
Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission
Meeting Summary
February 26, 2025
7:00 p.m.

This meeting was a hybrid virtual/in-person public meeting held through electronic communication means.

Planning Commissioners in attendance:

- Sara Steinberger, LRPC Chair (in-person)
- Daniel Weir (virtual)
- Devanshi Patel, (absent)
- Eric Berkey (in-person)
- Jim Lantelme (in-person)
- Karen Guevara (absent)
- Nia Bagley (in-person)
- Peter Robertson (absent)
- Tenley Peterson (in-person)
- Tony Striner (absent)

Staff in attendance (CPHD Planning):

- Anthony Fusarelli Jr., Planning Director (in-person)
- Natasha Alfonso-Ahmed, LRPC Coordinator (in-person)
- Jennifer Smith, Comprehensive Planning Manager (in-person)
- Aaron Shriber, Current Planning Manager (in-person)
- Matt Ladd, Comprehensive Planning Section Supervisor (virtual)
- Matt Pfeiffer, Site Plan Review Section Supervisor (virtual)
- Kris Krider, Urban Design Supervisor (virtual)
- Rana Abu Ghazaleh, Principal Planner (virtual)

Other:

- Darcey Cuffman
- Jeffrey Williams
- Jay Corbalis
- Stewart Stein

PRELIMINARY 2025-2026 PLANNING DIVISION WORK PROGRAM LRPC Meeting

Commissioner Steinberger opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Steinberger recognized staff members in attendance and that no members of other Arlington County advisory boards and commissions and civic leaders were present.

A staff presentation was provided by Anthony Fusarelli Jr., Planning Director (CPHD – Planning), on the preliminary Planning Division Work Program for 2025-2026. It was noted that this year, the work program materials will also be presented and discussed at a March 5 work session with the County Board, separate from a work session on the proposed FY2026 budget for the Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development. The presentation was followed by discussion with the following questions and comments, which focused on:

- The proposed work program and organization of the Planning Division.
- Extensions of approved Site Plans - Staff responded to questions about the anticipated extensions of approved (but not yet vested) Site Plans that are set to expire on July 1 because the Virginia General Assembly did not act to automatically renew them, as has been the case in previous legislative sessions. There was concern about the time and level of analysis needed to process extensions and that the process would introduce new risk to applicants. Staff clarified that, as minor site plan amendments, the applications will not need to be reviewed by the Site Plan Review Committee or the Planning Commission, therefore, there is no additional work for these groups. Staff has begun to review the applications and expects to bring them all together to the County Board for approval at the same time, prior to July 1. Staff also clarified that many of the projects were approved a long time ago, there are new development practices and codes in place, and this provides an opportunity to address the new standards through a review of the Site Plan conditions for each project. Furthermore, the application fee will be based on the existing fee schedule, as they would be filed before any potential updates to fees that are part of the County Manager's proposed FY2026 budget may take effect (if approved). This review would also apply to form based code use permits and Unified Commercial Mixed-use Development (UCMUD) use permits that are reliant on term of validity offered by VA Code and set to expire (if applications to request extensions are similarly submitted). Staff anticipates that some applicants will choose not to apply for an extension, and these special exceptions would expire.
- Potential elimination of the Principal Planner Position – Committee members expressed concerns about additional decrease in staff resources in the County Manager's proposed FY2026 budget and demanding workload, year-over-year, and impact on timing for completing items on the work program, particularly the work related to the Commercial Market Resiliency Initiative (CMRI). Staff clarified that the CMRI work involves multiple staff across various divisions and CPHD intends to continue supporting this initiative by prioritizing regulatory, procedural, and policy updates in FY2026. Committee members noted that they view the Planning Division's work as supporting County revenues because the timely completion of this work brings new development that supports the tax base. Committee members also discussed how community expectations for public engagement on planning projects have increased, which requires more staff time. The Committee is

interested in knowing what additional work could be advanced if the Principal Planner position is not eliminated. Staff noted that the Multifamily Reinvestment Study (MRS), which had been included in previous years' work programs, is not in the draft 2025-2026 work program and cannot say with certainty that this work could be completed if the Principal Planner position is not eliminated given other priorities and the associated, anticipated level of effort and resources.

- Langston Boulevard Area Plan implementation - There was support for the work related to the Plan Langston Boulevard GLUP/zoning ordinance amendments to support redevelopment of the constrained sites.
- Clarendon Live Entertainment Group (CLEG) – A committee member asked about this item, and staff responded that it is a coordinated review of live entertainment use permits that are reviewed by the County Board every two years, with an administrative staff review in the off-years. Staff noted there are 18 Use Permit applications in the queue that will be considered by the County Board in May 2025. The review involves staff from Planning, Zoning, Inspection Services and the Fire Marshal to address additional public safety efforts being implemented, as well as annual meetings with operators and community groups in and around Clarendon. Staff clarified that it takes the same amount of staff time to review the applications, whether or not it requires County Board or administrative review.
- Special GLUP Study Process – The committee inquired about the status of the Special GLUP Study Policy/Process Review and provided general comments regarding the current approach not being ideal. Staff responded that the review is currently underway, with completion anticipated in the 2nd quarter of 2025.
- Barcroft Apartments – The committee celebrated and commended staff for great, ongoing work focused on the property, bringing forward complex and detailed proposals and changes with very limited outstanding issues at the time of Planning Commission and County Board action.
- Annual Work Program – Committee members supported staff's need for flexibility to respond to unexpected work that arises, as well as the potential benefit that cross-training employees could have in balancing dynamic work demands (across various teams) while providing staff opportunities to learn new skills, as part of working in different roles, and contributing to the Division in other ways.
- Definition of Family Zoning Study – A committee member noted appreciation for seeing a zoning study of how "family" is defined for the purposes of determining occupancy within a dwelling on the work program, as this study has been a priority for the Planning Commission.
- Key messaging for projects – A committee member asked if more communication is possible to highlight project accomplishments and provide greater awareness about what is happening around the County for residents, businesses, developers and others. The recent policy and zoning ordinance work on adaptive reuse projects was listed as an example. Committee members offered to help communicate with the public about important project

milestones and decision points throughout the processes if staff could provide relevant key talking points.

- Area 5 Langston Boulevard transportation analysis – Committee members expressed concern with the timing of the County’s transportation analysis in Area 5 (specifically the intersection of Spout Run Parkway and Langston Boulevard), which is estimated to begin in late 2026, and the current Site Plan application at 3130 Langston Boulevard, which does not address the intersection. The Committee asked if the application could be reviewed as a Phased Development Site Plan (PDSP), including the adjacent commercial property (i.e., Pawn Shop site). Staff noted that it would be difficult to review the application as a PDSP because there are multiple owners at the intersection, and not all are parties to the active site plan application. Staff clarified that the transportation analysis will be conducted by the Department of Environmental Services (DES) and is separate from the Planning Division’s work program.
- Nomination of Local Historic Districts (LHDs) and development applications – The committee expressed concerns with the timing of studies for LHDs and review of development applications (i.e., site plans) by the Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB). A Committee member noted that the HALRB review should occur earlier in the process to influence the design of the development and that County departments should improve coordination of site plan and LHD reviews.
- Green Building Incentive Policy update – In response to a question, staff provided a status update on the work related to this policy to note that DES staff is planning to conduct more robust engagement and will continue refining the proposed changes that were presented in 2024.

Public Comment

- No public comments.

Next Steps

The LRPC expressed appreciation to staff for their work.

Chair Steinberger adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.