PRINT CLOSE

2011-2012 Area Plans Review Retrospective Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning

Results Overview

zoomerang

Date: 6/15/2011 7:29 AM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

The following survey contains 28 questions. The questions ask about your experience with the most recent Area Plans Review (APR) cycle, which includes the 2008-2009 North County and 2009-2010 South County processes, and about planning in general within Fairfax County. The survey will be used to gain preliminary feedback on the current APR process and to improve future planning efforts in Fairfax County. Click "Submit" to enter survey.

Part I: Demographic/Background Questions The following questions are demographic questions related to participant involvement in the most recent APR cycle.

1. What was your primary role in 2008-2009 North County and/or the 2009-2010 South County Area Plans Review process?

Property owner as nominator	8	6%
Agent for the property owner	11	9%
Task force member	27	21%
County staff	22	17%
Elected/appointed official or staff	6	5%
Interested community member	33	26%
Other, please specify	20	16%
Total	127	100%

2. In which Supervisor District(s) did you primarily participate during the 2008-2009 North County APR cycle and/or the 2009-2010 South County APR cycle?

Hunter Mill	7	6%
Sully	11	9%
Dranesville	7	6%
Providence	20	16%
Mason	16	13%
Braddock	3	2%
Springfield	12	9%
Lee	15	12%
Mount Vernon	49	39%
I did not participate in the last APR cycle	20	16%
Not Applicable	5	4%

3. Do you consider yourself to be an active participant in the land use process outside of APR?

Yes	87	69%
No	31	24%
Other, please specify	9	7%
Total	127	100%

4. Was the most recent APR cycle (North and/or South County) your first experience with APR or did you participate in past cycles?

First experience	38	30%
Past cycles	70	55%
I did not partipate in any cycles.	17	13%
Other, please specify	2	2%
Total	127	100%

5. Rank your usage of the following sources of accessing information about the APR process (1= did not use at all and 5= used frequently).

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
DPZ website	20 16%	17 13%	12 9%	25 20%	43 34%	10 8%
Community or HOA meetings	23 18%	15 12%	16 13%	27 21%	26 20%	20 16%
Public hearings	22 17%	9 7%	23 18%	22 17%	35 28%	16 13%
DPZ mailings	40 31%	19 15%	15 12%	13 10%	19 15%	21 17%
DPZ email listserv	37 29%	8 6%	23 18%	19 15%	22 17%	18 14%
Magisterial District Supervisor's office	32 25%	13 10%	21 17%	23 18%	19 15%	19 15%

DPZ printed material	26 20%	15 12%	19 15%	20 16%	34 27%	13 10%

Part II: Questions about the existing APR process The following questions are based on changes to the process that have been made since 2007, within the 2008-2009 North County and 2009-2010 South County APR cycle. The questions are based on specific parts of the APR process and are not intended to be a comprehensive review of the entire process.

Community Participation and Information Awareness

6. To conduct community outreach and interaction, the county held meetings between staff and nominators prior to nomination submission, broadcasted programs on Channel 16, and sent out notification letters to neighbors of the nominated properties. How do you think these efforts affected the process?

The efforts improved the process.	54	43%
The efforts did not affect on the process.	11	9%
The efforts slowed down the process.	3	2%
I was not aware of any of these efforts.	42	33%
Not Applicable	7	6%
Other, please specify	9	7%
Total	126	100%

7. The county increased the amount of information related to APR on the Department of Planning and Zoning website with the clickable map of nominations, task force meeting schedules, and publication of staff reports prior to task force meetings, and real-time status information about the nominations. Did these efforts improve access to information?

Yes	96	76%
No	15	12%
Not Applicable	16	13%
Total	127	100%

8. A screening process at the beginning of each of the APR processes worked to remove or defer into a special study any nominations that were not consistent with adopted county policy, did not have adequate justification, or involved large land areas or highly complex issues. Do you think that any of the nominations that were reviewed should have been removed or deferred into a special study?

Yes	32	25%
No	35	28%
Don't know	56	44%
Not Applicable	3	2%
Total	126	100%

9. The intent of the APR process is to provide an opportunity for anyone to participate in Fairfax County's land use planning process. Do you think the current process achieves this goal? Please explain.

Yes	70	55%
No	42	33%
Not Applicable	4	3%
Please Explain:	51	40%

APR Guidelines and Process

10. Staff provided impact analyses of important issues related to land use, transportation, schools, parks, etc. at the task force meetings and in the preliminary staff report. Was sufficient information given at the task force meeting to make an informed recommendation of the nomination?

Yes	77	61%
No	22	17%
Not Applicable	28	22%
Total	127	100%

11. Was there enough time for staff and the nominator to present the nomination and impact analyses at the task force meetings?

Yes	63	50%
No	37	29%
Not Applicable	27	21%
Total	127	100%

12. Were members of the community who were not part of the task force permitted to participate at the task forces that you attended? Please explain, if necessary.

Yes, the community was allowed to participate	82	66%
No, the community was not allowed to participate	12	10%
Not Applicable	30	24%
Please Explain:	16	13%

13. Are you aware of a standing district land use committee that reviews Plan amendments, apart from the APR task force?

Yes	58	46%

No		68	54%
Please Explain		13	10%

14. If you are aware of another standing land use committee that reviews nominations apart from the APR task force, would you be able to attend the committee's meeting to express your opinion?

Yes		49	40%
No		14	11%
Don't know		33	27%
Not Applicable		27	22%
	Total	123	100%

15. The nomination form was modified to elicit a better description of what the proposed development would look like (land use, square feet, building type, height, and parking). Did this change result in a clearer vision of the proposal?

Yes		81	65%
No		19	15%
Not Applicable		25	20%
	Total	125	100%

16. The APR guidelines prohibit changes to the character, increasing the intensity, and expanding the geographic boundary of the nominations that were accepted. Should any of these changes be allowed? Please explain.

Yes		52	41%
No		51	40%
Not Applicable		19	15%
Please Explain:		52	41%

17. In some cases, up to two different land use scenarios were submitted as part of a nomination for mixed-use. Did this approach provide adequate flexibility in the formation of the nomination?

Yes		65	52%
No		21	17%
Not Applicable		38	31%
	Total	124	100%

18. Deadlines for clarifying the nomination during the nomination acceptance period and for withdrawing a nomination were established. Did these deadlines positively or negatively affect the process? Please explain.

Positively		71	57%
Negatively		13	10%
Not Applicable		37	30%
Please Explain:		24	19%

Part II: Broader questions about comprehensive planning The section contains multiple-choice questions about planning in general terms.

Community Involvement

20. When should the community first be involved in the planning process?

At the beginning of planning process, when issues are identified.		81	64%
Once issues are identified and recommendations need to be made.		34	27%
After recommendations and preliminary plans are made.		2	2%
The community should not be involved.		0	0%
Other, please specify		9	7%
	Total	126	100%

21. How should the community be involved in the planning process?

Representatives of community organizations and neighborhood associations should be appointed or invited to a task force or working group to assist in the development and review of the Plan recommendations.		60	48%
Anyone who is interested in the planning process should be able to assist in the development and review of the Plan.		53	42%
Other, please specify		13	10%
	Total	126	100%

Process for Comprehensive Plan Review

23. The review of the Comprehensive Plan should be based on:

Political boundaries, such as Supervisor District	26	21%
Planning area boundaries, such as Planning Areas, Planning Districts, and Community Planning Sectors	29	23%
Distinct areas, such as urban centers, suburban neighborhoods, revitalization areas, transit station areas, and community business centers	50	40%
Other, please specify	19	15%
Total	124	100%

24. How often should review of the Comprehensive Plan take place?

On a rolling basis whenever an issue is raised about its guidance	39	31%
On a regular cycle whether an issue is raised or not.	71	57%
Other, please specify	14	11%
Total	124	100%

25. If you are familiar with past Fairfax County planning efforts, which type of planning process results in more thorough analyses and thoughtful conclusions about proposed Plan changes?

Area Plans Review (APR)	27	22%
"Out of Turn" Plan Amendments	17	14%
Special Studies	36	29%
I am not familiar with Fairfax County planning efforts	31	25%
Other, please specify	13	10%
Total	124	100%

26. Which type of planning process results in more timely review of proposed Plan changes?

Area Plans Review (APR)	32	26%
"Out of Turn" Plan Amendments	38	31%
Special Studies	12	10%
I am not familiar with Fairfax County planning efforts	25	20%
Other, please specify	17	14%
Total	124	100%

27. Which statement best represents your view on how the Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed:

At a parcel level (single or multiple parcels)	18	15%
As part of an identified study area	52	42%
At a Supervisor District level	28	23%
For County as a whole	14	11%
Other, please specify	12	10%
Total	124	100%

© 2011 Copyright MarketTools Inc. All Rights Reserved. | Privacy Policy | Terms Of Use