



Proposed Amendments

Land Development Services



PC Land Use Process Review Committee
July 20, 2017

Drivers of the Amendments

- ❖ Fairfax First Initiative

 - ❖ Review and Revise Codes and Ordinances

- ❖ Strategic Plan to Facilitate the Economic Success of Fairfax County

 - ❖ Provide regulatory flexibility to help fill vacant retail and other spaces expeditiously and to incentivize users to locate in these spaces

Today's Presentation

- ❖ Focus on these amendments

 - ❖ Soils Map Update

 - ❖ Minor Site Plans

 - ❖ Parking Proposals

 - ❖ Non-Tyson's TSA's

 - ❖ Shared Parking

 - ❖ Transportation Demand Management

 - ❖ New General Parking Category

Soil Map Updates

❖ Proposed Amendment

- ❖ Updates soil boundaries
- ❖ Updates online soils maps
- ❖ Updates the classifications of some soils

❖ Regulatory Impact

- ❖ Increases accuracy of County's Soil Maps
- ❖ Reclassification to a lower class reduces burden of unnecessary soils tests on developers and homeowners submitting plans

Minor Site Plans

❖ Proposed Amendment

- ❖ Increases the allowable disturbed area and/or GFA to be considered exempt from requiring a site plan/minor site plan
- ❖ Reorganizes text for clarity

❖ Regulatory Impact

- ❖ Expedites the land development process by expanding the exemptions for site plans/minor site plans.

Parking – Non-Tyson's Transit Station Areas

- ❖ Provide lower parking rates in the transit station areas thereby eliminating the need for reductions.

Rationale

- ❖ It is generally recognized that parking demand near metro stations is less than demand for similar uses without direct access to the metro.
- ❖ All of the transit stations are existing or in design/construction stage with funding.
- ❖ Proposal is in the Zoning Ordinance work program was recently presented to the Board.

Parking – Non-Tyson's Transit Station Areas

Proposed rates for multi-family:

<u>Bedrooms</u>	<u>Spaces per unit</u>
0-1	1.3
2	1.5
3+	1.6

Proposed rates for office:

<u>Distance from Transit Station</u> <u>sq. ft. GFA</u>	<u>Spaces per 1,000</u>
0-1/4 mile	2.0
> 1/4 mile	2.3

Shared Parking

- ❖ Allow for approval of reductions of up to 20% - 30% by the Director of LDS in certain situations. Would not be available for active zoning cases.

Rationale

- ❖ Determining peak parking demand based on the timing of parking demand for different uses rather than a simple sum of code required parking is basically a mathematical exercise.

Transportation Demand Management

- ❖ Eliminate parking reductions based on TDM programs and replace it with a more general reduction provision.

Rationale

- ❖ There is no generally accepted method for correlating trip reductions with reductions in parking demand.
- ❖ Current provisions require that the applicant demonstrate how parking would be provided if the TDM program doesn't result in the projected reduction in parking demand. This is necessary because of the speculative nature of these reductions but is problematic.

General Parking Reduction

- ❖ Add a provision to allow for Board approval of reductions that do not qualify for consideration under more specific types of reductions.

Rationale

- ❖ Some reductions don't fit neatly into the normal categories of reductions and couldn't otherwise be considered regardless of merit.

Additional Amendments

- ❖ Hydraulic Grade Line – updated requirements match VDOT
- ❖ Maintenance Standards – also required on plans
- ❖ Debris Control Devices- updated trash rack design
- ❖ Minor Fee Edits – to align with practices
- ❖ New E-plan Submission & associated Fees
- ❖ Subdivision Provisions- updated to align State Code regarding need for preliminary plan



Questions?