that a priority. Perfect. Thank you. Bill Hicks with Land Development Services, thank you very much for your kind compliments, Chairman McKay.

[00:55:37] We do feel like we've worked very hard in our organization, and I appreciate the recognition. You raised the issue about the PFM as a guidance document, and we had multiple conversations around this table and otherwise, and we adopted a change to the very first page of that document that describes it as a guide.

[00:55:57] What we've done since that time is we've gone back and trained our staff that that's what it is. We built in a process that allows for deviation of the PFM as long as it met the intent of where we were headed. And so we have made that cultural change. So we think we're good.

[00:56:14] I really appreciate that because, you know, looking at this, what we had in here was important, which is the change that was recently made involving streetlights and some other things. But the headline here is what Bill just said. And I think we just need to continue to treat it that way.

[00:56:31] And where we're seeing conflict or routine problems with being able to meet that standard, then looking at how we modify it in a similar way we did the streetlights and continue to fix those challenges that come up, I think, is really important. So thank you. Well done. Thank you.

[00:56:46] I have Supervisor Beerman, Lusk, Palchik, and Harity. Thank you. So co-sign everything Jeff just said about DPD, sorry, plan amendments. But I do have a question on slide six, limit site plan review recommendations to regulatory requirements with LDS.

[00:57:09] Really, that seems like a very, very useful way of doing things. And then on slide 10, we talk about improved clarity and understanding during zoning processes. Can you talk, Tracy, to the degree that we are engaging in a similar, especially around regulatory requirements, and I recognize that what's going through DPD is often more flexible, but can you talk a little bit about what we're doing to essentially do with what we're doing, sorry, to do what is happening at LDS, also at DPD, to improve those processes?

[00:57:47] Sure. Tracy Strunk, Department of Planning and Development. You actually just said it. One of the things, when we put that item on there, and that's one of the reasons it's been a little delayed, one of the things we said is should we be doing what LDS is doing, which we've been interacting with on our side because we also review site plans in some things, and we think that's going really well.

[00:58:10] So we have looked at, we've already started the part about training and talking with our staff about how we work on comments and making sure that they're getting consolidated and clear, And we are looking at actually doing the same sort of thing with going with an outside contractor to kind of get some fresh eyes on those and make sure that we're reviewing them.

[00:58:28] So that's one of the reasons it's been a little delayed because I think we are going to be asking to use a consultant to look at that. Okay. I will say, you know, Chairman McKay said, you know, individual board members, sometimes it gets held up with us.

[00:58:45] But I will simply ask that my colleagues up here also work with DPD on trying to also be more clear with DPD up front so that we can move these zoning processes, plan amendments, you name it, so that everything that is coming before us as a board is moving more smoothly as well, even before it gets to Bill and LDS.

[00:59:08] I think that would be hugely helpful for us getting through these processes faster and getting more of the housing that we need across the county. So that's my little call to action. Go forth and prosper. Thank you. Thank you.

[00:59:24] Supervisor Lewis. Thank you, Madam Vice Chairman. I just have a couple of questions and maybe a point. First, I want to acknowledge the great work that's been done here as well. This is a pretty heavy lift and involving a number of different agencies and departments, so nicely done.

[00:59:40] And thank you to the chairman for bringing the board matter forward in the first place. One of the questions I wanted to ask is on page 7. This is on improving the customer-facing metric dashboards. Really excited about this one. I think it does have a unique and important role.

[00:59:58] You talk about work underway for the external-facing customer dashboard. We're just curious in terms of the timing to maybe unveil and produce it. I don't have my notes in front of me, but I think we're aiming, I think around June 2027 was our planned rollout.

[01:00:18] We were ahead of schedule and continue to work ahead of schedule. The biggest lift that we've undertaken recently, which hopefully nobody felt, was moving the PLUS system to software-as-a-surface or in the cloud.

[01:00:37] And I think that that went swimmingly. I had great years. No complaints. And I think it's going really well. But that move means that our development environments and our access to work on those metrics has been delayed.

[01:00:55] So we expect to hear back from DIT right after Thanksgiving about when those environments will be back up, and we can work again in earnest. And so hopefully it will be not long after the beginning of the calendar year that we'll be able to see some things. No, that's great. No, thank you for that.

[01:01:11] and then agreed on the positions that are going to be in the Department of Economic Initiatives for real estate opportunities. The one point I might add here is the Economic Development

Authority also has a real estate department. And I hope that there's going to be collaboration between those two because they're different.

[01:01:31] I think there's some different things that are done, but there are also some similar things as we're trying to figure out how to fill the vacant office space and to reactivate some of these other underutilized properties. So I think there's an opportunity to encourage that collaboration as well and just wanted to make that point.

[01:01:50] And then the last question, which is very easy, is on slide 10. I noted the points you made about the minor delays. Would it be possible to give us an update later in terms of the timing for when you might complete each of these items as well.

[01:02:11] Yes, we can provide a list to you of that. Thank you. Supervisor Pelczyk, then Harrity. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you so much to the team, and thank you, Bree. You know, I love this work. This is very actionable, measured goals, and I appreciate the update.

[01:02:32] Just a couple of questions in addition to what was said. Number one, I guess I heard a rumor from one of the industry people. Bill, that there's a pilot that you are working on with industry to have reviews of submissions, maybe with AI before they are submitted. I heard that's going well, but I was hoping to see. So we have a public-private partnership with a firm called ESI, and they did work with industry and worked through a pilot. We were not actually involved in that, but I did speak to an industry member who said that they thought it went really well. I've since had

[01:03:10] conversations with ESI. Setting all of that aside, I've had conversations with staff over the last six weeks with probably that many or more firms that do offer this service. We are very interested. We think that that pre-check ahead of submission is an ideal place that folks could, one of the things we have struggled with is if the plans are not super, if they're not of great quality, it is very hard to get out the other side of that without a bunch of comments, right? And so here's

[01:03:46] a way that we can help industry to kind of do their QA, QC on the front end. So we are actively talking with firms who could bring that technology to us, and we would see that ahead of a submission, ahead of a full submission to us. Okay. No, I mean, I think that kind of innovation and as we look at staffing needs, you know, as we continue to work through this process, cutting times and cutting the needs to go back and forth not only helps reduce cost, right, externally, but I think internally as well, help our staff be able to focus on good submissions, right? A hundred percent.

[01:04:24] Actually, during this very meeting, County Exec Hill and I were having this very discussion. So we are very interested in seeing something. Okay. So I appreciate that. You know, I think there's a lot we can do with technology. And thank you for doing that. I would just say, keep in mind, it might be internal versus external may need to be different. So as you have updates on that, it would be helpful to hear those. Okay. And then I very much appreciate the phase one of the communications toolkit. I've been looking through it. I guess I'm wondering what phase two will look like? I still think it needs a little bit more work or a way for us to really, I think what's

[01:05:03] great about this work is that you're really showing that breaking down silos works, right? We have to break down silos, keeping the main thing the main thing. And here's building more housing, reducing the cost of housing. And so I don't know if you're working with on Fairfax and CS or other groups

to really, it still feels a little county, right? How do we vamp it to really make it more accessible to more people in our community? I don't know if it's Tony.

[01:05:29] We might have to wait and get back to you on that one because Tony Castrilli has been, and his team, have really been, has Tony in here? Other Tony, they're both here, both Tony's. Tony's a little call for Tony Castrilli. But doing, ah, there we go.

[01:05:46] Okay, the toolkit, the actual housing toolkit's more OPA than, yeah. Do you have anything to add, Tony? Good morning, Tony Castrilli, Director of Public Affairs. We have been coordinating with all the stakeholders on a consistent basis and we have, you know, regular planning and outlines for current and future use for the toolkit and other communication strategies regarding the information that you're asking about.

[01:06:20] Okay, so will we get an update on the outcomes of that? It's just, right now the toolkit is a lot of talking points, which are a good first step, but I think we need something more robust. I was expecting? Yes, we can share an update with you in the very near future. I'll coordinate with ECX Miller, and we can make a plan for that. So just to clarify, sorry, so there's the housing toolkit, which OCA has been more lead on. Then there's the initiative under the task forces, which is how do we improve community engagement, which has been a huge effort that Tony Zolicoffer is leading. So if you want an update on that, housing toolkit, Tony, other Tony,

[01:06:58] on the engagement and how we're improving. Okay, I'm trying to break down the silo, because I think they both connect with each other and give us tools as well. So, yes, if we could get both of those, I think. Yes. So we have created a task force with many county agencies where we really want to try to have a baseline understanding of what we mean when we say community engagement, some metrics that we can look at together, but also that we are able across departments to coordinate well, to have engagement that is

[01:07:35] countywide engagement. And really what we're trying to do is have a Fairfax County ethos that says that we are interested and committed to working with community, all community, and having input into decision making. And so it's a huge effort that we're working with lots of county agencies to come together to sort of just have that baseline understanding and that that is what we will be reporting back to the board. Okay do we have a tentative time I'm just wondering as we're proposing additional land use development I want us to know when we can see it

[01:08:11] through that lens. Yeah so we we've created the work groups we have done a baseline training for for everyone on that we've done some practical application that other departments are using And so now these work groups have come into, like, different subgroups, and they are coming back with some recommendations on how we can use that sort of as baseline.

[01:08:38] So I imagine three months to have all of that completed, but that's off the top. But we are absolutely working diligently to pull that together. I appreciate that, because I do think it will help us with all of these efforts.

[01:08:54] So thank you for the excellent work and especially looking forward to the updates, and I appreciate that you shared the delays as well. And finally, the needs for the ownership is huge, right? Andrew Halshauer came with us to visit the Tyson's Flats, 17 WDUs.

[01:09:11] They had a wait list, so we know there's definitely a need for housing for the workforce that's for sale and for rent. So thank you. Thank you. Supervisor Herity, then Stork. Yeah, let me start, Bill. I mean, I've heard good things and have been over the last years or so as they improve.

[01:09:30] And this is a lot of work, so good stuff. Let me jump back to AI. I think that really is, if you get plans in good shape, it takes care of a lot. So it's not listed as one of the initiatives, but at some point it needs to be probably one of the number one initiatives because I think it gets us to a good place, and then you don't have to say the blames them.

[01:10:01] They'll know it up front before they submit the plans. I think that's a critical piece to this. Happy to see the homeownership program finally some money going into homeownership.

[01:10:16] Do we know how much we've invested so far in that? And I don't know whether we've gotten details on the program. I know we got a little bit saying we got this grant to do this, but I'd like to understand a little bit more about that either now or later.

[01:10:36] We can also follow up with an additional NIP just to give an outline of the program. One slight update is that we do have 20 of the loans closed under that program, and we've also been sort of making loans under the ADUWD, which we usually do through CDBG and have also been able to use the REACH funds as well.

[01:10:56] We've had 63 applications total under that program. And so a lot of the challenge has been getting people to the pricing of our market. And so we're actually going back to the Redevelopment and Housing Authority Board to authorize an increase in the down payment assistance to be able to go up to $100,000.

[01:11:16] Currently, we're at $50,000, and it's not necessarily getting households at or below 50, sorry, 80% AMI up to the market. And so that's where we really see a gap. So we're going to try a higher amount. As you know, it's a pilot, so we're really trying to assess it as we drive it. And then hopefully that will get more people into the market to be able to purchase.

[01:11:34] Okay. Go ahead, Bree. I just wanted to address your first question. The AI within development review is part of the Economic Competitiveness Task Force recommendations. So it is? Yes. Okay. Wanted to make sure because I didn't see it specifically called out.

[01:11:53] I know AI kind of scares all of us and makes all of us happy all at the same time. But anyway, good that it's there. If I can add one thing, sorry. Sure. So a lot of the initiatives, and I don't know if you remember during the Economic Competitiveness Task Force, Brandy Mueller briefed a lot of initiatives.

[01:12:11] And those all we have categorized under the header of the Economic Competitiveness Task Force, even though they help housing as well as other developments. So AI and a few of the other development improvements are those that we're just reporting quarterly now, and then we'll do the annual briefing, but yes, so did want to. And I'm aware we're working on it.

[01:12:29] We've made some good progress on it too, so that wasn't, you're not working on it, because I know you are working on it, because I've heard some of the good things that have come out of it already. So to go back to the units that are entitled but not getting built, we got our auditor looking at that.

[01:12:51] I just want to make sure the auditor's efforts kind of in that, And if you need examples, I'm sure we all have ones. And I'd be happy to introduce you to a couple developers that can tell you exactly what

they need to get their projects going.

[01:13:09] So, I mean, I guess it's all Tracy. Tracy Strunk, again, we are coordinating with the auditor on that, and we are in the midst of matching things up. Honestly, we know how many zoning cases were done in a particular year. We know how many site plans were done in a particular year.

[01:13:26] It gets really tricky when you have to try and figure out which site plan and track all of that through. We do some of that in our Tysons database that is up there for Tysons, and it's a very labor-intensive effort. So we're working right now also with Bill's folks and LDS to figure out how to track those things through so we can get really better numbers.

[01:13:45] But to answer your initial question, yes, we are working hand-in-glove with the auditor on that. So thanks. Yeah, and I think the order is going to come back to us with why the why's those aren't being, because that's what we sent them to do. But I think the other point, the other part that, again, is missing from the initial board, chairman's additional board matter, and I'm very grateful of the one we put in place at the last meeting that was the chairman's on waiving regulatory requirements and proffers to get things moving in a quick manner.

[01:14:23] But what's missing still is an understanding of which of those regulations, I think we're going to get back some from industry, but what regulations are, we're not receiving the bang for the buck on, you know, we all know urban parks, we've run into all kinds of problems with urban parks.

[01:14:42] I mean, the affordable housing requirement is a big one, but which of those is the board going to be flexible on and not flexible on is going to be the hard part of that whole conversation.

[01:14:58] So, and I know you know that already, but that's, and I think that was all I, oh, the only other comment, and I had this trouble and Chair Phyllis Randall and Loudon talks about attainable and affordable.

[01:15:19] It's two different things because affordable means a lot of people, they get, they think it means our very specific affordable housing plans. What we're really looking for is attainable housing for everybody in the county. And I don't know whether we want to start using that language.

[01:15:36] I know they have in Loudoun, but really it's housing that's attainable when you're talking the broader picture. And then you talk the affordable housing program when you're talking the very narrow piece that's the affordable housing program. But those are my two cents, and I'm certainly not going to change the lingo by myself.

[01:15:57] So I'll throw it out there as a thought and leave it at that. Thank you. Supervisor Stork. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I use the term housing fraud because I know that even attainable housing for somebody who is on SSI or has practically no income means that they're going to need extra help and support.

[01:16:22] It could be supportive housing, which we know some of our folks who have housing issues need extra help. some of our folks who are disability, et cetera. So I think it's an all-the-above approach, and so I'm always looking for ways to do all the above.

[01:16:38] In particular, I see the folks that earn less than 30% of our AMI are going to struggle no matter what we have in the marketplace. So first off, I think the work that we're doing on this is fantastic, and I think it's been focused.

[01:16:57] It's been producing results and I think is moving the needle, if you will, or moving us further along. And we recognize we can't probably move fast enough, but we also know that we've made good progress, and I'm looking forward to really the 2027 as being the year that we really see even more of that difference, and especially looking forward to seeing the metrics for the items that are completed and seeing if, in fact, we're getting what we think we're getting, because in the end, that's what really matters is we have these great plans and ideas and work,

[01:17:32] but if we're not seeing the result, then we're going to have to figure out a way to do something more. So on the point of, if you will, metrics and how do we, I guess, make a difference with that, I have one that I've brought up previously about how do we help industry itself do their jobs and, frankly, how do we help consumers do their jobs better?

[01:17:56] Folks are hiring people, developers, contractors, engineers, architects, et cetera, to do their job. And we all, you all, probably better than anybody, recognize the ones that are, I guess, in the bottom 20, 25 percent of performance.

[01:18:14] And we aren't here to tell anybody what to do or how to do it. But I think we can show metrics by just showing results of which one of those developers, contractors, et cetera, has more on-time submissions or more complete submissions.

[01:18:31] Or having that data available is, I think, something essential. We're not picking winners and losers. In essence, the results are going to speak for themselves. So I think we can talk all we want about what the county is doing, and I think we're laser focused on that.

[01:18:48] I appreciate all that. But if we're not giving more information to the community and frankly using the private sector to kind of better manage themselves and produce a better outcome, I think we're always going to be the folks who are holding something back, even though we recognize it may not be about us.

[01:19:09] And anybody who's been to meetings with community members or even developers, it's always somehow the county didn't do something well. We also know that that's not necessarily true. So we need more data to help, if you will, to put some sunshine on that.

[01:19:25] And that sunshine, I think, would enable us all to speak more clearly and honestly with developers who are contractors or architects or engineers who aren't really performing in the way that maybe the person who hired them is expecting them to do.

[01:19:42] And particularly taking that out of the information that you have in here about tracking that information for noticing it as well as the zoning case. I mean, it's really across-the-board opportunities.

[01:19:59] So I don't know what your thoughts are about that. Yeah, Supervisor Stork, I think you make some really good points. And as the Director Hicks from LDS stated, we're looking at some technology advances to our PLUS system, which would probably unearth a lot of that information that you just mentioned.

[01:20:17] As he stated, he's probably spoke to six or seven or even eight entities that are doing things that we can plug into our system to help those folks who you are referencing. I would be very careful to out people because they have choice of who they want to use, but we could provide them with rubrics and how to make the process work faster, and this is what we're trying to do.

[01:20:47] They're always going to use the county as a scapegoat. I had a conversation with a developer yesterday. When he saw the logs for my Plus system, he said he'll get back to me, and I just got a text saying he just fired his architect, so it's all good. Those are the things, and I'm never going to tell you who, but those are the things that you deal with on a regular.

[01:21:07] And I got to give kudos to Bill. I mean, I still remember the day we put Plus up. I was going to a football game in Baltimore, and Bill and I were talking about when things were submitted versus when they weren't submitted because we had to separate the two.

[01:21:23] So a lot of that fact-finding missions that we do are not germane to the board or to the citizens or the residents. But I do want to thank Bill and his team because they have taken where we were in 2018 to where we are today into space.

[01:21:42] So we're doing very well. And obviously, COVID helped us and hurt us. So, Bill, thanks. Thank you. And I have no interest in picking winners and losers either, which is, I think, your point. And as you and I have talked, sometimes the developers that we talk to are surprised, if you will, because they think something is one way, and then the data obviously shows something else.

[01:22:07] And the more that that data is available for everybody to access and aggregate, frankly, I think the better we'll be able to hold us all accountable for our portions of it. So I think that's our opportunity. I have shared that.

[01:22:23] Bill and I, you and I have talked about this over the last maybe decade, I don't know, long time. And I have talked about it in particular related to, as well to, green builders and green focused individuals. Again, not picking winners and losers, but folks who have included those kinds of elements in the projects that they do and become more known for delivering on those projects.

[01:22:51] And, again, the objective is to have sunshine on it and let people make their own decisions. But without that data, without those KPIs, if you will, it will be difficult for us to do that. Thank you. Thank you very much for all the information and all the work that goes behind it.

[01:23:12] And you're done. You had something? I just looked at my notes. The comprehensive plan amendment, 12 months, need to do it, especially when there is something pending.

[01:23:29] A little different when there's nothing pending and you're replanting an area. That doesn't happen very often, but I just wanted to 100% agree that. Yeah, and on that point, you know, to be clear, we know there's some staffing issues and, you know, that's a complication. But this would be, this proposal would be a 12-month period of time once staff has accepted the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for review.

[01:23:53] Normally, that is, it is because there's something coming behind it. And I think we need to prioritize the ones where we know something is coming behind it. And maybe the ones that are hypothetical do take longer. But, you know, I think we've had a couple where people are ready to go and it has taken too long.

[01:24:09] And we've talked about that. And I think if we can improve upon that and set a shot clock for comp plan amendments the same way we do for site plan reviews, that would be a huge help. Okay. Now the Land Use Policy Committee is adjourned. Thank you, everyone.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com