



BRAC

* NOMINATION FORM
Owen Land, LLC, David J. Brown,
Rock Stone and Sand Yard, Inc.,
Berry & Sons, LLC, Yukon Builders, Inc.,
Robert L. Arnold and Carolyn G. Arnold,
Charles F. Sweeny, Jack T. Elmore Jr. and
Melissa L. Huston

TYPE OR PRINT RESPONSES IN BLACK INK
Incomplete forms will not be accepted for review and will be returned to the nominator. Staff reserves the
right to correct errors in street address, tax map number, acreage or current Plan designation. Be sure to
attach required map and original certified mail receipts as proof of property owner notification.

PART 1. NOMINATOR/AGENT INFORMATION

Name: Lynne J. Strobel, Agent for * Daytime Phone: (703) 528-4700

Address: 2200 Clarendon Boulevard, 13th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Nominator E-mail Address: lstrobel@arl.thelandlawyers.com

Signature of Nominator (NOTE: There can be only one nominator per nomination):
Lynne J. Strobel

Signature of Owner(s) if applicable: (NOTE: Attach an additional sheet if necessary. Each owner of a nominated parcel must either sign the
nomination or be sent a certified letter.) See attached

Anyone signing on behalf of a business entity must state the relationship to that organization below or on an attached page.
See attached

THIS BOX FOR STAFF USE ONLY
Date Received: 3/28/08
Date Accepted: 4-11-08 CAR
Planning District:
Special Area:

PART 2. GENERAL INFORMATION

Check appropriate supervisor district: [] Lee [X] Mount Vernon

as per 4/30: Total number of parcels nominated: 168 12.6 ac 548,430.3 square feet as per 4/30

Total aggregate size of all nominated parcels (in acres and square feet): 36.92 acres 1,609,077 square feet

Is the nomination a Neighborhood Consolidation Proposal? [] Yes [X] No

Are the parcels within the Approved Sewer Service Area? [X] Yes [] No

PART 3: PROPERTY INFORMATION - Attach either the Property Information Table found at the end of this application form or a separate
8 1/2 x 11 page (landscape format) identifying all the nominated parcels utilizing the format as shown in the Table found at the end of this application.

All subject property owners must be sent written notice of the nomination by certified mail unless their signature(s) appears in Part 1 (above).

IMPORTANT NOTE: Any nomination submitted without originals or copies of all the postmarked certified mail receipt(s) and copies of each
notification letter and map will not be accepted.

PART 4: CURRENT AND PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

See Section IV of the Guide to the 2008 BRAC APR for instructions.

a. CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT for nominated property: Use the Plan on the Web (www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/) for your citation.
It is the most current version: Lorton-South Route 1 Suburban Center-Land Unit F-2- Industrial uses
up to .35 with an option for industrial/flex uses up to .25 FAR.

b. CURRENT PLAN MAP DESIGNATION: Alternative Uses

c. CURRENT ZONING DESIGNATION: I-5, I-6 and R-1

d. PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: (NOTE: The proposal you submit with your nomination is the proposal that is to be presented to the task force and will be the subject of their consideration and vote). Industrial uses in accordance with existing zoning with an option for mixed-use development up to 2.5 FAR.

e. DESCRIBE what development under the new plan would look like. (What uses? Type of buildings? Building heights? Surface or structured parking? Typical unit size?) Mixed-use development including office, hotel, residential and retail uses with a combination of structured and surface parking and heights up to 200 feet.

f. NON-RESIDENTIAL: Check the appropriate use: Office Retail Govt/Institutional

Industrial Open Space
 Mixed Use (specify uses in table)

1,371,076 square feet (as per 4/30)
~~4,022,692 square feet~~

g. TOTAL Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Proposed: 2.5 TOTAL Gross Square Feet: 1,371,076

Categories	Percent of Total FAR	Square feet
Office/Hotel	70%	2,815,884 959,753.025
Retail and support services	10%	402,269 137,107.575
Public Facility, Govt & Institutional		
Private Recreation/Open Space		
Industrial		
Residential*	20%	804,539 274,215 = 274 du
TOTAL	100%	4,022,692 1,371,076

*If residential is a component, provide the approximate number and size of each type of dwelling unit proposed in the chart below based on the approximate square footage.

h. RESIDENTIAL COMPONENT (Circle the appropriate density range proposed and complete the table to the right):

- .1 - .2 du/ac (5-10 acre lots) 5 - 8 du/ac
- .2 - .5 du/ac (2-5 acre lots) 8 - 12 du/ac
- .5 - 1 du/ac (1 - 2 acre lots) 12 - 16 du/ac
- 1 - 2 du/ac 16 - 20 du/ac
- 2 - 3 du/ac 20+ (specify 10 unit density range)
- 3 - 4 du/ac _____
- 4 - 5 du/ac

Residential Unit Types			
Unit Type	Number of Units	Unit Size (sq ft)	Total Square Feet
Single Family Detached			
Townhouse			
Low-Rise Multifamily (1-4 stories)			
Mid-Rise Multifamily (5-8 stories)			
High-Rise Multifamily (9+ stories)	274 804	1,000	274,215 804,538
TOTAL:	804 274	1,000	804,538 274,215

changes as per 4/30/08
e-mail from nominator

PART 5: MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

Attach a map clearly outlining in black ink the property of the proposed Plan amendment. The map must be no larger than 8½ x 11 inches and clearly legible. Maps in color will not be accepted.

PART 6: JUSTIFICATION

Each nomination must conform to the Policy Plan and must be related to the changes anticipated due to BRAC. Provide a written justification that explains why your nomination should be considered BRAC-related, based on the questions below (two-page limit):

- a. Why should this proposal be considered BRAC-related?
- b. How would the proposed changes serve the new employees and residents of Fort Belvoir and the surrounding area?
- c. What needs created by the BRAC directives does this proposal fulfill?
- d. How could the proposed uses address the transportation networks impacted by the changes anticipated in the area?
- e. What adverse impacts might be created and how would they be off-set?
- f. What is your anticipated timeframe for development, if the proposed uses were to be approved?

All completed nomination forms must be submitted between March 3 and March 28, 2008 to:



Fairfax County Planning Commission Office
Government Center Building, Suite 330
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5505

PROPERTY INFORMATION TABLE

All subject property owners must be sent written notice of the nomination by certified mail unless their signature appears in Part 1 of this application. If you are required to notify more than one property owner, you must provide all the information requested below.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Any nomination submitted without originals or copies of all the postmarked certified mail receipt(s) and copies of each notification letter and map will not be accepted.

Tax Map Number	Name of Property Owner	Street Address of Parcel	Mailing Address of Owner	Parcel Size in Acres	Signature of Owner or Certified Receipt Number
113-4 ((2)) A1	Maurice C. Harbin, TR	10201 Richmond Highway Lorton, Virginia 22079	8109 Dayton Street Lorton, Virginia 22079	0.73	7007 3020 0000 6578 0357
113-4 ((2)) A2	Maurice C. Harbin, TR	N/A	10201 Richmond Highway Lorton, Virginia 22079	4.2	7007 3020 0000 6578 0319
113-2 ((3)) B1	Owen Land LLC	10138 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	P. O. Box 1595 Lorton, Virginia 22199	1.5	N/A, See Part 1
113-4 ((2)) B3	JR Land LLC	10139 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	P. O. Box 1423 8474 Terminal Road Newington, Virginia 22122	2.2	7007 3020 0000 6573 4572
113-2 ((3)) C1	Owen Land LLC	10132 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	P. O. Box 1595 Lorton, Virginia 22199	2.1	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) C3	David J. Brown	10133 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	10701 Harley Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	1.75	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) C4	Rock Stone and Sand Yard Inc.	10131 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	9824 Richmond Highway Lorton, Virginia 22079	1.8	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) D1	Robert J. Balwinski Vera M. Balwinski	10124 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	7511 Devries Drive Lorton, Virginia 22079	1.8	7007 3020 0000 6578 0326

PROPERTY INFORMATION TABLE

All subject property owners must be sent written notice of the nomination by certified mail unless their signature appears in Part 1 of this application. If you are required to notify more than one property owner, you must provide all the information requested below.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Any nomination submitted without originals or copies of all the postmarked certified mail receipt(s) and copies of each notification letter and map will not be accepted.

Tax Map Number	Name of Property Owner	Street Address of Parcel	Mailing Address of Owner	Parcel Size in Acres	Signature of Owner or Certified Receipt Number
113-2 ((3)) D2	Charles F. Sweeny	10125 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	1933 Franklin Avenue McLean, Virginia 22101	3.4	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) E3	Yukon Builders Inc.	10117 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	15024 Dumfries Road Manassas, Virginia 20112	1.0	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) E5	Gerald D. and Brenda Cooper	10118 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	2439 Research Court Woodbridge, Virginia 22192	0.9	7007 3020 0000 6578 0333
113-2 ((3)) E6	Berry & Sons LLC	10116 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	15024 Dumfries Road Manassas, Virginia 20112	0.9	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) F1	David J. Brown	10110 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	10701 Harley Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	1.6	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) F2	Jack T. Elmore, Jr. and Melissa L. Huston	10109 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	2811 P Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007	4.7	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((3)) G1	Robert L. Arnold, Jr. and Carolyn G. Arnold	10101 Giles Run Road Lorton, Virginia 22079	4 Rome Dome Court Stafford, Virginia 22556	4.4	N/A, See Part 1
113-2 ((1)) 68	Robert L. Arnold, Jr. and Carolyn G. Arnold	10017 Richmond Highway Lorton, Virginia 22079	4 Rome Dome Court Stafford, Virginia 22556	3.9	N/A, See Part 1

BRAC Area Plans Review

Tax Map: 113-2 ((1)) ~~68~~, 113-2 ((3)) B1, C1, ~~C3~~, ~~C4~~, D1, D2, ~~E3~~, E5, ~~68~~ (40%)
E6, F1, ~~F2~~, ~~G1~~, 113-4 ((2)) ~~A1~~, ~~A2~~, ~~B3~~ 50% of G1;

Nominator: Lynne J. Strobel, agent for Owen Land, LLC, David J. Brown, Rock Stone and Sand Yard, Inc., Berry & Sons, LLC, Yukon Builders, Inc., Robert L. Arnold and Carolyn G. Arnold, Charles F. Sweeny, Jack T. Elmore Jr. and Melissa L. Huston

^(40%)
The nominated property is identified among the Fairfax County tax map records as 113-2 ((1)) ~~68~~, 113-2 ((3)) B1, C1, ~~C3~~, ~~C4~~, D1, D2, ~~E3~~, E5, E6, F1, ~~F2~~, ~~G1~~, 113-4 ((2)) ~~A1~~, ~~A2~~, ~~B3~~ (the "Subject Property") and is located within Area IV of the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan (the "Plan"). More specifically, the Subject Property is part of the Lower Potomac Planning District. The Subject Property is comprised of approximately ~~36.93~~ acres and located on the east side of Richmond Highway, east of I-95, and northeast of Fairfax County's border with Prince William County. In the Lower Potomac Planning District, the Subject Property is included in the Lorton-South Route 1 Suburban Center, within Land Unit F-2. The area is generally planned for industrial uses up to .35 FAR with an option for industrial/flex uses up to .25 FAR. The Subject Property is zoned to the I-5, I-6 and R-1 Districts and is developed with heavy industrial uses. The proposed nomination would permit a mixed-use town center comprised of office, retail, and residential uses up to a 2.5 FAR. ^{(G1(50%))}

12.6 ac
The location of the Subject Property is well-suited to address the development needs of BRAC and revitalize the southern portion of Richmond Highway. The BRAC directives will result in an influx of military, civilian, and contractor employees to the area. The proposed nomination will provide convenient office space, hotel rooms, housing, and support retail for the increased workforce and for visitors to the area. The Subject Property is an approximately ten-minute drive from both Ft. Belvoir and the Engineer Proving Ground ("EPG"). Additionally, the Subject Property has direct access to Richmond Highway, convenient access to I-95 and service by Richmond Highway bus service. Based on the Subject Property's access to existing transportation networks, transportation impacts on surrounding areas will be minimal. Any increased traffic may be mitigated with transportation demand management ("TDM") strategies that may include carpooling and staggered work hours, and shuttle service to the Lorton Virginia Railway Express ("VRE") station.

Commercial development on the Subject Property will revitalize an aging industrial corridor in the southeastern portion of Fairfax County without negatively impacting the surrounding area. Located on Richmond Highway, the Subject Property is surrounded by industrial uses to the north, east, and west, and by vacant land to the south, thus the proposed development will have no visual impacts on surrounding uses. The Subject Property and the surrounding area have long been developed with heavy industrial uses. As Fairfax County becomes increasingly urbanized, such heavy industrial uses are no longer compatible with the surrounding area, particularly with the

recent redevelopment in the northeastern area of Prince William County. Located in the southernmost portion of Fairfax County, the Subject Property is a highly visible gateway into Fairfax County. This nomination envisions a high-quality mixed-use town center that will create a more attractive appearance and foster a sense of place in the Richmond Highway corridor. More specifically, the nomination proposes office, retail, and residential uses that will provide a live, work, play environment and allow a vibrant synergy of uses. As part of the town center concept, the Subject Property is also uniquely situated to provide a Fairfax County visitor's center. A visitor's center would allow new residents and visitors an introduction to a historic part of Fairfax County. A visitor's center might provide information on Gunston Hall, Mount Vernon, and the new Lorton Arts Facility.

The development of the Subject Property will be market-driven. The existing heavy industrial uses will continue as viable uses. Upon the demand for office, hotel, residential, and support retail services in the area, plans will be prepared for higher intensity development. The proposed town center use will require a rezoning application, followed by site plan approval. The rezoning application may take up to a year to process. Site plans will then be prepared for portions of the development, which will be constructed in phases. Thus, the nominator anticipates that construction will begin on the first buildings no earlier than Fall, 2011.

In conclusion, the proposed mixed-use town center will provide office space for the influx of additional civilian employees and contractors associated with the BRAC process, housing in proximity to Ft. Belvoir, and retail uses which will serve the additional population in Fairfax County and complement the office and residential uses. A hotel use will be a valuable service for visitors to Ft. Belvoir and EPG. Transportation impacts will be accommodated using the Subject Property's access to major road networks combined with TDM strategies. The proposal will have no visual impacts on abutting properties and will serve as a catalyst for revitalization in the southern Richmond Highway corridor. The proposed Plan nomination will be a valuable addition to an aging industrial corridor and will fulfill the development needs generated by the BRAC process.

{A0138500.DOC / 1 BRAC APR Justification -- EAST 005610 000002}

Gardner, Marianne

From: Mariska, Sara [smariska@arl.thelandlawyers.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2008 2:17 PM
To: Gardner, Marianne
Cc: Van Allen, Cheryl L.; Hardy, Sara Robin; Mason, Lindsay A.; Strobel, Lynne J.; Ty@chambersconstructioncompany.com; Bob White
Subject: RE: PC 2008-036 withdrawal
Attachments: 4813_001.pdf

Marianne,

The site now consists of eight (8) parcels, two of which are only partially included. For parcels 113-2 ((1)) 68, forty percent (40%) of the parcel remains nominated. For parcel 113-2 ((3)) G1, fifty percent (50%) of the parcel remains nominated. The total revised site area is 548,430.3 square feet or 12.6 acres.

The updated GFA for a 2.5 FAR is as follows:

Office = 70% = 959,753.025 square feet
 Retail = 10% = 137,107.575 square feet
 Residential = 20% = 274,215.15 square feet = 274 units
 TOTAL = 1,371,075.75

I have attached a tax map with the revised site area outlined in black. Please let me know if there are any further questions.

Thanks,
 Sara

From: Gardner, Marianne [mailto:Marianne.Gardner@fairfaxcounty.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2008 1:13 PM
To: Mariska, Sara
Cc: Van Allen, Cheryl L.; Hardy, Sara Robin; Mason, Lindsay A.
Subject: RE: PC 2008-036 withdrawal

Sara - Thank you for the information. We will update the nomination to reduce the site size, and revise the GFA to reflect a 2.5 FAR on the smaller site. Please confirm that this understanding is correct.
 Thank you, Marianne

From: Mariska, Sara [mailto:smariska@arl.thelandlawyers.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2008 12:40 PM
To: Gardner, Marianne; Van Allen, Cheryl L.
Cc: Ty@chambersconstructioncompany.com; Bob White; Strobel, Lynne J.
Subject: PC 2008-036

Marianne and Cheryl,

Please withdraw the following parcels from the nomination that is currently identified by PC 2008-036:

BRAC# 08-IV-4LP
Page 9 of 13

4/30/2008

113-2 ((3)) C3, C4, D2, E3, E4, F2

113-4 ((2)) A1, A2, B3

Please do not hesitate to call me with questions.

Thanks,

Sara V. Mariska, Esq.
WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY, EMRICH & WALSH, P.C.
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, 13th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201
703-528-4700 Ext. 5419
703-525-3197 (Fax)
smariska@arl.thelandlawyers.com

From: Gardner, Marianne [mailto:Marianne.Gardner@fairfaxcounty.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2008 1:13 PM
To: Mariska, Sara
Cc: Mariska, Sara ; Chilton, Keith; Van Allen, Cheryl L.; Osei-Kwadwo, Gilbert; Baik, Bo
Subject: RE: Properties within the Sewer Service Area

Good afternoon Sara:

Attached for your information is the adopted Plan text and staff report you requested. Please be aware that even if the properties were subject to the 400' rule, they would still be ineligible for nomination. The 2008 BRAC APR Guide to Participation (excerpt below) excludes properties outside the sewer service area. Properties within the 400' rule area are not a part of the approved sewer service area. The ability to extend sewer service under this provision is conditioned upon meeting specific conditions and is not automatic. These conditions are stated in Keith Chilton's e-mail below. As we discussed yesterday, we look forward to hearing your client's decision to withdraw the nomination or reduce the area of the property nominated to that which falls within the sewer service area as soon as possible and by next Wednesday at the latest. Please call me if you have any questions.

Thank you, Marianne

Marianne Gardner, Chief
Policy and Plan Development Branch

Department of Planning and Zoning
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 730
Fairfax, Virginia 22035

703.324.1245
marianne.gardner@fairfaxcounty.gov

Form the Guide to Participation:

'Approved Sewer Service Area: On the nomination form, check the appropriate box confirming that the land area being nominated is within the Approved Sewer Service Area. Only areas within the

BRAC# 08-IV-4LP
Page 10 of 13

4/30/2008

Approved Sewer Service Area will be eligible for consideration in the 2008 BRAC-related APR process.

From: Mariska, Sara [mailto:smariska@arl.thelandlawyers.com]
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2008 9:51 AM
To: Chilton, Keith; Van Allen, Cheryl L.
Cc: Osei-Kwadwo, Gilbert; Baik, Bo
Subject: RE: Properties within the Sewer Service Area

All,

Based on my discussion with Bo, he asked that I e-mail additional questions to the group. By way of background, I am representing a group of property owners in the Richmond Highway area that have submitted applications to change the Comprehensive Plan designation of their property. Parcels that are not within the approved sewer service area are not eligible for nomination.

It has been my clients' understanding that that the parcels to the east of Giles Run Road were in the approved sewer service area because they were not aware that the 400 foot rule does not apply in this area. They are now interested in understanding why the 400 foot rule does not apply. Specifically, when did the Board of Supervisors make this decision and what were the reasons for not extending the approved sewer service area beyond Giles Run Road?

I am also trying to understand the development implications for parcels that are only partially within the approved sewer service area. How does this affect the ability of the parcels to be developed?

I am happy to discuss by phone or in person.

Thanks,
 Sara

From: Chilton, Keith [mailto:Keith.Chilton@fairfaxcounty.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2008 11:33 AM
To: Van Allen, Cheryl L.
Cc: Mariska, Sara; Osei-Kwadwo, Gilbert; Baik, Bo
Subject: RE: Properties within the Sewer Service Area

Cheryl,

I hope the attached map will clarify the location of the Approved Sewer Service Area (ASSA) boundary for this area. The green area shown on the map is inside the ASSA.

Please note that the 400 Foot Rule does not apply to the Sewer Service Area Boundary where identified (on the map) by red stars. No sanitary sewer facilities may be extended beyond the Boundary line in this area.

In areas where the 400 Foot Rule is applicable, sanitary sewer facilities may extend up to 400 feet beyond the service area boundary line - provided that manhole depth does not exceed 12' and no portion of existing or proposed structures may utilize a pump to achieve service.

If you have additional questions, please give me a call.

BRAC# 08-IV-4LP
Page 11 of 13

4/30/2008

Keith H. Chilton

Wastewater Planning & Monitoring Division
Department of Public Works & Environmental Services
(703) 324-5840 (703) 324-3946 FAX
Keith.Chilton@fairfaxcounty.gov

From: Van Allen, Cheryl L.
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2008 2:46 PM
To: Chilton, Keith; Baik, Bo
Cc: 'smariska@arl.thelandlawyers.com'
Subject: FW: Properties within the Sewer Service Area

Good afternoon,

I am reviewing a BRAC APR nomination that borders on the Approved Sewer Service Area. Apparently, the nominator and I have received two different interpretations of the Approved Sewer Service Area boundaries. I believe that Ms. Mariska looked at a map of the Approved Sewer Service Area. Could y'all please verify that the information below is correct.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible, as we are trying to present this case to our Task Force in the next couple of weeks.

Thank you so much for your help!

Cheryl van Allen
Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning
703-324-1288

From: Baik, Bo
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2008 11:10 AM
To: Van Allen, Cheryl L.
Subject: RE: Properties within the Sewer Service Area

Dear Cheryl;

The green numbers are in the sanitary sewer service area, gray numbers are partially out side of approved sewer service area, and red numbers are the ones that completely outside of approved sanitary sewer service area.

113-2-((1))-66A, 62A,62B,65, 67, 68

113-4((1))-1

113-4 ((2))-A1, A2, B3

113-2 ((3))-B1, C1, C3, C4, D1, D2, E2,E3, E4, E5, E6, F1, F2 & G1

Bo

BRAC# 08-IV-4LP
Page 12 of 13

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of the message. Thank you very much.

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of the message. Thank you very much.

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of the message. Thank you very much.