

FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA  
2005 SOUTH COUNTY AREA PLANS REVIEW  
NOMINATION TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Date Received: 9/19/05  
Date Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_  
Planning District: \_\_\_\_\_  
Special Area: \_\_\_\_\_

SECTION 1: NOMINATOR/AGENT INFORMATION

Name: Joseph A. Roberts Daytime Phone: (703) 406-8000

Address: Paretian Engineering Group, LLC, 21515 Ridgetop Circle, #120  
Sterling, VA 20166

Nominator E-mail Address: Joseph.PEG@gmail.com

Signature of Nominator (NOTE: There can be only one nominator per nomination):  
 Representing Lee Boulevard Hts. Block A Business Interest Group

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 sheet(s)

Anyone signing on behalf of a business entity, must state the relationship to that organization below or on an attached page: Joseph A. Roberts, Nominator, signs as Director of Urban and Environmental planning for Paretian Engineering Group, LLC, on behalf of the Lee Blvd. Hts. Block A Business Interest Group. See attached sheet(s) for other relationships.

SECTION 2: GENERAL INFORMATION

Check appropriate supervisor district:  Braddock  Lee  Mason  Mount Vernon  Springfield

Total number of parcels nominated: Six (6)

Total aggregate size of all nominated parcels (in acres and square feet): 69,200 sq. ft. 1.59 acres

Is the nomination a Neighborhood Consolidation Proposal:  Yes  No

SECTION 3: SPECIFIC INFORMATION – *Attach either the Specific Information Table found at the end of this application form or a separate 8 ½ 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 Section 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.*

SECTION 4: CURRENT AND PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATIONS

*See Section IV, #4, of the Citizen's Guide for instructions.*

Current Comprehensive Plan text for nominated property: **Use the Plan on the Web for your citation. It is the most up to date. Link: [www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/):**

Please see attached Supplement 1, "Current Comprehensive Plan Text".

Current Plan Map Designation: R-3, SC, HC, CRD

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Designation:

Office Uses, SC, HC, CRD; please see attached Supp. 2, "Proposed Comprehensive Plan Text".

<b>Mixed Use</b>	
<p>If you are proposing Mixed Use, it must be expressed in terms of floor area ratio (FAR). The percentage and intensity/density of the different types of uses must be specific and must equal 100% of the total FAR proposed. The mix and percentage of uses provided by the nominator are what staff and the task force will review. Ranges are not acceptable.</p>	
Categories	Percent of Total FAR
Office	
Retail	
Public Facility, Gov & Institutional	
Private Recreation/Open Space	
Industrial	
Residential*	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>
<p>* If residential is a component, please provide the approximate number and type of dwelling unit as well as the approximate square footage per unit assumed (i.e., 300 mid-rise multifamily units at 800 square feet per unit).</p>	

<b>Residential Land Use Categories</b>	
Categories expressed in dwelling units per acre (du/ac)	Number of Units
.1 - .2 du/ac (5-10 acre lots)	
.2 - .5 du/ac (2-5 acre lots)	
.5 - 1 du/ac (1 - 2 acre lots)	
1 - 2 du/ac	
2 - 3 du/ac	
3 - 4 du/ac	
4 - 5 du/ac	
5 - 8 du/ac	
8 - 12 du/ac	
12 - 16 du/ac	
16 - 20 du/ac	
20 + du/ac**	
<p>** If you are proposing residential densities above 20 du/ac, you must specify a range such as 20-30 du/ac or 30 -40 du/ac.</p>	

**SECTION 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. Maps in color will not be accepted.

**SECTION 6: JUSTIFICATION**

Each nomination must conform with the Policy Plan and must meet at least one of the following guidelines. Check the appropriate box and provide a written justification that explains why your nomination should be considered, based on the guidelines below (two-page limit).

The proposal would better achieve the Plan objectives than what is currently in the adopted Plan.

There are oversights or land use related inequities in the adopted Plan that affect the area of concern.

**All completed nomination forms must be submitted between July 1, 2005 - September 21, 2005 to:**

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

### SPECIFIC 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
051-4-02-A-0004	John F. & Frances M. Schiller	6063 Arlington Blvd.	6063 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.25	<i>[Signature]</i>
051-4-02-A-0005	The Millennium Lotus, LLC	6065 Arlington Blvd.	1111 Towlston Rd. McLean, VA 22102	0.23	<i>[Signature]</i> General Partner
051-4-02-A-0006	The Millennium Lotus, LLC	6067 Arlington Blvd.	1111 Towlston Rd. McLean, VA 22102	0.24	<i>[Signature]</i> General Partner
051-4-02-A-0007	Hoang Enterprises, Inc.	6069 Arlington Blvd.	6069 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.24	<i>[Signature]</i> Henry N. Hoang
051-4-02-A-0008	James L. Smith	6071 Arlington Blvd.	6071 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.24	SEE NEXT PAGE
051-4-02-A-0009	David S. Frenkel	6073 Arlington Blvd.	6073 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.39	SEE NEXT PAGE

**SPECIFIC 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
051-4-02-A-0008	James L. Smith	6071 Arlington Blvd.	6071 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.24	<i>James L. Smith</i>

**SPECIFIC 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
051-4-02-A-0009	David S. Frenkel	6073 Arlington Blvd.	6073 Arlington Blvd. Falls Church, VA 22044	0.39	



EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT

Sub-Unit B-4

To provide a transition in land use intensity between Arlington Boulevard and the Lee Boulevard Heights subdivision to the south, Parcels 51-4 ((15)) 1-21 are planned for townhouse office use up to .35 FAR, well-buffered from the residential uses to the south. Parcels 51-4 ((2)) (B) 1-7, 51-4 ((2)) (A) 4-9, and 51-4 ((1)) 6 and 8 are planned for office use up to 0.25 FAR, with retention of existing residential structures encouraged to form a transition zone. As an option, this area may be considered for redevelopment with townhouse office uses up to .35 FAR provided that building height is limited to 40 feet, logical consolidation of parcels is achieved, and screening to include a solid wall and effective landscaping adjacent to single-family residences is provided. These parcels are designated as a gateway location.

## PROPOSED PLAN TEXT

### Sub-Unit B-4

To provide a transition in land use intensity between Arlington Boulevard and the Lee Boulevard Heights subdivision to the south, Parcels 51-4 ((15)) 1-21 are planned for townhouse-style office use up to .35 FAR, to be well-buffered from the residential uses to the south. Parcels 51-4 ((2)) (B) 1-7, 51-4 ((2)) (A) 4-9, and 51-4 ((1)) 6 and 8 are designated as a gateway location and are currently planned for office use up to 0.25 FAR, to form a transition zone with retention of existing residential structures, encouraged to form a transition zone.

On a case-by-case basis, these parcels may be considered for redevelopment with office uses with an FAR of up to 0.65 when, in addition to the foregoing criteria being met, individual parcel entrances to the existing service drive have been eliminated or consolidated, an additional landscaped open space of five percent of the assembled parcels is provided, and further practical consolidation of parcels is not precluded.

As an enhancement option, this area may be considered for office uses up to .35-1.00 FAR, provided that building height is limited to 40 feet, adequate consolidation of parcels is achieved, and coherent design standards are applied across the parcels, including: consistent screening treatment to include with a solid wall and effective landscaping adjacent to the single-family residences to the rear, architecturally compatible parking structures, dedication of cross easements with provision for construction of inter-parcel connections between adjacent commercial parking lots, and the institution of site-specific Transportation System Management measures to be established at the time of redevelopment with the approval of the Director. is provided. These parcels are designated as a gateway location.

September 14, 2005

**MEMORANDUM**

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

Our Reference Ffx05027

**SUBJ:** 2005 South County Comprehensive Plan Review  
Nomination for Plan Revision  
by Lee Boulevard Heights Block A Business Interest Group

**RE:** Justification for Nomination

We ask the Commission to examine the below economic profile of the neighborhood block in which Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be gauged as a factor in the measure of value:

**Parcels Arrayed by Year of Acquisition and FAR-Foot Cost of Land:**

Year of Sale	Address of Parcels in Block A Arlington Blvd.	Most Recent Sale	Assessed Gross Floor Area** (Sq.Ft.)	As-sessed Land Area (Sq.Ft.)	Existing Floor Area Ratio	Planned Floor Area Ratio (Max. Range)	Current Perceived Least FAR-Foot Cost of Land
1984	6063	\$114,500.00	2279	10725	0.21	0.25-0.35	\$30.50
1988	6073	\$425,000.00	3394	16775	0.20	0.25-0.35	\$72.39
1997	6069	\$290,000.00	3210	10600	0.30	0.25-0.35	\$78.17
2003	6065-6067	\$700,000.00	3696	20800	0.18	0.25-0.35	\$96.15
2005	6071	\$778,000.00	2294	10300	0.22	0.25-0.35	\$215.81

The point of the table (also graphically depicted on the next page) is to show that there is insufficient financial incentive to assemble and redevelop these parcels when the range of Existing FAR of 0.18 to 0.30 is not sufficiently different from the range for the Planned FAR of 0.25 to 0.35. The question is, why tear down existing income-producing assets to build new ones that may be only marginally improved in terms of yield? Examine the following summation:

Aggregate (Unadjusted for inflation):	\$2,307,500.00	14873	69200	0.22	0.35	\$155.15
---------------------------------------	----------------	-------	-------	------	------	----------

Given the simple aggregates for the scenario of a complete assemblage of Block A, merely the replacement cost for the land appears too high (even with no adjustment for inflation), because the range of potential increments of redeveloped yield is limited to only 0.05 - 0.17 FAR (0.13 in Aggregate). The Plan may call for a "Gateway Project," but even renovation is not strongly encouraged at the existing planned intensities, meanwhile expecting the existing residential structures to continue to age well beyond their average of already more than fifty years.

In other words, even if current owners were to sell their parcels at zero capital gain to a single developer for an assemblage at planned intensities, then the maximum gross floor area that could be developed would be 0.35 x 69,200 Sq. Ft. = 24,220 Sq. Ft., or a net increase of only 9,347 Sq. Ft., making the average FAR-foot cost \$95.35 per Gross Sq. Ft. of floor area (\$2,307,500 / 24,220), just to acquire the land. On top of this unit cost per foot of yield would be the new building cost, parking lots, etc., almost not to mention soft costs to plan, engineer, and finance from approvals through tenant fit-out and lease. In short, the land costs are simply too high to encourage redevelopment at the current Planned FAR.

To sum up, the Owners making this nomination ask the Task Force, Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to give due consideration to the economics of redeveloping the parcels within the Lee Boulevard Heights Block A, as well as the neighborhood and other planning constraints, and adopt progressive plan language that takes account of the new realities facing the improvement of this Gateway location.

