

Written Testimony Received

Continued recommendations to Board of Zoning Appeals on request to amend an existing Conditional Use Permit, and to Town Council on request for modifications of site plan requirements for Green Hedges School, located at 415 Windover Ave NW, in the RS-12.5 Zoning District.

Testimony Number	Name of Submitter	Address of Submitter
1.	Judi Medwedeff	309 Windover Ave NW
2.	Sara Goldberg	428 Knoll St NW
3.	Stephen Swanekamp	8711 Litwalton Ct
4.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
5.	Edward & Melissa Maillett	214 Nutley St NW
6.	Christina Farquharson	720 McKinley St
7.	Elizabeth Williams	123 Lewis St NW
8.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
9.	Sandy Shin	511 Kibler Cir SW
10.	Roxanne Nersesian Paul	1104 Trowbridge Ln SW
11.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
12.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
13.	Elizabeth DiFrancisco	123 Lewis St NW
14.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
15.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
16.	Avril Garland	917 Hillcrest Dr SW
17.	Edward and Melissa Maillett	214 Nutley St NW
18.	Tony Zhang and Ying Huang	424 Knoll St
19.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
20.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
21.	Penny Oszak	221 Nutley St NW
22.	David Welch	412 Knoll St NW
23.	David Welch	412 Knoll St NW
24.	Katherine Welch	412 Knoll St NW

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Murphy, Jennifer](#); [Levy, David](#); [O'Brien, Kelly](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Green Hedges
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 11:17:31 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Vienna Planning Commission ,

We do not object to Green Hedges School modernizing its facilities.

Our concern is that any expansion or modification be carried out in full compliance with applicable zoning regulations and with appropriate consideration for the quality of life of the surrounding neighbors in regards to traffic, noise and artificial light pollution.

Judi & David Medwedeff
309 Windover Ave NW

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Murphy, Jennifer](#); [Levy, David](#); [O'Brien, Kelly](#)
Subject: Letter of Objection
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 6:07:56 PM

<p>CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.</p>

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I live at 428 Knoll ST NW, and my property abuts the Green Hedges playground. I had planned to attend and speak briefly at the meeting tonight, but I'm sick.

Please accept this letter as voicing my strong objection to Green Hedges' planned expansion. I will be glad to provide you with the reasons for this objection once I feel better. If you would like to discuss them, please let me know.

Thank you for for your time and kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Byrd Goldberg
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: Mumby, Jennifer Levy, David, O'Brien, Kelly
Subject: Public Comment on Green Hedges School CUP and Site Plan Applications
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2026 8:05:30 AM

Testimony No.3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Vienna Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to offer public comment on the Green Hedges School Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Site Plan Modification applications from the perspective of a Fairfax County Tree Steward and volunteer involved in tree rescue and preservation.

I am not a resident of the Town of Vienna, but I reside in the 22182 ZIP code just a few hundred yards outside the Town limits. I am concerned about the broader implications of this application for tree canopy preservation, buffer integrity, and noise mitigation in residential zoning contexts-issues that extend beyond municipal boundaries and reflect shared regional environmental values.

In particular, I am concerned about the potential removal of up to 54 mature trees that currently function as a vegetative buffer between the school and adjacent residential properties. Mature trees provide meaningful and irreplaceable benefits, including noise attenuation, visual screening, stormwater absorption, and habitat value. These functions cannot be replicated in the near term through replacement plantings or fencing alone.

Available materials and public testimony indicate that noise from school operations is already a documented concern in the surrounding neighborhood. The removal of a substantial number of mature trees that serve as a buffer would reasonably be expected to exacerbate those impacts, regardless of future landscaping plans.

This concern is especially relevant given that the Town of Vienna is a Tree City USA community, reflecting a formal commitment to responsible stewardship of its urban tree canopy. That designation carries with it an expectation that removal of mature trees-particularly those serving functional buffer roles in residential settings-will be carefully scrutinized, transparently disclosed, and avoided wherever feasible.

I respectfully encourage the Planning Commission to require a clear accounting of proposed tree removal, including the size, species, and location of affected trees; to evaluate the functional role those trees currently serve; and to ensure that any approvals prioritize preservation of mature canopy as a first-order mitigation measure.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment and for your consideration of the environmental and land-use implications of this application.

Respectfully,

Dr. Stephen B. Swanekamp
8711 Litwalton Court
Vienna, VA 22182
Fairfax County Tree Steward

From:

To:

Cc:

Levy, David; O'Brien, Kelly; Cloutre, Lyndsey; Murphy, Jennifer; Glassman, Matthew; Plowgian, Jessica; Noble, Douglas; Kenney, Steve; Chakrapani, Deepa; Miller, David; Aimone, Keith

Testimony
No. 4

Subject: Green Hedges School - Noise Samples
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2026 10:03:40 PM
Attachments: [Green Hedges Noise 1.m4a](#)
[Green Hedges Noise 2.m4a](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Evening,

At the January 14th Planning Commission meeting, there was considerable discussion regarding noise generated by the School and its impact on the surrounding residents.

Attached are two audio recordings that clearly demonstrate the volume and intrusive nature of that noise as it is experienced by neighbors on a daily basis. These recordings were taken from my backyard, behind a six-foot solid wood fence, confirming that existing buffers and mitigation measures are ineffective.

After listening to these recordings, it should be evident that the site is already operating at or beyond what this residential neighborhood can reasonably absorb. Approving additional density—through increased lot coverage, enrollment, staffing, and reduced buffering with no real sound mitigation—would intensify impacts that are already excessive and documented. That outcome would be incompatible with residential Conditional Use Permit zoning and contrary to the Town's obligation to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its residents.

For these reasons, the proposed expansion, as submitted, should not be approved.

Penny Oszak
221 Nutley St NW
Best,
Penny

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Edward Maillett [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 11:05 AM
To: Levy, David
Cc: O'Brien, Kelly; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Murphy, Jennifer; Glassman, Matthew; Plowqian, Jessica; Noble, Douglas; Kenney, Steve; Chakrapani, Deepa; Miller, David; Aimone, Keith; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Green Hedges School - Increased traffic- specifically associated with future gym rentals if approved

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

In addition to Penny's reasonable concerns, we gave testimony how the Town has approved or endorsed expansions at Louse Archer, Madison, and several commercial establishments one to two blocks down from our homes without any formal consideration on how increased traffic and school, commercial parking in front of our homes on Nutley St. would reasonably impact our single family neighborhood.

With that in mind, Melissa and I are particularly opposed to Green Hedges being allowed to rent their future gym facilities outside of school hours solely so they can make further income off any future approved expansions. This is entirely unreasonable and puts another undo hardship on our community having to bear even more traffic outside normal school hours. If Green Hedges needs to rent their facilities to outsiders in order to pay for their development and operations, then Green Hedges should not be allowed to build such a facility.

We already incur an unreasonable amount of traffic in front of our homes during school commuting hours and we should not be asked to absorb more associated with another 30 - 60 cars going in and out every hour or so during evenings and weekends to use a future gym.

Thank you for considering and hopefully prioritizing, how all this development surrounding and within our single family zoned residential area is negatively impacting our neighborhood.

Edward and Melissa Maillett
214 Nutley St., NW

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Christine Farquharson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 11:45 AM
To: Murphy, Jennifer
Subject: comments on PC26-287

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Members of the Vienna Planning Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written comments on Green Hedges School's (GHS') application for changes to its site plan (PC26-287).

I am the parent of a current GHS student, but that fact is almost incidental to my decision to submit these comments.

As a long-time member of the Vienna community (1983-1998 and 2008-present), who supports the Town's philosophy on land use as outlined in its draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan, I am submitting these comments because I am concerned that a small number of highly engaged stakeholders who are opposed to GHS' proposed changes are attempting to disproportionately and negatively influence the public narrative around GHS' proposed changes.

I support GHS' proposed changes to its site plan and conditional use permit (CUP) and I strongly believe the following to be true:

- 1) GHS' proposed changes, as discussed at the Planning Commission meeting on January 14, 2026, are consistent with the Town's land use goals to allow the community to benefit from the presence of vibrant institutions while maintaining the character and livability of surrounding neighborhoods.
- 2) GHS has earnestly attempted to be a good neighbor and has thoughtfully updated its proposals through an iterative process in response to feedback from neighbors and the Planning Commission that began in 2022.
- 3) GHS' proposed changes will bring demonstrable benefits over the status quo to the school's immediate neighbors with respect to improved visual screening, improved sound abatement, improved lighting, improved stormwater management and the installation of sidewalks on Lewis Street and Windover Avenue.
- 4) GHS' request to increase enrollment to 225 from 190 will have minimal effect, in practice, on

neighborhood road congestion, sound, or -- in the case of special events held at the school -- neighborhood parking.

- 5) There is some degree of urgency for GHS to complete these proposed changes if it is to remain a vibrant educational institution into the future.
- 6) Some stakeholders who are opposed to GHS' proposals are currently advocating for unprecedented changes to GHS' CUP that could unfairly curtail GHS' long-standing operational practices and undermine the school's ability to meet its educational mission.

As stated above, I believe that a small number of highly engaged stakeholders who are opposed to GHS' proposed changes have disproportionately and negatively influenced the public narrative around them. While I do not find their complaints, in general, to be consistent with my experience as a member of the GHS community who is on the campus nearly every day, I acknowledge their experiences and perceptions are different from mine. What I find particularly concerning, however, is that in written comments submitted to the Planning Commission these stakeholders cite a log of over eighty complaints that they have made to the Town of Vienna since April 2022 alleging zoning violations and violations of the existing CUPs by GHS, and assert that these "documented issues raise reasonable concerns regarding site's ability to accommodate additional density." I do not agree that these complaints represent "reasonable concerns". On the contrary, close examination of the complaint log reveals a sustained pattern of certain neighbors reporting perceived violations, that, in the vast majority of cases, the Town of Vienna investigated and found that there were no violations of zoning policy or CUPs.

Thank you for your consideration of these perspectives on important matters under your consideration.

Best regards,

Christine Farquharson

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Elizabeth Williams <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 3:34 PM
To: Murphy, Jennifer; Levy, David; O'Brien, Kelly
Cc: TBLC - Tracy McCarty; [REDACTED] Jessica Wadlow - Junior High Leader
Subject: Letter to Vienna Commission
Attachments: Letter to Vienna Planning Commission.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello-

My name is Elizabeth Williams, and my address is 123 Lewis Street, NW, in the Town of Vienna. This letter is a follow-up to my comments I gave during the Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday, January 13, 2026.

I was one of the first speakers on Wednesday evening and as I listened to some of my neighbors voice their concerns about the revised campus plan and conditional use permit that Green Hedges has submitted, I feel compelled to add additional thoughts. I have been a neighbor to Green Hedges since April 2016, long before my daughter began attending the school in 2022. I appreciate that several neighbors acknowledged that the Green Hedges leadership team has taken their feedback into consideration and are in favor of the modernization plans. I am concerned that there are a very small number of neighbors who seem to frequently and loudly vocalize their ongoing distaste for the school. When I think about the number of neighbors who live adjacent to or across from the school and have not voiced any concerns, it gives me pause about those with the loudest voices. Additionally, it truly struck a chord with me listening to their complaints about our children and the disdain they have for the Greens Hedges Community. While I understand complaints regarding high school parties in the area, teenage drivers speeding, or animal control issues (e.g., chicken coops and dog kennels), I am baffled by the focus and hostility directed at our children—whom they have never taken the time to meet or understand.

As a neighbor, I am thrilled to see the campus plan that has been submitted. I know the plans have been thoughtfully and intentionally designed taking into consideration feedback from the other neighbors and me, Town of Vienna staff, and the Planning Commission. Over the last few years, I have been invited to participate in multiple meetings on campus to discuss the plans, as well as have received innumerable communications from the school stating that if any neighbors have any questions or concerns, that I am welcome to contact the school directly. I did take the opportunity to do that and Peter Barrett, the current Interim Head of School, reviewed the plans with me.

For me, alleviating the traffic concerns on Windover is a huge win. Very occasionally, as stated by Green Hedges and others, the Windover entrance can sometimes back up onto the street. By allowing additional stacking, even with increased student headcount, I am confident that cars will not back up on to Windover. Additionally, I know that a crosswalk on Nutley has been suggested by the Town, but I also hope crosswalks at the intersection of Windover and Lewis are also being considered. Now that a sidewalk will be installed by Green Hedges along Windover beginning at Lewis, crosswalks should be installed at the intersection to encourage safe crossing by pedestrians, and more importantly, recognition by drivers that there are pedestrians using Windover. During school arrival and departure times, the preponderance of people

driving on Windover are going to and from JMHS and are frequently student drivers who forget there are pedestrians sharing the road.

I am also very much in favor of the new academic building that would replace the current Rice Arts building. The building is designed to be harmonious with the current Stable building that is next to it as well as other homes on Windover and in the neighborhood. The current building was never intended to be an academic space and creating one that isn't an afterthought will serve the students and educators well. Additionally, as with all new buildings, it will be much more sustainable and more importantly, safer for the children and adults who spend their time there.

I appreciate having the opportunity to provide feedback to the Planning Commission and hope that you will consider the feedback from all of the neighbors regardless of how they have chosen to participate. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Williams
123 Lewis St, NW
Vienna, VA 22180

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Penny Oszak [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 4:40 PM
To: Levy, David; O'Brien, Kelly; Cloutre, Lyndsey; Murphy, Jennifer; Glassman, Matthew; Plowgian, Jessica; Noble, Douglas; Kenney, Steve; Chakrapani, Deepa; Miller, David; Aimone, Keith
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Green Hedges School - Noise Summary From Green Hedges School - Not in Original Packet
Attachments: Summary of Green Hedges Sound Monitoring.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Afternoon,

In reviewing the media from the Planning Commission meeting on January 14, I realized that the School may not have provided the Planning Commission with their "summary" of the noise findings. In the Summary, it specifically states that Impulse Sound is actually Max Sound. I have attached the summary here for your review.

Best,

Penny Oszak

Summary of Green Hedges Sound Monitoring

Prepared by Jessica Edwards-Brandt

January 9, 2026

The intent of the sound monitoring event was to obtain baseline data to allow for continued evaluation of sound within the Green Hedges property and presumably near adjacent property, within the main playground area. Data was collected when students were not in school and when students were in school.

- A sound level monitor was placed in the northwest corner of the playground from October 11 to October 13 and October 27 to October 30, 2025.
- The instrument used was an Extech Sound Level Meter (with SD card real time datalogger) Model SDL600. The instrument meets the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standard S1.4 for a "Type Two" meter and was calibrated prior to use.
- The settings below were programmed into the meter.
 - Date = calendar date/time
 - Sampling rate = 30 seconds
 - Numerical format = decimal point
 - Weighting frequency = A
 - Time response = slow (1 sec)

A-Weighting (Frequency Weighting) is a mode that allows the meter's frequency response to mimic the sensitivity of the human ear. The human ear is more sensitive to mid-range frequencies and less sensitive to very high or very low frequencies. A-weighting is standard for most environmental noise measurements, OSHA regulatory testing, and enforcing noise ordinances because these standards are based on how sound is perceived by people. (*EXTECH Model SDL600 User Manual*)

In most applications, the Extech SDL600 is used with A-weighting and a Slow time response, as this provides a better average of consistent noise levels and a slow time response captures continuous sound.

Fairfax County defines continuous sound as having essentially constant intensity during an observation period, like air conditioners or humming machinery. Impulse sound is defined as a rapid rise and slower decrease in sound pressure, lasting no more than one second, such as weapons fire or pile drivers. Continuous sound is measured with a "slow response setting," while impulse sound uses "unweighted peak dB levels" and a "fast setting". (<https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning-development/zoning/noise-ordinance>)

The technical definition of an impulse sound is the duration of sound event, which includes a combination of rise time, peak amplitude and decay, and shall be no more than one second.

Since the sound meter was not set to the fast time response setting, the impulse sound data in the original table is technically not accurate, but the intent of the data collection was to

demonstrate that there are periods of elevated sound occurring at the site, but below the maximum recommended levels.

To correct this, the table has been updated to show the maximum data value during each day.

To develop the summary table, the data was averaged from 7AM to 10PM to calculate the continuous sound and the maximum value was selected.

The updated table is shown below.

Date	Avg. Continuous Sound, dBA 7AM – 10PM (Max 60 dBA)	"Max" Sound, dBA 7AM – 10PM (Max 100 dBA)	Notes
Oct 11, 2025	45	66	Not a school day
Oct 12, 2025	53*	69	Not a school day
Oct 13, 2025	42	68	Not a school day
Oct 27, 2025	53	83	School day
Oct 28, 2025	54	87	School day
Oct 29, 2025	54	84	School day

*Note, the data trend showed gradual increase in decibels representative of yard work around the area

The data set has been provided as a .PDF attachment
Compiled Decibel Data Oct 2025 PG PG2 MPR.pdf

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Levy, David](#); [O'Brien, Kelly](#); [Murphy, Jennifer](#)
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 9:05:15 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Vienna Planning Commission Members,

I am a Vienna resident and a Vienna Tree Advocacy Committee member. I am also a Fairfax Tree Steward, I am writing to you about the Green Hedges School Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Site Plan Modification applications. I am very concerned about the potential removal of 54 mature trees due to the anticipated construction.

I read over materials about Green Hedges CUP and something jumps out at me. They are applying for a variance to have the lot coverage changed from 25% to 47.8% (apparently they currently have a variance for 32.2%) They are more than doubling the size of one building (Kilmer) and tearing down another building (Rice) and replacing it with a building almost 6 times bigger. The neighbors already complain about the noise currently originating from this school in a residential neighborhood. Why should Vienna allow a private school that benefits a small number of families to expand its buildings so dramatically? In hopes of reining in this plan, I urge you to keep the allowable lot coverage at the 32.2% that Green Hedges is currently allowed.

The Town of Vienna is undergoing a crisis in terms of tree loss due to residential development (teardowns), sidewalk work and the cutting of trees by Dominion Energy along the W&OD. The Vienna tree canopy is suffering a death from a thousand cuts. As the Planning Commission members, I hope that you carefully consider every variance that comes your way. I hope that you evaluate the cost vs the benefit. I hope your decisions occasionally preserve some trees.

Sandy Shinn
511 Kibler Cir SW
Tree Advocacy Committee member
Fairfax Tree Steward

Green Hedges Proposed Plan and Environmental Impact

Dear Director Levy, Deputy Director O'Brien, Planning Commission Clerk Murphy and Planning Commission Member Doug Noble,

I am writing concerning the proposed expansion plan of Green Hedges School. I am the Chair of the Town's Tree Advocacy Committee, but I am writing today on my own, because we won't have another meeting until February and so the committee couldn't vote on my remarks. I am also a member of the Town's Conservation & Sustainability Commission. I don't want to sound like Andy from the popular TV show "The Office" (haha), but I hold a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resources from Cornell University and a Master of Natural Resources from Virginia Tech.

I spoke at your last meeting on January 14, but yesterday (a Saturday) was able to walk the grounds with two of the school's neighbors to examine some of the approximately 54 trees that will be killed if the proposed plan goes forward. It was an extremely cold day, but I was able to measure the circumferences of some of the mature trees and then calculate their DBH (Diameter Breast Height, which is a standard measure of trees used in Forestry).

The new Tree Conservation Ordinance, passed in 2024, created the Tree Advocacy Committee. We are a very hard-working committee dedicated to saving mature trees and increasing the tree canopy in Vienna, since 13% of it was recently lost in only 10 years. It broke my heart to see so many mature trees that would potentially be on the chopping block. A Black Walnut (*Juglans nigra*) with a 35" DBH (nearly a yard!) *in the garden area was one of these, as well as an American Beech (*Fagus grandifolia*) just over 35" DBH.* Black Walnut is the most valuable of all the trees in North America. Many of them are often cut down because people don't care for the very large nuts that fall from the tree. There are two more Black Walnuts along Windover Avenue that are 31" and 34" DBH that are destined to be killed as well, because a sidewalk would be put in if the school expansion plan goes through. Other species that would be cut down include Sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), Eastern Red Cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*) and Maple (*Acer sp.*) (I think it was a Red Maple, but couldn't tell for sure in the winter.)

In addition to the loss of approximately 54 trees and all their ecological services (air filtering, erosion control, flood control, cooling effects, shade, wildlife habitat, sound buffering, privacy, carbon sequestration and aesthetics), the increase of over 50% in impermeable surfaces (from 31.1 to 47.8%) that is proposed will greatly increase the possibility of flooding and the heat island effect. The increase in impermeable surfaces is

arguably the largest factor contributing to increase in destructive flooding that we are seeing today across the nation.

At a time when Vienna voters have elected a Town Council that is so favorably inclined towards tree conservation and has passed a new Tree Conservation Ordinance, I doubt that Vienna residents would support yet another expansion of this private school embedded in a residential, historic neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Roxanne Nersesian Paul

1104 Trowbridge Ln SW

Planning Commission Meeting 1/14/2026 – Green Hedges School CUP Expansion and Site Modifications -

I would like to respond to some of the comments made by the School at the above-mentioned meeting.

Claim: Noise will be the same as it has been for the past 40 years under the 190-student cap.

- This statement is incorrect. Noise conditions have changed significantly over time due to repeated increases in intensity of use approved through multiple CUPs and site plan modifications. Outdoor play areas have expanded across nearly the entire campus, and students are now outside for longer and more frequent periods throughout the day. The noise experienced today is materially different—and greater—than in prior decades.

Claim: Playground noise is consistent with other schools.

- The School's own peer group study contradicts this assertion. That study shows Green Hedges has one of the highest student densities per acre among its peers. Many of the comparison schools are located on substantially larger campuses and are not fully surrounded by residential homes. These contextual differences are critical and were not acknowledged.

Claim: Noise impacts are comparable despite location.

- As correctly noted by Commissioner Kenney, Green Hedges is completely surrounded by residential properties. This distinguishes it from many peer schools and magnifies the impact of outdoor noise. Comparisons that ignore this fundamental difference are misleading.

Claim: Noise will remain the same as it is today.

- This claim assumes current noise conditions are acceptable. They are not. Neighbors continue to experience persistent, disruptive noise that already exceeds what is reasonable in a residential neighborhood. Maintaining the status quo is not an acceptable benchmark for further expansion.

Claim: Mitigation measures such as buffers, parking controls, stacking, stormwater management, and wood fencing are sufficient concessions.

- These measures are not concessions. They are mandatory zoning and CUP requirements designed to protect surrounding neighborhoods. Compliance with baseline requirements does not justify increased intensity of use.

Claim: The proposed mitigation adequately offsets increased intensity.

- If the School seeks increased intensity—more buildings, more students, more staff—then neighbors must receive greater protection, not reduced or minimum protections. If additional buffers or mitigation cannot be provided, the appropriate response is to reduce the size and scale of the expansion, not weaken neighborhood safeguards.

Claim: The proposed phasing plan is reasonable and manageable.

- The phasing plan spans approximately 10 years:
 - Phase 1 begins in ~24 months and lasts ~24 months
 - Phase 2 begins ~24 months later and lasts another ~24 months
 - Phase 2 is contingent on future funding
- Given the length of this timeline and the likelihood of zoning changes, any approval or recommendation should be strictly limited to Phase 1 only. Phase 2 should require a separate, future review which should include updated traffic studies and noise analysis.

Claim: If the proposal is not approved, existing neighbor friction cannot be addressed.

- This is incorrect. The School can address existing impacts immediately by planting trees, enhancing buffers, replacing chain-link fencing and shielding lights — actions that do not require CUP expansion. Suggesting otherwise reflects a reluctance to address known impacts absent approval for growth.

Claim: Lack of existing parking lot landscaping justifies proposed modifications.

- The absence of landscaping today does not make it acceptable. The 1978 CUP explicitly required the parking lot to be screened with a dense buffer. Failure to comply with past conditions does not justify continued noncompliance.

Claim: Playground noise will be dispersed by wrapping play areas along Knoll Street.

- The School already uses green space along Knoll Street and Windover (near the Kilmer House) as play areas. The proposed configuration does not meaningfully change noise dispersion or reduce impacts.

Claim: Increasing enrollment to 225 students is necessary as a revenue lever, though the cap may never be reached.

- This argument mirrors statements made in prior applications. When the School requested approval for 190 students in 1985, similar assurances were given. History shows that once an enrollment cap is approved, it is ultimately reached.

Claim: The expansion is necessary to modernize the campus.

- While certain site improvements may be beneficial, there is no demonstrated need to increase student or faculty population. Expansion would result in more buildings, more parking, more stacking, more students and staff, and more playground activity—each increasing impacts on neighbors' quality of life. This is a preference, not a necessity.

Claim: Growth serves the public interest.

- Growth serves no public interest. It places additional burdens on an already strained residential neighborhood. The educational choice Green Hedges provides already exists without expansion and does not depend on increased enrollment.

Claim: Expansion is the only way to address campus needs.

- The School has made clear it will proceed only if the CUP is amended to allow growth. This demonstrates that expansion is driven solely by the need for operating leverage to fund improvements—not by public necessity.

Final Observation

- The size and scale of this proposal foreshadow future requests. The expanded site would be capable of supporting 300+ students. Town Council previously indicated that 1997 was intended to be the last expansion. Neighbors believe that threshold has already been exceeded.
- Please recommend NO on any CUP amendment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Penny Oszak, 221 Nutley St NW

Written Statement Regarding Proposed Gymnasium Rentals

I submit this statement in clear opposition to the proposal to allow third-party rental of the Green Hedges School gymnasium.

At the Planning Commission meeting, the School equated gym rentals to renting a music room for piano lessons. That comparison is not reasonable.

Gymnasium rentals are not comparable to routine school use and are not incidental to the School's academic mission. They function as event-based commercial activities that introduce traffic, noise, and neighborhood impacts materially different from and more intense than normal school operations.

Traffic Impacts

Gymnasium rentals generate concentrated arrival and departure surges associated with games, tournaments, clinics, and open-gym use. These surges typically occur in the evenings and on weekends, when surrounding residential streets are already constrained by on-street parking and limited visibility.

Even if all vehicles were to park on-site, traffic impacts would still occur. Vehicles arrive within short time windows, queue at site entrances, make frequent turns on narrow residential streets, and then depart simultaneously at the conclusion of events. When rentals are scheduled back-to-back, which is common for gym use, traffic peaks overlap and compound congestion and circulation conflicts.

These impacts are inherent to the use and are unlikely to be eliminated through operational controls or parking supply.

Noise Impacts

Gymnasium rentals would materially expand noise into evenings and weekends—times when residents reasonably expect quiet enjoyment of their homes. These uses introduce spectator-driven noise, including cheering, whistles, buzzers, and amplified voices, as well as exterior noise from vehicles, car doors, alarms, and post-event gatherings in parking areas.

Because rentals are repetitive by nature, these impacts are cumulative and recurring, not occasional or incidental. The resulting noise environment is incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood and is direct conflict with the requirements for with CUP approval.

Parking and Demand

While sixty (60) parking spaces may appear adequate for routine school operations, that number does not function as a reliable ceiling for third-party gym rentals. Gym rentals may include league games, practices, tournaments, clinics, and open-gym use—many of which draw spectators and generate overlapping arrivals and departures. Spectator attendance, multiple teams, overlapping schedules, and back-to-back events make overflow parking into surrounding residential streets foreseeable and likely.

Parking Is Not the Limiting Issue

While parking capacity is often cited, it is not the controlling concern. Event-based traffic surges, extended hours of activity, and spectator-related noise occur regardless of whether vehicles technically fit within on-site parking. Parking supply does not mitigate these impacts.

Incompatibility With Residential Zoning

Third-party gym rentals represent a commercial, non-educational use that is fundamentally incompatible with a residential zoning district. Allowing such rentals would intensify use of an already constrained site and shift impacts directly onto surrounding homes.

These impacts are predictable, recurring, and unavoidable. They cannot be adequately mitigated through conditions without fundamentally altering the nature of the use.

Conclusion

Gymnasium rentals serve no public necessity, are unrelated to the School's academic mission, and impose traffic and noise impacts that exceed what this residential neighborhood can reasonably absorb.

For these reasons, third-party gymnasium rentals should not be permitted under any circumstances as part of the proposed CUP or site plan modifications.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Penny Oszak, 221 Nutley St NW

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Murphy, Jennifer](#); [Levy, David](#); [O'Brien, Kelly](#)
Subject: Green Hedges
Date: Monday, January 26, 2026 12:03:06 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Afternoon,

I have been pondering the Green Hedges meetings of January 2026 and the last 40+ years; I have many organized binders full of meeting notes, CUPs, neighbor letters, proposals, drawings, plans, etc. and have read through and organized everything.

What I have noticed is that over the years is when Green Hedges gets a new Headmaster, the school then asked for improvements and expansions. This has happened time and time again.

As a neighbor abutting two sides with the school playground and parking lot, I am TIRED of always wondering what the newest Head of School is planning.

In December 1999, The Mayor and Town Council approved "in reliance on assurances that there are no plans to increase enrollment, staff or facilities at Green Hedges School".

And yet, here we are again.

Another expansion.

More students.

More staff.

More lot coverage.

More playground noise and use.

More activities after 6 pm on weeknights and on the weekends.

Along with all of this comes at a cost to the abutting neighbors.

Did we know there was a school when we moved in? Yes we did, it was a small country school with approximately 125 students. Things have changed at Green Hedges in the almost 27 years we have lived here. More children, staff, cars, lights, evening programs and disruptions to time in the evening and on weekends.

The children are outside more and they are allowed to scream for hours at a time, worst is 10-2 pm and then again 3-530 pm. I love the sound of children playing as I was a teacher for about 15 years and have been involved in youth sports and Scouting as an administrator, parent, coach and Board of Directors.

I would like to see the school modernize their facilities, to keep their current footprint at 31%, staff and student ratio to remain the same, and to bring to Zoning Standards the buffers, sound attenuation, and light screening.

Neighbors should not have to bear the brunt of a school outgrowing their space. If the

school cannot fit their future at the current location, they should explore a different location.

Respectfully,
Elizabeth DiFrancisco
434 Knoll Street NW

Attachments 17–29 - Planning Commission Meeting – January 28, 2026 - Green Hedges School CUP Expansion and Site Plan Modifications

I respectfully submit the following written comments regarding the updated documents included as Attachments 17 through 29 for the January 28, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Because residents will not have the opportunity to speak at this meeting, it is important that these comments be included in the record.

Attachment 17 – Active Conditional Use Permit / Approved Uses and Conditions (January 21, 2026)

Attachment 17 is incomplete and omits several material CUP conditions that remain relevant to the School's operation. Missing conditions include:

1970

- No prepared parking spaces shall be developed along the entrance driveway between Nutley Street and the permanent parking areas.

1985

- No parking or standing permitted on Nutley Street.

1996

- Waiver from public street improvement requirements, in lieu of which Green Hedges was required to construct a storm drainage system along the northwesterly side of Windover Avenue connecting to an existing system near Nutley Street.
- The Kilmer House may be used as a residence only until Mrs. Kilmer vacates the premises; thereafter, use by Green Hedges is limited solely to administrative services.
- Additional escrow contribution of up to \$2,000 (not to exceed a total of \$7,000) for the Town of Vienna to construct a meandering asphalt sidewalk along Windover Avenue.
- Town Council approval of the site plan modification was based on statements from the Chair of the Board of Directors that there were no plans to increase enrollment, staff, or facilities beyond those approved in December 1997, **nor were any such additions likely to be approved in the future.**

2017

- Two parking spaces at 202 Lewis Street restricted to maintenance, custodial, and administrative personnel only; signage required.
- Two parking spaces at 202 Lewis Street to be screened with landscaping consistent with the approved Site Development Plan.
- Maximum lot coverage of 31.22%.

Additionally, a 1978 CUP condition required that the edge of the parking lot be screened with fast-growing trees and shrubbery. When neighbors later filed a complaint regarding the absence of this screening, they were advised that because the most recent site plan did not show screening, the CUP condition was no longer valid.

This raises a fundamental procedural question: How does the Town ensure that site plan submissions do not override existing CUP conditions? If a site plan conflicts with an active CUP condition, should that not trigger a formal CUP modification?

Attachment 18 – Nutley and Windover Demand and Capacity Analysis

The data presented in this attachment is confusing and internally inconsistent.

As presented, current drop-off and pick-up activity totals approximately:

- 107 vehicles on Nutley Street
- 52 vehicles on Windover Avenue

Total: 159 vehicles

Future projections show:

- 157 vehicles on Nutley Street
- 63 vehicles on Windover Avenue

Total: 220 vehicles (for 217 students)

This reflects a net increase of 61 vehicles in an already saturated residential neighborhood.

These figures also omit:

- Existing 42 FTE staff and future 50 FTE staff (who contribute to traffic even if not stacking)
- After-school program pickups, which add to overall traffic volumes

As such, this analysis understates actual traffic impacts.

Attachment 23 – Odin Feldman Pittleman Letter (January 23, 2026)

Noise Mitigation

The letter proposes the use of “Acoustiblok or similar material.”

- Who determines what qualifies as “similar”?
- What assurances exist that the selected material provides measurable sound attenuation?
- If noise impacts persist, what enforcement or recourse is available to neighbors?

The letter further states that sound attenuation will be applied to chain-link fencing adjacent to play areas, while areas with wood fencing will receive additional landscaping. If the intent is sound management, sound attenuation should be required consistently along all play areas, driveways, and parking lots, regardless of fence type.

Buffers

The requirement for a 15-foot buffer adjacent to exterior play areas should also apply to high-traffic areas, including driveways and parking lots. Vehicle noise and headlight glare materially impact adjacent homes. A solid wood fence does not block headlights.

Specific buffer deficiencies noted in the attachment include:

221 Nutley Street

- Northwest side buffer reduced to 3 feet due to a neighboring driveway and shed.

The shed could be relocated to achieve the required buffer.

If buffer reduction is recommended, a condition must require installation of the full code compliant buffer if that property (227 Nutley St – Headmasters residence) redevelop or change use in the future.

- Southeast side buffer reduced to 10 feet due to parking lot relocation.

The parking lot should be shifted back to achieve the required 15-foot buffer. Over two-thirds of this property fails to meet zoning requirements as proposed. Remove the basketball court to achieve the required buffer requirements.

435 Windover Avenue

- A 30-foot section does not meet buffer requirements due to stormwater management.
- A 20-foot section does not meet buffer requirements due to an existing shed.

The shed should be relocated to achieve the required buffer.

Stormwater

The letter states that drainage toward adjacent properties will not increase. Given documented neighbor complaints of flooding, the appropriate standard should be improvement, not merely “no increase.”

Enforceability

All representations in Attachment 23 must be converted into explicit, enforceable conditions. Neighbors have experienced prior deviations from approved plans, including the 2007 proposal to demolish the Stable, which instead received a second story in 2013. How will similar changes be prevented in the future, and who will enforce compliance?

As this is a concept plan, clarification is needed regarding who ensures that future site plans incorporate these commitments.

Finally, the information in Attachments 23, 27, and 28 is not consistent and should be reconciled.

Attachments 24 and 25 – Draft Proposed Development Conditions - TBD

These documents appear to have been prepared by the School’s attorney. Neighbors previously submitted a separate set of proposed conditions. We will review and respond to these drafts in a separate submission.

Attachment 26 – Revised Layout Exhibit

This document does not contain a “key” so it is difficult to understand the intent.

Attachments 27 and 28 – Buffers with Adjacent Neighbors

Attachments 23, 27 and 28 contain discrepancies when compared to each other. Additionally:

- Sound attenuation is required adjacent to play areas, driveways, and parking lots.
- These attachments do not recognize the residence at 213 Nutley Street NW.

Attachment 29 – Acoustic Fence / Buffer Example

The proposed buffer does not prevent active use. Based on existing conditions, children routinely play within buffer zones and along fence lines.

To ensure buffers function as passive zones, neighbors request:

- A fence adjacent to all play activity areas
- A full 15-foot dense buffer behind that fence
- A second fence at the property boundary

This can be achieved by installing a 6-foot wood fence with sound attenuation at all abutting property boundaries; install the buffer in front of that 6-foot wood fence with sound attenuation; and add an additional fence in front of that buffer. The additional fencing can be whatever the School chooses as long as it prohibits the children from entering the buffer zone.

Closing Comments

While the School has made improvements to its site plan modifications, the proposed expansion remains inconsistent with the interests of surrounding neighbors. Modernization of existing facilities can be achieved without increasing lot coverage or intensifying use.

Thank you for your consideration and for including these comments in the record.

Penny Oszak
221 Nutley St NW

NEIGHBOR RECOMMENDED CUP CONDITIONS

Should Green Hedges be granted a new Conditional Use Permit and/or Site Plan approval, the neighbors respectfully request the following conditions be included as binding and enforceable conditions of approval. These conditions are intended to mitigate ongoing and documented School impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

1. Kilmer House Use and Exterior

The Kilmer House shall be used solely for administrative office purposes. No exterior alterations, expansions, or modifications to the structure shall be permitted.

2. School Days and Hours of Operation

Green Hedges School operations shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except as otherwise expressly permitted under this CUP.

3. Maximum Enrollment and Staffing

The School shall not exceed 190 students and 42 full-time equivalent employees at any time.

4. Parking Maximum

The total number of parking spaces at 415 Windover Ave shall not exceed 63 spaces.

5. Lot Coverage

Total lot coverage shall not exceed 31.22 percent.

6. Project Phasing and Completion

The approved project may be constructed in phases; however, all phases shall be completed within three (3) years of final approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Town Council. Failure to complete all phases within three (3) years shall result in revocation of the Conditional Use Permit, and Green Hedges School shall be required to apply for an amendment to the CUP and Site Plan.

7. Corrective Drainage Improvements

Corrective grading to address existing drainage issues affecting the rear yards of 434 Knoll St and 416 Knoll St shall be completed by the applicant prior to issuance of the CUP, as determined necessary by the Department of Public Works and upon request of other abutting property owners.

8. Construction Traffic Timing Restrictions

Construction vehicles and equipment, other than passenger cars, vans, or pickup trucks, shall not enter or exit the site between 6:30–8:30 a.m. and 3:00–6:00 p.m. during the school year.

9. Construction Parking Restrictions

All construction vehicles and equipment shall be parked on-site or at an approved off-street location. No construction-related parking shall be permitted on Windover Ave, Lewis St, Nutley Str, or Knoll St.

10. Occupancy Limits

Maximum occupancy of any multi-purpose room, auditorium, gymnasium, or other communal space shall not exceed limits established by the Fire Marshall.

11. Noise Ordinance

All contractors and vendors shall be subject to the Town of Vienna noise ordinances, and the School shall be responsible for compliance. Repeated violations by contractors shall be deemed violations by the School.

12. Student Drop-Off and Vehicle Stacking

All student drop-off and pick up shall occur entirely on-site only. All vehicles shall enter the site and utilize designated on-site drop-off and pick-up areas. Vehicle stacking shall be accommodated exclusively on-site. Under no circumstances shall vehicles queue or stage off-site. If on-site stacking capacity is reached, vehicles shall be directed to continuously circulate until space becomes available. Green Hedges shall be solely responsible for enforcing this condition, including the provision of on-site staff or the hiring of police officers to manage traffic and ensure compliance.

13. On-Site Parking and Overflow Parking

All parking shall occur on-site within areas shown on the approved Site Plan. No overflow parking shall be permitted on surrounding streets, including Nutley St, Windover Ave, Knoll St, or Lewis St. Off-site parking shall be secured for overflow events or rentals, and staff shall be assigned to direct traffic accordingly.

14. Buffering and Landscaping

No modification or reduction of required buffers shall be permitted. All buffers shall comply fully with the applicable zoning code. Buffer areas shall include dense, year-round vegetative screening, consisting of a continuous barrier of evergreen trees to provide visual and noise attenuation throughout all seasons. Buffer plantings shall not be cut back, thinned, or removed except for maintenance or replacement of dead or diseased material, subject to Town approval. All buffer areas shall be designated as passive space. No playground use, circulation, storage, seating or programmed activity shall occur within buffer zones.

15. Fencing and Masonry Walls

A minimum six-foot (6') solid wood fence shall be installed along all property lines abutting residential uses. A minimum six-foot (6') masonry wall shall be required wherever driveways, loading areas, or parking areas directly abut residential properties. All fencing and masonry walls shall be permanently maintained in good condition. Any damaged, deteriorated, or removed fencing shall be promptly repaired or replaced to ensure continuous compliance with applicable screening and buffering requirements.

16. Rental Use Restrictions

Rental use shall be limited to internal school buildings only and shall not include any outdoor play areas. Rental hours shall be limited to Monday–Friday, 3:00–8:00 p.m., and Saturday, 9:00 a.m.–2:00 p.m. The campus shall be fully closed within one (1) hour of the last scheduled activity. Rental group size shall not exceed 20 participants. Rental

policies and one-time events shall be reviewed annually, or as needed, with abutting neighbors and the Director of Planning and Zoning.

17. The gymnasium and performance space or multi-purpose room shall be used exclusively for school-related activities. Rental, leasing, or use by outside organizations or individuals shall be prohibited. Use of the gymnasium shall be limited to:

- School days between 8am and 6pm
- School sponsored events only
- Maximum occupancy shall not exceed limits set by the Fire Marshall

18. Special Events and Extracurricular Activities

Special events and extracurricular activities shall be limited to 12 events per school calendar year. Weekday events shall conclude with campus closure by 9:00 p.m. Saturday events shall occur between 9:30 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., with campus closure by 3:00 p.m. Written mail and email notice of all such special events and extracurricular activities shall be provided to abutting neighbors at least two (2) weeks in advance.

19. Outdoor Play Areas

Outdoor recreational play areas shall not be located adjacent to residential property lines without required buffer separation and sound attenuation. Outdoor student activity shall be limited to designated areas shown on the approved Site Plan. Use of outdoor recreational play areas shall be limited to Monday–Friday, 8:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m. Use of outdoor areas shall be continuously monitored by staff at all times. No more than 40 children shall be outdoors at any one time during standard school days and hours. No lighting shall be permitted, and play areas shall be fenced.

20. Noise Controls

The use of outdoor amplification, including whistles, speakers, bullhorns, or PA systems shall be prohibited. The proposed six-foot wooden fence shall not substitute for required buffers and shall not be relied upon as the sole noise mitigation measure. Sound attenuation measures shall be installed along all play areas.

21. Mechanical Equipment and Noise Mitigation

Generators, HVAC systems, and mechanical equipment shall be located toward the interior of the site, with components placed indoors to the maximum extent feasible. All equipment shall comply with zoning noise and screening.

22. Solid Waste and Refuse Collection

Dumpsters and refuse areas shall be located as far from residential properties as practicable. Dumpsters and refuse areas shall be fully compliant with all zoning enclosure and screening standards.

23. Outdoor Lighting

Outdoor lighting shall not exceed 12 feet in height and shall be fully shielded and directed downward away from adjacent residential properties. No exterior lighting shall remain illuminated after 7pm, except for safety lighting.

24. Upon approval of this Conditional Use Permit and any associated Site Plan, all prior Conditional Use Permits, Site Plans, special exceptions, variances, approvals, and

associated conditions previously granted for Green Hedges School are hereby expressly superseded, replaced, and rendered null and void.

25. This Conditional Use Permit and associated Site Plan shall constitute the sole and controlling land use authorization governing the use, operation, development, and expansion of Green Hedges School. No prior approval, condition, or representation shall have any force or effect unless it is expressly incorporated into this Conditional Use Permit.

SHOULD rental use be allowed for the gymnasium and performance space or multi-purpose room, the following conditions should be included in the CUP:

1. Permitted Uses

Gymnasium use by third parties shall be limited to non-tournament, non-commercial recreational activities. Tournaments, camps, clinics, leagues, or multi-game events are expressly prohibited.

2. Hours of Operation

Third-party gymnasium rentals shall be permitted only between the hours of 6:00 p.m and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

3. Scheduling and Overlap

No gymnasium rental events shall be scheduled to overlap in time. A minimum 30-minute buffer shall be required between the conclusion of one rental event and the start of the next to prevent overlapping arrivals and departures.

4. Occupancy and Spectator Limits

Each rental event shall be subject to the following

- No evening rentals beyond 8:00 p.m. shall be permitted.
- A maximum of two (2) teams per event
- A maximum of twelve (12) players per team
- No more than fifty (35) spectators per event
- Total occupancy shall not exceed the number supportable by on-site parking only.

5. Parking Management

All vehicles associated with gymnasium rentals, including participants, staff, officials, and spectators, shall park exclusively on-site.

No on-street parking by rental patrons shall be permitted on adjacent residential streets.

The School shall post signage and actively monitor parking during all rental events to ensure compliance.

6. Traffic Control

The School shall provide on-site staff supervision during all rental events to manage vehicle circulation, prevent off-site queuing, and ensure safe ingress and egress.

If traffic congestion or unsafe conditions are observed by Town staff, law enforcement, or reported by residents, the Town may require additional traffic control measures or suspend rental activities.

7. Noise Controls

- No amplified sound, artificial noisemakers, or exterior loudspeakers shall be permitted.
- Gymnasium doors and windows shall remain closed during rental events, except for normal ingress and egress.
- No outdoor congregating or post-event socializing shall be permitted in parking areas.
- No evening rentals beyond 8:00 p.m. shall be permitted

8. Noise Compliance

All rental activities shall comply with the Town's noise ordinance at the property line.

Documented noise complaints related to gymnasium rentals shall constitute a violation of this Conditional Use Permit.

9. Monitoring and Reporting

The School shall maintain a log of all gymnasium rentals, including dates, times, number of participants, and estimated attendance.

This log shall be made available to the Town upon request.

10. Enforcement and Revocation

Failure to comply with any condition governing gymnasium rentals shall be grounds for:

- Immediate suspension of rental privileges, and/or
- Revocation or modification of the Conditional Use Permit following notice and hearing.

Murphy, Jennifer

From: avril garland [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 1:31 AM
To: Murphy, Jennifer; Levy, David; O'Brien, Kelly
Subject: Reject variance for building at Green Hedges School

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the members of the Vienna Planning Commission,

Please reject the variance for increased impermeable surface in Green Hedges School. The noise is temporary, but the loss of 54 mature trees is not. Our town is already losing far too many trees to development.

Who is going to benefit from this tree destruction? Certainly not the residents of the neighborhood who, every single one of them, must be furious and heartbroken. You are there to protect such residents against this kind of depredation. Please protect them!

If the school wants more indoor space, destroying trees is a poor solution. Perhaps add another story to existing buildings or seek to make more efficient use of the space they have.

Understandably, the residents in the neighborhood will be writing to you as this tree loss affects them directly, but please also consider those writing to you who have no skin in the game, who may never even set foot in the neighborhood: taking a chain saw to 54 mature trees which provide habitats to countless birds and other species of wildlife - I will still oppose that anywhere in my town. Where will the owls nest now? (Owls build nests in mature trees where there are cavities. Such cavities also shelter birds in freezing temperatures.)

When will our tree cutting stop? When will people stop considering treed areas as blank spaces on a map?

As responsible stewards of the Town, please do not permit private wants to override the public good. Town residents love their trees. Trees are beautiful and deliver to the Town many free ecological services including storm water control. Let's not feed them to the wood chipper.

Sincerely,

Avril Garland
917 Hillcrest Drive

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Edward Maillett [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 9:50 AM
To: Penny Oszak
Cc: COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; [REDACTED] Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Murphy, Jennifer; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Green Hedges School - Support for Attachments 17-29 for Planning Commission Meeting 01282026

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Morning, Jennifer,

Being Penny's neighbor and being directly impacted by the unbearable increase in concentrated traffic and non-neighbor parking in front of our homes all day during the weekend, Melissa and I wholeheartedly support Penny's rationale for not allowing Green Hedges to rent or allow their gymnasium facilities to be used for any activities not directly related to the direct operations of the school solely for their enrolled students during school hours.

Our residential neighborhood deserves our remaining sliver of residential calmness.

Fundamentally, we believe that Green Hedges wishes to further grow their facility is not compatible any longer with our neighborhood for the many reasons we have given to the Town in testimony.

Please add our support to Penny's letter on the Gym rental's negative impacts to our neighborhood for this week's Planning Commission meeting on 01282026.

Thank you.

Edward and Melissa Maillett
214 Nutley St., NW

On Jan 26, 2026, at 12:21 PM, Penny Oszak <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear All:

In the Planning Commission meeting on 01142026, it was stated that the Planning Commission would continue to accept written statements regarding the Green Hedges School CUP and Site Modifications proposals.

Please accept the attached written statement with respect to the updated Attachments 17-29 to the Agenda for the Planning Commission meeting on 01282026. Please ensure this document is added to the list of comments received for this week's Planning Commission meeting on 01282026.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Penny Oszak,
221 Nutley St NW

<PC 01282026 Meeting Statement.docx>

Murphy, Jennifer

From: tony zhang [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 11:56 AM
To: COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; [REDACTED]; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Murphy, Jennifer; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David; Penny Oszak [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Green Hedges School - Rebuttal Planning Commission Meeting 01142026
Attachments: Picnic table - 7 feet from the fence.jpeg; View from GH.jpeg; No Buffer Zone Playground.jpeg; In-ground Sandbox - 9 feet from the fence.jpeg; View From my House.jpeg

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Morning, Jennifer,,

I agree with the concerns raised by our neighbors and appreciate everyone's efforts to speak up.

I'd like to share a few photos I took on January 15, 2026, the day after the last meeting. Please take a look and help me understand where the "**15-foot buffer zone**" is that GH stated would be maintained next to the playground area bordering our homes.

As shown in the photos, a permanent sandbox has been installed approximately 9 feet from the fence, and a picnic table is placed within 15 feet on either side of the fence. This area is directly adjacent to my backyard. When weather permits, we regularly see many young children playing there. You can also see that I planted trees along this boundary on my side last year as I have no other choices.

Can we reasonably trust that the situation will improve as the school continues to grow? Especially as enrollment increases and more children use the space

Thank you for your attention,
Tony Zhang and Ying Huang
424 Knoll St, NW

On Monday, January 26, 2026 at 11:06:03 AM EST, Penny Oszak [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear All,

In the Planning Commission meeting on 01142026, it was stated that the Planning Commission would continue to accept written statements regarding the Green Hedges School CUP and Site Modifications proposals.

Please accept the attached written rebuttal to comments heard in the Planning Commission meeting held on 01142026. Please ensure this document is added to the list of comments received for this week's Planning Commission meeting on 01282026.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Penny Oszak,
221 Nutley St NW



14 feet









Murphy, Jennifer

From: Penny Oszak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 2:10 PM
To: COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; [REDACTED]; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Murphy, Jennifer; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Green Hedges School - Buffer Photos

<p>CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.</p>

Dear All-

I've attached a picture of the current buffer behind my fence line, where children play all the time, to show how a non-dense buffer does nothing to prevent children from the fence line.

To be fair, I found one small area along Knoll St that had what could be considered a dense buffer. Certainly not 15 foot dense, but an example of "dense". It also is attached.

Thank you for your consideration.





Best,

Penny Oszak
221 Nutley St NW

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Penny Oszak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 2:27 PM
To: COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; Lowther, Joseph; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Murphy, Jennifer; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Green Hedges School - Photo Evidence - Play Areas

<p>CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.</p>

Dear All -

Green Hedges School has stated they plan to disperse the play area along the rest of Knoll St. I had mentioned in my testimony that they already have. It used to be green space but over the years the School has taken over the green space. As you saw in Tony's emailed pictures, it's clearly used as play space. Attached are additional photos of the play space along Knoll St and the front of Windover Ave.

I've also included a photo of all the bolls that get left in the surrounding yards. My dogs think they are gifts from heaven.











Murphy, Jennifer

From: Penny Oszak [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 2:50 PM
To: COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; Lowther, Joseph; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Murphy, Jennifer; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Green Hedges School - Trash Receptacles - Photos

<p>CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.</p>

Dear All -

As you consider Green Hedges Shool's proposed application, please carefully consider where refuse storage will be located. The main refuse storage unit is located right next to an existing residential property. Additionally, there are several loose trash receptacles located by the Rice Arts Center. These should be located into a storage enclosure.

We respectfully request trash receptacles be relocated away from residential properties.

Thank you for your consideration.



Small
WONDER

NO
PARKING
STANDING
IN FIRE LANE





Regards,

Penny Oszak
221 Nutley St NW

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Sending for neighbor David Welch

I'm not sure who is compiling "letters" for the town, but if helpful, my thoughts are below...

To the Town of Vienna Planning Commission,

Thank you for the seriousness with which you have approached the Green Hedges requests for variances. I trust that the consistent, impassioned objections of every neighboring property (and many others) have made an impact in your assessment.

I'd like to offer an observation on the decision before you as you prepare for yet another discussion with the school.

To date, Green Hedges has framed this entire process - and their interactions with the Town - as a search for a site-plan that mitigates the impact of their intended increase in usage/growth. Because of this framing, most conversations elide the requests for growth that are embedded in their CUP request and focus almost exclusively on the site plan - buffers, drainage, lot coverage, etc. This is a choice, not a requirement...and it is completely backwards.

The framework for approval of the site plan should not **assume** growth and then try to find a plan that mitigates impact while "working for everyone" (a characterization I find entirely disingenuous). I understand Green Hedges intends to pursue this specific redevelopment plan only if the CUP adjustments are also approved, but each should be evaluated by the town separately, and on their own merits.

Thus, the starting point for evaluation of the site plan should be to find an option that fits the existing CUP, is consistent with zoning requirements, and meets their stated goal of *modernization*. I'm confident GH could modernize their facilities without any

adjustments to the current CUP. That the school has chosen not to (and instead assumed they will grow to fund it) was a choice, not a requirement.

Perhaps a plan to modernize without growth would force tradeoffs that lowered the overall cost of the project (and thereby eliminated the need for higher student/faculty counts)? Perhaps, instead, the school would need to raise tuition to fund such a plan. Either of these outcomes should be preferable to the Commission since both would center the costs and benefits of the development within the Green Hedges community, instead of shunting many new costs to neighbors.

Once again thank you for diligence. I appreciate the time you have taken on this matter to date and ask only that the Commission treat this request as you would any other - based on the holistic impact to the specific Vienna community in which it is being proposed.

David Welch
412 Knoll St NW

Murphy, Jennifer

From: David Welch [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 8:31 PM
To: Murphy, Jennifer; Levy, David; O'Brien, Kelly
Subject: Green Hedges proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Commissioners Murphy, Levy, and O'Brien,

Thank you for the seriousness with which you have approached the Green Hedges requests for variances. I trust that the consistent, impassioned objections of every neighboring property (and many others) have made an impact in your assessment.

I'd like to offer an observation on the decision before you as you prepare for yet another discussion with the school.

To date, Green Hedges has framed this entire process - and their interactions with the Town - as a search for a site-plan that mitigates the impact of the proposed increase in usage/growth on the neighbors. Because of this framing, most conversations elide the requests for growth that are embedded in their CUP request and focus almost exclusively on the site plan - buffers, drainage, lot coverage, etc. This is a choice, not a requirement...and it is completely backwards.

The framework for approval of the site plan should not *assume* growth and then try to find a plan that mitigates impact while "working for everyone" (a characterization I find entirely disingenuous). I understand Green Hedges intends to pursue this specific redevelopment plan only if the CUP adjustments are also approved, but each should be evaluated by the town separately and on their own merits.

Thus, the starting point for evaluation of the site plan should be to find an option that fits the existing CUP, is consistent with zoning requirements, and meets their stated goal of *modernization*. I'm confident the school could modernize their facilities without any adjustments to the current CUP. That the school has chosen not to (and instead assumed they will grow to fund it) was a choice, not a requirement.

Perhaps a plan to modernize without growth would force tradeoffs that lowered the overall cost of the project (and thereby eliminates the need for higher student/faculty counts). Perhaps, instead, the school would need to raise tuition to fund such a plan. Either of these outcomes should be preferable to the Commission since both would center the costs and benefits of the development within the Green Hedges community, instead of shunting many new costs to neighbors.

[As an aside, I would also suggest that any material site-plan changes - even without growth - would require the school to come into compliance with the current buffer and noise requirements where they are currently deficient. The idea that these "improvements" to come up to existing code should only be granted with an additional CUP variance does not fit with my understanding of the regulations]

Once again, thank you for diligence. I appreciate the time you have taken on this matter to date and ask only that the Commission treat this request as you would any other - based on the comprehensive impact to the specific Vienna community in which it is being proposed.

Once again, thank you for your consideration of these thoughts.

David Welch
412 Knoll St NW

Murphy, Jennifer

From: Katherine Welch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:48 AM
To: Murphy, Jennifer
Cc: Penny Oszak; COUNCIL; Town Manager; Levy, David; West, Andrea; O'Brien, Kelly; Morris, Jim; Briglia, Steven; Kenney, Steve; Plowgian, Jessica; Glassman, Matthew; Noble, Douglas; Lowther, Joseph; Clouatre, Lyndsey; Janickey, Daniel; Chakrapani, Deepa; Aimone, Keith; Miller, David; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Green Hedges School

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the Town of Vienna Planning Commission:

Thank you for the diligence and seriousness with which you have approached Green Hedges' applications for expansion and variances. Ahead of tonight's meeting, I would like to offer a summary of my current thoughts.

By my count, at least seven abutting households and four nearby (but not adjacent) households have been present at various meetings with Green Hedges and/or the Town throughout this process. Many of us have been to all meetings. Some at Green Hedges would like to reduce us to just "a small number of highly engaged neighbors." But we **are** the neighborhood. And since we first got word of the initial application, we have stood united and unwavering against any changes to Green Hedges' CUP (while supporting their need to modernize existing facilities).

I appreciate the forthrightness with which Green Hedges finally spoke at the Planning Commission meeting two weeks ago about the requested variances to the CUP being necessary to fund the expansion. But why do they need to expand? Why can't they just modernize (as is their stated goal) without building new structures? This is growth solely for the sake of growth. And their desire to not raise tuition and instead increase the number of students and staff places the burden of this expansion squarely on the shoulders of those of us who are neighbors of Green Hedges.

For the last year or so, as Green Hedges has worked to revise their original plan, I have worried that we might fall into the "well at least this plan is better" mindset. And it is. But we and you do not need to accept **any** proposed changes to the CUP. The choice needn't be the prior plan or this plan. Or this plan or a further modified plan. Those are false choices. Green Hedges can simply be told "no, not this time." Additionally, we do not view buffers as the concession they appear to be offered as. They are a *current requirement* the school is already obligated to address. None of this is to say, of course, that Green Hedges can't modernize within their existing CUP, but I continue to urge you all to listen to the neighborhood when we say, "enough is enough." Green Hedges is already bigger than they repeatedly promised they would be, and further growth is a burden only the neighbors will end up bearing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine Welch
412 Knoll St NW