



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

---

October 19, 2015

**2015 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*

-----

**John Ulfelder**  
*Dranesville District*

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

**Janyce N. Hedetniemi**  
*At-Large*

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

**John L. Litzenberger**  
*Sully District*

**Kenneth A. Lawrence**  
*Providence District*

**James Migliaccio**  
*Lee District*

**Julie Strandlie**  
*Mason District*

-----

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

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

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

David Campbell, Coordinator  
Capital Projects Team  
Fairfax County Public Schools  
8115 Gatehouse Road, Ste. 3500  
Falls Church, VA 22042

**Re: PRC 76-C-111/FS-H14-41 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD  
Hunter Mill District**

Dear Mr. Campbell:

At its October 15, 2015 meeting, the Planning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioners Lawrence, Murphy, and Strandlie were absent from the meeting) to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of PRC 76-C-111 to the Board of Supervisors, subject to the development conditions dated October, 1, 2015. A copy of the verbatim transcript and development conditions is 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 application is still subject to the final decision by the Board of Supervisors.

Concurrently, the Planning Commission voted 9-0 (Commissioners Lawrence, Murphy, and Strandlie were absent from the meeting) to **CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION THAT THE "FEATURE SHOWN," FS-H14-41, FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, AT 11400 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE, IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF 15.2-2232 AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.** As noted above, a copy of the verbatim transcript is attached.

This action does not constitute exemption from the various requirements of this County and State. The applicant is responsible for ascertaining if permits are required and for obtaining the necessary permits.

Sincerely,



John W. Cooper, Clerk  
Fairfax County Planning Commission

Attachments (a/s)

cc: Catherine Hudgins, Supervisor, Hunter Mill District  
Frank de la Fe, Planning Commissioner, Hunter Mill District  
Catherine A. Chianese, Assistant County Executive, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors,  
County Executive Office  
Megan Duca, Staff Coordinator, ZED, DPZ  
Robert Harrison, ZED, DPZ  
Harvey Clark, Planning Division, DPZ  
Diane Johnson-Quinn, Chief, Zoning Permit Branch, ZAD, DPZ  
October 15, 2015 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 76-C-111****October 1, 2015**

If it is the intent of the Board of Supervisors to approve PRC 76-C-111 located at 11400 South Lakes Drive, Tax Map 26-2 ((18)) 7, 8 part, then staff recommends that the Board condition the approval by requiring conformance with the following development conditions:

1. Any plan submitted pursuant to this PRC Plan shall be in substantial conformance with the approved PRC Plan entitled "South Lakes High School Addition," prepared by ADTEK, consisting of 10 sheets, dated April 10, 2015, as revised through September 10, 2015. Minor modifications to the approved PRC Plan may be permitted pursuant to Sect. 16-203 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Applicant shall demonstrate adequate sight distance for all applicable access points to the site, as determined by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) at the time of site plan review. The Applicant shall perform regular maintenance to ensure that adequate sight distance is maintained in accordance with the Sight Distance Easement recorded on the property.
3. The Applicant shall provide on-site traffic controls during the morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up periods consistent with Fairfax County Public Schools approved procedures in order to minimize the potential for conflicts between buses and vehicles that utilize the parking along the western side of Seahawks Drive.
4. The Applicant shall upgrade the existing sidewalks that are less than five feet wide along South Lakes Drive and Ridge Heights Road to five feet in width, or provide ADA passing areas, at the applicant's discretion, in conformance with Public Facilities Manual (PFM) requirements as determined by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). These improvements shall be in place prior to the issuance of a Non-Residential Use Permit (Non-RUP) for the proposed building addition.
5. The specific type, number, and the locations of the bicycle racks shall be determined at the time of site plan subject to the approval of the Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) consistent with the Fairfax County Bicycle Parking Guidelines.
6. At such time as funding is available for the construction by others of an on-road bike lane along South Lakes Drive and upon demand by Fairfax County, the Applicant shall convey to the Board of Supervisors a perpetual public street

easement along the South Lakes Drive frontage of the property as generally shown on the PRC Plan and consisting of up to an additional six feet from the existing right-of-way, for the purpose of accommodating a future on-road bike lane. If the granting of the perpetual easement impacts the existing conservation easements on the Property and requires that additional Best Management Practices (BMPs) be provided on the Property in the future, the Applicant shall identify an area on the Property for the location of additional BMPs to be constructed by others in conjunction with the construction of the on-road bike lane, provided such area does not impact school facilities unless the Applicant is satisfied that such impacts are appropriately addressed.

7. Prior to site plan approval, stormwater management (SWM), best management practice (BMP) facilities, and adequate outfall shall be provided in accordance with the Public Facilities Manual as determined by DPWES.
8. The Applicant shall incorporate green building measures with the construction of the building addition through the Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS) program. Prior to the issuance of a Non-RUP for the building addition, a list certified by a Licensed Architect or Professional Engineer identifying the green building measures that have been utilized in the building addition shall be provided to the Environment and Development Review Branch (EDRB) of the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ).
9. The Applicant may install additional modular classrooms on the property if needed to accommodate future enrollment. The location of any future modular classrooms shall be subject to review and approval by the Zoning Administrator and shall meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements including the number of required parking spaces. Such modular classrooms shall not be located between South Lakes Drive and the southern façade of the school building.
10. Tree Preservation: The Applicant shall submit a Tree Preservation Plan and Narrative (the "Tree Preservation Plan") as part of the first and all subsequent site plan submissions. The preservation plan and narrative shall be prepared by a Certified Arborist or a Registered Consulting Arborist, and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Urban Forest Management Division (UFMD), DPWES.

The Tree Preservation Plan shall provide for the preservation of those areas shown for tree preservation, those areas outside of the limits of clearing and grading shown on the PRC Plan and those additional areas in which trees can be preserved as a result of final engineering. The Tree Preservation Plan and narrative shall include all items specified in PFM 12-0509. Specific tree preservation activities that will maximize the survivability of any tree identified to be preserved, such as: crown pruning, root pruning, mulching, fertilization, and others as necessary, shall be included in the plan.

- A. **Tree Preservation Walk-Through.** The Applicant shall retain the services of a certified arborist or Registered Consulting Arborist, and shall have the limits of clearing and grading marked with a continuous line of flagging prior to the walk-through meeting. During the tree-preservation walk-through meeting, the Applicant's certified arborist or landscape architect shall walk the limits of clearing and grading with a UFMD representative to determine where adjustments to the clearing limits can be made to increase the area of tree preservation and/or to increase the survivability of trees at the edge of the limits of clearing and grading, and such adjustment shall be implemented. Trees that are identified as dead or dying may be removed as part of the clearing operation. Any tree that is so designated shall be removed using a chain saw and such removal shall be accomplished in a manner that avoids damage to surrounding trees and associated understory vegetation. If a stump must be removed, this shall be done using a stump-grinding machine in a manner causing as little disturbance as possible to adjacent trees and associated understory vegetation and soil conditions.
- B. **Limits of Clearing and Grading.** The Applicant shall conform strictly to the limits of clearing and grading as shown on the PRC Plan, subject to allowances specified in these conditions and for the installation of utilities and/or trails/sidewalks as determined necessary by the Director of DPWES, as described herein. If it is determined necessary to install utilities and/or trails/sidewalks in areas protected by the limits of clearing and grading as shown on the PRC Plan, they shall be located in the least disruptive manner necessary as determined by UFMD. A replanting plan shall be developed and implemented, subject to approval by UFMD for any areas protected by the limits of clearing and grading that must be disturbed for such trails or utilities.
- C. **Tree Preservation Fencing.** All trees shown to be preserved on the Tree Preservation Plan shall be protected by tree protection fence. Tree protection fencing in the form of four (4) foot high, fourteen (14) gauge welded wire attached to six (6) foot steel posts driven eighteen (18) inches into the ground and placed no further than ten (10) feet apart or, super silt fence to the extent that required trenching for super silt fence does not sever or wound compression roots which can lead to structural failure and/or uprooting of trees shall be erected at the limits of clearing and grading as shown on the demolition, and phase I & II erosion and sediment control sheets, as may be modified by the "Root Pruning" condition below.

All tree protection fencing shall be installed after the tree preservation walk-through meeting but prior to any clearing and grading activities, including the demolition of any existing structures. The installation of all tree protection fencing shall be performed under the supervision of a certified arborist, and accomplished in a manner that does not harm existing vegetation that is to be preserved. Three (3) days prior to the commencement of any clearing, grading or demolition activities, but subsequent to the installation of the tree

protection devices, UFMD shall be notified and given the opportunity to inspect the site to ensure that all tree protection devices have been correctly installed. If it is determined that the fencing has not been installed correctly, no grading or construction activities shall occur until the fencing is installed correctly, as determined by UFMD.

- D. Root Pruning. The Applicant shall root prune, as needed to comply with the tree preservation requirements in these conditions. All treatments shall be clearly identified, labeled, and detailed on the erosion and sediment control sheets of the site plan submission. The details for these treatments shall be reviewed and approved by UFMD, accomplished in a manner that protects affected and adjacent vegetation to be preserved, and may include, but not be limited to the following:
- Root pruning shall be done with a trencher or vibratory plow to a depth of 18-24 inches.
  - Root pruning shall take place prior to any clearing and grading, or demolition of structures.
  - Root pruning shall be conducted with the supervision of a certified arborist.
  - A UFMD representative shall be informed when all root pruning and tree protection fence installation is complete.

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, shall not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of any applicable ordinances, regulations, or adopted standards. The applicant shall be himself responsible for obtaining the required Non-Residential Use Permit through established procedures.

Planning Commission Meeting  
October 15, 2015  
Verbatim Excerpt

PRC 76-C-111/FS-H14-41 – FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD

After the Close of the Public Hearing

Secretary Hart: I'll close the public hearing and recognize Commissioner de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Like any school, this presents problems and we - we all have heard about, you know, traffic - bicycle, pedestrian, living on a street that fronts an elementary school. We learned 40 years ago that there was a 15 to 20 minute period that we avoided getting out of this street. But what I think with the development conditions that we have we are trying to minimize the number of cars to what is required by Code - increase, although it is not specified because it will be done at site plan, the number of bicycle racks and spreading them out. Hopefully, you will consider the signage of the shared road. I will add a condition, which you have agreed to already, but I will ask you later: The applicant shall extend the existing asphalt path located to the north of the northernmost parking lot to provide a pedestrian connection from this path to the existing asphalt path located to the east of the basketball courts. I believe that that is what was required, but if not you could - but that - that would be my - you know, my - my recommended additional condition to take care. If that is too specific, I will just say that you will extend the existing path so that there isn't that gap that was shown in the photograph, but that's the - the - that's what it - the addition means.

John McGranahan, Jr., Esquire, Applicant's Agent, Hunton & Williams LLP: And - and we would agree with that condition and - and may agree with this one. I - I'm - - Mr. Sarno and I was talking - is it asphalt or is it concrete; I think it's asphalt, though, from the photograph, and I don't know if those are tennis courts or basketballs courts -

Commissioner de la Fe: No, it - it is asphalt.

Mr. McGranahan: I think - I think it is asphalt. See, because it's the left.

Commissioner de la Fe: There's - there's the concrete entrance but then there's asphalt.

Secretary Hart: Looks like both

Mr. McGranahan: So I - I think certainly addressing the gap shown in that photo and perhaps -

Commissioner de la Fe: If you look at it across the way...

Mr. McGranahan: Mr. Sarno's making a good point; if it needs to be ADA accessible, it may be -

Commissioner de la Fe: Right.

Mr. McGranahan: - better to use concrete to pick up from there and go to the curb with a curb cut, because you're going to need a - not a curb cut but a - an ADA compliant ramp.

Commissioner de la Fe: If we don't say what you will - - We say said you will extend but it doesn't -

Mr. McGranahan: How about -

Commissioner de la Fe: It says the existing - so you - you can extend it with something else, you know, whether it's concrete or asphalt. But we - we - the reference for the asphalt there is the paths that are being connected are asphalt; so, you know, that you - you connect with something -

Mr. McGranahan: I - I think if you strike "asphalt" in the first line - the applicant shall extend the existing path -

Commissioner de la Fe: The existing path.

Mr. McGranahan: - located to the north of the northernmost parking lot to provide a pedestrian connection from this path to the existing asphalt path located to the east of the basketball courts. And I do -

Commissioner de la Fe: Well, why don't we just drop "asphalt" -

Mr. McGranahan: Okay.

Commissioner de la Fe: - from that the condition so it says, "the applicant shall extend the existing path," and then in the last, it will say, again, the - again, dropping the word "asphalt."

Mr. McGranahan: Okay.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay?

Mr. McGranahan: Then that's acceptable and I think everyone here and staff know the intent. So - this will fill the gap.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay.

Mr. McGranahan: Thank you.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, with that I move - - First of all, Mr. McGranahan, do you accept the development conditions that are contained in the staff report plus the one that we just -

Mr. McGranahan: Yes, on behalf of the applicant we agree with the conditions.

Commissioner de la Fe: Okay. Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PRC 76-C-111, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED OCTOBER 1ST, WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITION TO THE CONDITIONS:

THE APPLICANT SHALL EXTEND THE EXISTING PATH LOCATED TO THE NORTH OF THE NORTHERNMOST PARKING LOT TO PROVIDE A PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION FROM THIS PATH TO THE EXISTING PATH LOCATED TO THE EAST OF THE BASKETBALL COURT.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Secretary Hart: The motion is seconded by Commissioner Flanagan. Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll move to vote. All in favor, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed? That motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENTS AND A WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE SOUTHERN, EASTERN, AND WESTERN PROPERTY BOUNDARIES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 13-305 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE PRC PLANS.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Secretary Hart: Seconded by Commissioner Flanagan. Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll move to vote. All in favor, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed? That motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: And Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with this application - this PRC application - there also as you notice in the agenda - there is a 22 - a "feature shown."

Secretary Hart: A "feature shown."

Commissioner de la Fe: - which I did not move earlier because it was concurrent with this. But I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION THAT THE "FEATURE SHOWN" FS-H14-41, FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD AT 11400 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE, IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF 2232 [*sic*] AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Secretary Hart: Seconded by Commissioner Flanagan. Any discussion? Seeing none, we'll move to vote. All in favor, please say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Secretary Hart: Those opposed? That motion carries.

//

(Each motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Murphy, Strandlie were absent from the meeting.)

JN