



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

---

December 14, 2017

**2017 Planning  
Commission**

**Peter F. Murphy**  
Chairman  
*Springfield District*

**Frank de la Fe**  
Vice Chairman  
*Hunter Mill District*

**James R. Hart**  
Secretary  
*At-Large*

**Timothy J. Sargeant**  
Parliamentarian  
*At-Large*

-----  
**Ellen J. "Nell" Hurley**  
*Braddock District*

**John Ulfelder**  
*Dranesville District*

**James Migliaccio**  
*Lee District*

**Julie Strandlie**  
*Mason District*

**Earl L. Flanagan**  
*Mount Vernon District*

**Phillip A. Niedzielski-  
Eichner**  
*Providence District*

**Vacant**  
*Sully District*

**Mary D. Cortina**  
*At-Large*

-----  
**Jill G. Cooper**  
*Executive Director*

**Kimberly A. Bassarab**  
*Assistant Director*

**John W. Cooper**  
*Clerk to the Commission*

Mark Looney  
Cooley, LLP  
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1400  
Reston, VA 20190

**Re: PRC C-378/SE 2016-HM-024 – KENSINGTON SENIOR  
DEVELOPMENT, LLC  
Hunter Mill District**

Dear Mr. Looney:

At its December 7, 2017 meeting, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-1 (Commissioner Cortina abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the public hearing) to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of PRC C-378, subject to the development conditions dated November 15, 2017; SE 2016-HM-024, subject to the development conditions dated December 6, 2017, as well as the waivers and modifications, as listed in the handout dated December 7, 2017, as attached. A copy of the verbatim transcript is also attached.

This letter serves as a record of the Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board of Supervisors and not as the final approval. The applications are still subject to final decision by the Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

  
John W. Cooper, Clerk  
Fairfax County Planning Commission

Attachments (a/s)

cc: Catherine Hudgins, Supervisor, Hunter Mill District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Planning Commissioner, Hunter Mill District  
Catherine A. Chianese, Assistant County Executive, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, County Executive Office  
Harold Ellis, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)  
Robert Harrison, ZED, DPZ  
December 7, 2017 date file

 To request special accommodations, call the Planning Commission office at 703-324-2865, TTY 703-324-7951. Please allow seven working days to make the appropriate arrangements.



## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

PRC C – 378

November 15, 2017

If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve PRC C – 378 located at Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C to permit a Medical Care Facility (Assisted Living) as a principal use in an PRC District, staff recommends that the Board condition the approval by requiring conformance with the following development conditions:

1. Development of the property must be in substantial conformance with the PRC Plan entitled “The Kensington, Reston, Section 58, Block 1-C”, submitted by VIKA Virginia, LLC, and consists of 26 sheets dated November 16, 2016 and revised through November 2, 2017. Minor modifications may be permitted pursuant to Par. 8 of Sect. 16-203 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The above proposed conditions are staff recommendations and do not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors unless and until adopted by that Board.

This approval, contingent on the above noted conditions, does not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The applicant will be himself responsible for obtaining the required Non-Residential Use Permit through established procedures, and this PRC Plan will not be valid until this has been accomplished.

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

SE 2016-HM-024

December 6, 2017

If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve SE 2016-HM-024 located at Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C to permit a Medical Care Facility (Assisted Living) as a principal use in an PRC District, staff recommends that the Board condition the approval by requiring conformance with the following development conditions:

1. This Special Exception is granted for and runs with the land indicated in this application and is not transferable to other land.
2. This Special Exception is granted only for the purpose(s), structure(s) and/or use(s) indicated on the special exception plat approved with the application, as qualified by these development conditions.
3. This Special Exception is subject to the provisions of Article 17, Site Plans. Any plan submitted pursuant to the special exception must be in substantial conformance with the approved Special Exception (SE) Plat and PRC Plan entitled "The Kensington, Reston, Section 58, Block 1-C", submitted by VIKA Virginia, LLC, and consists of 26 sheets dated November 16, 2016 and revised through November 2, 2017. Minor modifications to the approved special exception may be permitted pursuant to Par. 4 of Sect. 9-004 and Par. 8 of Sect. 16-203 of the Zoning Ordinance.
4. A copy of this Special Exception and the Non-Residential Use Permit must be posted in a conspicuous place on the property of the use and be made available to all departments of the County of Fairfax during the hours of operation of the permitted use.
5. The applicant must work with Public Art Reston to coordinate the proposed public art amenity to be located along Sunrise Valley Drive.
6. The maximum number of resident rooms may not exceed 75, and the maximum number of resident beds may not exceed 105.
7. The proposed building may not exceed 38 feet in height measured in accordance with the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, nothing will preclude the applicant from constructing the building to a lower building height provided the building foot print remains in substantial conformance with the SE Plat/PRC Plan.
8. The final architectural design of the building must be consistent with general architectural design provided on sheet "A-02" of the SE Plat/PRC Plan.

9. The applicant must construct pedestrian connections between the proposed development and abutting Wethersfield residential single-family attached dwellings, as well as Sunrise Valley Drive sidewalk network. The exact locations of the pedestrian connections must be determined at time of site plan and coordinated with Fairfax County Department of Transportation. The pedestrian connections must be completed and available for use prior to the issuance of the Non-Residential Use Permit (Non-RUP) for the proposed development.
10. The applicant must make a contribution of \$20,000.00 for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the area prior to issuance of a non-residential use permit.
11. The applicant must maintain 4 percent of the beds in the Assisted Living Facility for residents who are eligible for the Virginia Department of Ageing and Rehabilitative Services Auxiliary Grant program. If a resident occupying a bed under Virginia Department of Ageing and Rehabilitative Services Auxiliary Grant program moves into the memory care program, the resident must be entitled to maintain his/her status as a Virginia Department of Ageing and Rehabilitative Services Auxiliary Grant program recipient and will be considered part of the 4 percent of beds provided pursuant to this condition.
12. Prior to site plan approval the applicant must provide an outfall analysis that extends the review to the existing culvert system under Sunset Hills Road and the Washington and Old Dominion Trail and demonstrate that the development will not exacerbate the flooding situation downstream. Onsite detention shall be provided in accordance with Article 4 of Stormwater Management Ordinance and that the onsite detention is provided so that a reduction in the 100-year Water Surface Elevation is achieved upstream of the culvert under Sunset Hills Road.
13. The applicant must provide landscaping, including trees and shrubs, in substantial conformance with the SE Plat. The exact number, species, location and spacing of trees and other plant material will be determined at the time of site plan review and will be subject to review and approval of the Urban Forest Management Division (UFMD). In addition, if the site plan includes the use of soil amendments for stormwater quality control (BMP) purposes, the species and/or location(s) of proposed plantings must be revised, if necessary, as determined by UFMD.
14. Subject to the Applicant securing all necessary easements and the approval of the Reston Association Design Review Board, supplemental landscaping must be installed along the common boundary line with the Wethersfield Cluster located east of the subject property to enhance the screening and buffering of the proposed structure to the adjacent residences, as determined by the Urban Forest Management Division in consultation with

the Applicant's landscape architect. Details of the supplemental landscaping must be coordinated with the cluster association for the Wethersfield Cluster and will be included on the supplemental landscape plans at the time of final site plan approval for the proposed development.

15. **Site Monitoring:** The applicant's Project Arborist must be present on site during implementation of the Phase 1 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and monitor any construction activities conducted within or adjacent to areas of trees to be preserved. Construction activities include, but may not be limited to clearing, root pruning, tree protection fence installation, vegetation/tree removal, and demolition activities. During implementation of Phase 2 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, the Project Arborist will visit the site on a regular basis to continue monitoring tree preservation measures and ensure that all activities are conducted as identified in the Tree Preservation Plan and approved by UFMD. Written reports will be submitted to UFMD and SDID site inspector detailing site visits. A monitoring schedule and Project Arborist reports must be described and detailed in the Tree Preservation Plan.
16. **Landscape Planting Pre-installation Meeting:** Prior to installation of any plants to meet the requirements of the approved landscape planting plan, the contractor/developer must coordinate a pre-installation meeting on the site with the landscape contractor, UFMD staff, and any additional appropriate parties. Any proposed changes to planting locations, tree/shrub planting sizes, and species substitutions shown on the approved plan must be reviewed and must be approved by UFMD staff prior to planting. The installation of plants not approved by UFMD may require the submission of a revision to the landscape plan or removal and replacement with approved trees/shrubs prior to bond release.
17. **Invasive Plant Species Management:** Forested areas containing plant species that are known to be invasive in quantities that threaten the long term health and survival of the existing vegetation present must be the subject of an invasive plant species management plan in order for the area to be awarded full 10-year canopy credit. At the time of site plan submission the applicant must provide a management plan for review and approval by UFMD specifying the common and scientific name of invasive species proposed for management, the target area for management efforts, methods of control and disposal of invasive plants, timing of treatments and monitoring, duration of the management program, and potential reforestation as needed.
18. **Trash and/or recycling collection, and food and linen delivery hours** must be limited to the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, unless unusual circumstances, such as emergencies, atypical weather or traffic conditions require collection outside of these days and times. No weekend pickups will be allowed.

The above proposed conditions are staff recommendations and do not reflect the position of the Board of Supervisors unless and until adopted by that Board.

This approval, contingent on the above noted conditions, does not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The applicant will be himself responsible for obtaining the required Non-Residential Use Permit through established procedures, and this Special Exception will not be valid until this has been accomplished.

Pursuant to Section 9-015 of the Zoning Ordinance, this special exception will automatically expire, without notice, thirty (30) months after the date of approval unless, at a minimum, the use has been established or construction has commenced and been diligently prosecuted for one of the proposed buildings.

The Board of Supervisors may grant additional time to establish the use or to commence construction if a written request for additional time is filed with the Zoning Administrator prior to the date of expiration of the special exception. The request must specify the amount of additional time requested, the basis for the amount of time requested and an explanation of why additional time is required.

## Waivers, Modifications, and Deviations

December 7, 2017

### Applications:

SE 2016-HM-024

PRC C-378

### Applicant:

Kensington Senior Development, LLC

I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the waivers and modifications listed in the handout dated November 30, 2018 and distributed earlier tonight, which shall be made part of the record:

- Waiver of Par. 3 of Sect. 9-308 of the Zoning Ordinance which requires that service vehicles have access to the building on the side or rear entrance
- Modification of Par. 5 of Sect. 9-308 of the Zoning Ordinance which requires that no building be located closer than 45 feet to any street line to permit the building to be located 25 feet from the right-of-way.
- Modification of Par. 13 of Sect. 11-203 of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the loading spaces from two to one.
- Modification of Sect. 13-303 of the Zoning Ordinance which requires transitional screening to permit the landscaping shown on the SE/PRC Plat and waiver of the barrier requirements of Sect. 13-304 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Waiver of Par 3. of Sect. 17-201 of the Zoning Ordinance which requires a service drive along Sunrise Valley Drive.
- Modification of Par. 2 of Sect. 17-201 of the Zoning Ordinance for the countywide Trails Plan to provide a sidewalk along Sunrise Valley Drive as shown on the SE/PRC plat.

**County of Fairfax, Virginia**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**December 7, 2017**  
**Verbatim Excerpt**

*PRC C-378 – KENSINGTON SENIOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Appl. to approve the PRC plan associated with RZ –C-378 to permit a medical care facility (assisted living). Located at 11501 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston, 20191 on approx. 1.8 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community- Retail and Public Facilities. Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C. (Concurrent with SE 2016-HM-024). (Hunter Mill District)*

*SE 2016-HM-024 – KENSINGTON SENIOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Appl. under Sect. 6-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a medical care facility (assisted living). Located at 11501 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston, 20191 on approx. 1.8 ac. of land zoned PRC. Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C. (Concurrent with PRC-C-378). (Hunter Mill District)*

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public Hearing held on November 30, 2017)

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman on November 30<sup>th</sup> we held a public hearing on PRC C-378 and concurrent with that a Special Exception 2016-HM-024 and with Kensington Senior Development, LLC. This is to provide assisted living for seniors, something which the Health Care Advisory Committee looked at and has recommended that it be approved. The applicant has worked for a long time with the Reston Association Design Review Board and has after many changes and substantial reductions in the size and height of the facility obtained their conceptual approval. The public hearing, the neighboring residential neighborhood unanimously everyone that's spoken, everyone that's sent in their comments opposed this development as being too large and inconsistent with, you know, being adjacent to such a relatively small townhouse development. Having lived in Reston for 45 years, I know that large apartment buildings, larger than this, adjacent to the smaller residential neighborhoods are not unique in Reston. This occurs regularly. In this case, the assisted living facility will be replacing a daycare or nursery school. I can't remember exactly what they call themselves. But that has been there for almost forty years. And it – it was time for the owners to redevelop this property. The assisted living facility when you look at the location of the building itself and the configuration of the neighboring residential neighborhood, bulk of the closest part of the building to the residential neighborhood, it doesn't – it actually abuts green space and driveways – a street. And the closest stick of townhouses is, I would say, sort of at a forty-five degree angle and there is, you know, they do not directly, you know, it isn't like they are looking into the – the new development. As I drove by tonight, I - when coming here I drive by this site all the time. The – it seemed to me that the height of this building - and I believe it's being now capped at thirty-eight feet, is not that this similar to the apparent height of the convenience center next door. Actually the managing partner of the convenience center has recommended that this, you know, in favor of this proposal. I realize that the neighbors – just I'm not quite sure what they would be satisfied with next door in a redevelopment situation. I guess that could be townhouses or could be something else. But I don't think, you know, that is not what is before us now. What we have now is what I believe a needed facility in Reston. I don't believe that it is precedent setting. We were at least one person that testified said that this was precedent setting to develop similar facilities, or industrial facilities, or institutional facilities all along this side of Sunrise Valley Drive as opposed to the other side of Sunrise Valley Drive. This is not precedent setting. If somebody want convenience center along this part of Sunrise Valley Drive between Reston Parkway and Wiehle. So this is the only place with this. What happened I don't think it's

precedent setting in that – in that discussion. So, I think the applicant has worked diligently with the Reston Association to get this building to the point that the Design Review Board is comfortable in granting their conceptual. But they never approve until the actual, you know, drawings and sight plans and so on. So this is as positive as they get mainly because the applicant has accepted many if not all, I think, almost all of their recommendations for reducing the size of the building, the height of the building, the materials and for that reason and also the fact that as I stated before that the Healthcare Advisory Committee believes that it's necessary facility and the facility has committed to providing the four percent units for the grant program for, you know, lower income folks that need this. And since the public hearing the applicant has changed their commitment to – has added a commitment and a contribution for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the area which they have not done before and this was something that was asked for by some of the emails that I received. And also subject to securing all the necessary easements and approvals, they – the applicant will work with the neighboring residential community to provide supplementary landscaping to further, you know, further buffer the property. With that, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the applicant to come forward? And do you confirm for the record your agreement to the proposed development conditions now dated December 6, 2017 for SE 2016-HM-024 and PRC C-378?

Mark Looney, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP: Mr. Chairman, Mark Looney, on behalf of the applicant and we agree with the development conditions.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2016-HM-024, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2017.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I left early from that meeting and I missed actually being here but I live here in Braddock District. I drove straight home and I watched that on television. So I did observe the public hearing and I will be voting on the motion.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I appreciated Commissioner de la Fe's comments and his usual thoughtful approach to this. This was a close case, I think going into it, I could've gone either way. These are some very difficult issues that we've seen over the past year in several situations. We started with the Silas Burke House case a few months ago which was difficult. It had – it was a larger site but it had some of the same complications with – with proximity to neighbors and opposition. We worked through that with some modifications to it. That one was approved. We did the Sunrise case about a year ago which was a smaller site embedded in a residential area. Again, a lot of residential opposition. We recommended denial. The Board denied it and the applicant, I think, took away from that the perception that we work against senior housing, we were against senior housing in residential neighborhoods, that sort of thing. The – the Arden Courts case we did earlier this year – we – and again, neighbor opposition

of the large building up against townhouses. We recommended approval of a scaled down version. It was withdrawn before it went to public hearing with the Board. So that one never went forward. Then we had this case. And again, some of the same dynamics - a large building up against townhouses, neighbor opposition and difficulties fitting this kind into the fabric of the community. This is a growing need in Fairfax County or we wouldn't be seeing so many applications for this type of use. We also are running out of sites to do anything. And the sites that are left are going to be difficult. We've got to find ways to mitigate the impacts from these uses. The biggest issue for me on this case was the scale of the building, not the materials, not the size of it necessarily compared to other things on the plan, but the proximity to the townhouses. I think that the applicant has sufficiently dealt with that issue and I would point particularly to Sheet 802 in the plans. These buildings are not going to be viewed from the roof. They are going to be viewed from the side. And showing the elevations, the modulation of these facades, the scale of these little gables, these little bump outs is all sort of townhouse size, townhouse size windows. This building, the rhythm of it is not all that different from a stick of townhouses or perhaps an apartment building which might be adjacent to townhouses. As Commissioner de la Fe has pointed out as well, there is going to be landscaping added. I think it would have been an easier case if it were a smaller building but it doesn't. It meets all of the requirements in the Plan and in the Ordinance. And I think this is the type of case that has to be approvable if we're going to be accommodating senior facilities like this in residential neighborhoods. And for those reasons I'm going to be supporting the motion. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion. Yes, Mr. Cortina.

Commissioner Cortina: Yes, the senior tsunami is definitely heading their way in need to integrate senior living options with respect to dignity and quality of life for the elderly. But I am conflicted about this application because of the need for – because of the need for senior living options. However, if we overlook the constraints on this site and grant the waivers, we impact the quality of life for the elderly residents as well as their neighbors. The main issue here is the size of the facility relative to the size of the property. Because a facility was reduced in height to satisfy concerns by the neighbors, it was stretched out leaving no room for a buffer from a busy road, no amenities other than the back terrace. There is no crosswalk, although I hear now that the funding will be provided. But no other place for these residents to go, except for a convenience store. While I understand from the Healthcare Advisory Board's report that there is demand for the proposed facility, there are many other criteria that have not been met. A problem related both to the PRC and the lack of clear planning language that could help provide guidance to communities and to developers for senior living, assisted living and senior housing options. PRCs have no minimum lot area requirements, no width requirements, no maximum building height and no regulations for open space or percentage of lot coverage. The proposed facility does not contain dwelling units but beds and, therefore, is not subject to PRC density requirements. Furthermore, the staff report says that it's not a nursing facility, it's not a hospital and all the usual mechanisms are bypassed and residents have no say in the potential density of a development such as this when neither the density nor the dwelling units can be regulated and it relies on a subjective compatibility test where a .85 FAR is in the eye of the beholder. I support senior living and assisted living environments and all the ways we can support seniors as they age. So I regret that I cannot support this application. But I am a new member who have not had the benefit of working on this for these many years. But I do have these concerns about senior

living in general. And we need to find the way to humanely integrate these hybrid facilities into our communities. So I'm abstaining on this vote.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr...

Commissioner de la Fe: I would just like to – in reference to some of the comments we just heard, read a paragraph from the Chairman of the Healthcare Advisory Committee which is the organization which looks at all these things and it sort of makes their recommendation and we all look to it as to when they're doing it after having reviewed this. They summarize by saying "given this information," what they have said above with relationship to the size, and number of beds and so forth, "the HCAB believes that the applicant has demonstrated a need for developing an assisted living facility and that the application is reasonable in terms of access, need, operations and financial stability – financial accessibility." So I - I just wanted to say that.

Chairman Murphy: Further... Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: I want to realign myself with Commissioner Hart's comments. I was troubled by the size – the coverage of the building within this small lot. And, however, in looking at the range of cases, recent decisions which he referenced, if you look at them, they each presented a different – there is some similarities but they also each represented differences that made a difference in terms of the Planning Commission's recommendation and the Board's decision in terms of each site. And I think that was something that was overlooked by some of the people attacking the Planning Commission after our Sunrise decision not understanding that it wasn't a bias against these types of facilities in residential neighborhoods or abutting residential neighborhoods. We look at each of these one-by-one. And they each represent – present different issues, and problems, and accommodations and often have – need modifications and - in order to fit. But the fact is we all agree with the need. HCAB – HCAB doesn't swing it for me because HCAB is looking at the need for these facilities and not looking at the land use impact of the facility. That's our job and the Board's job. And – but in this case I will support the motion and I will do it because I think they've added some additional landscaping and I think they are trying very hard to meet some of the concerns of the neighbors and to make their facility not an overwhelming battleship sailing next to the residential subdivision. And – but they can't make it invisible. So with the revised conditions and the situation, I'm planning to support the motion.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion. All this conversation is another good reason why I am very thankful that the staff is reviewing the Zoning Ordinance amendment. And this is on the top of the list, senior housing, because we do need them and we need to have a better handle on the rules and regulations surrounding the senior developments in this County it's the largest growing demographic in Fairfax County now, ages 60 to 65. So, all those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2017-HM-024 [sic], say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. One abstention. Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PRC C-378, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2017 [sic].

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PRC C-378, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. And one abstention, Ms. Cortina.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I also MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS LISTED IN THE HANDOUT DATED NOVEMBER 30<sup>TH</sup>, 2018 [sic] and distributed earlier tonight which shall be made a part of the record.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Discussion. All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstention.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay. That's it. Thank you very much.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you.

William O'Donnell, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: Excuse me, Chairman Murphy, I just want to make sure on the record that the special exception number was referenced as 2016 and not 2017.

Commissioner de la Fe: I'm sorry, did I say 17? It's 2016.

Mr. O'Donnell: I think it was summarized as 2017 but I just want sure it's 2016. Sorry.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. So noted.

Mr. O'Donnell: Sorry.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Appreciated.

The motions carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Cortina abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the public hearing.

IK



**County of Fairfax, Virginia  
Planning Commission Meeting  
November 30, 2017  
Verbatim Excerpt**

*PRC C-378 – KENSINGTON SENIOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Appl. to approve the PRC plan associated with RZ –C-378 to permit a medical care facility (assisted living). Located at 11501 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston, 20191 on approx. 1.8 ac. of land zoned PRC. Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Planned Community- Retail and Public Facilities. Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C. (Concurrent with SE 2016-HM-024). (Hunter Mill District)*

*SE 2016-HM-024 – KENSINGTON SENIOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Appl. under Sect. 6-304 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a medical care facility (assisted living). Located at 11501 Sunrise Valley Dr., Reston, 20191 on approx. 1.8 ac. of land zoned PRC. Tax Map 17-4 ((17)) 1C. (Concurrent with PRC-C-378). (Hunter Mill District)*

After Close of the Public Hearing

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I wanna thank everybody who came out to speak. We have also received a number of written communications and e-mails, and all those will be made part of the record. And, Mr. Chairman, there obviously some things that we need to look at, and I would MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR SE 2016-HM-024 AND PRC C-378 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 7<sup>TH</sup>, 2017.

Commissioners Sargeant and Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on SE 2016-HM-024 and PRC C-378, to a date certain of December the 7<sup>th</sup>, with the record remaining open for comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. I would like to also congratulate all of you that came in this evening for this orderly, well done, professional public hearing. We appreciate your opinions and we understood what everybody was saying because it was done in an orderly manner. Please drive safely, and thank you very much for coming.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioner Cortina abstained from the vote. Commissioner Flanagan was absent from the public hearing.

SL