

**Fairfax Center Area Study
Springfield District Transition Area
Working Group Meeting
Wednesday, April 23, 2014**

Meeting Summary

The meeting began with introductions of members. There are seven members: Jeff Saxe (Chairman), Gail Brugger, Karan Shaffer, Robbie Stark, Philip Poole, Tony Wiley, Susan Yantis, and Tom McDonald. Tony Wiley and Tom McDonald were absent.

Staff present included Springfield District Planning Commissioner/Chairman Pete Murphy, Kimberly Rybold and Tom Merce from the Department of Planning and Zoning. Also in attendance was Meghan Van Dam, the Branch Chief for the Department of Planning and Zoning, Policy and Plan Development Branch.

Ms. Rybold began the meeting with a brief follow-up discussion regarding transportation questions from the March 19, 2014 meeting. Chairman Murphy asked staff what the balance was in the Fairfax Center Area Road Fund and if there are projects programmed to use the funding. Ms. Rybold said that she would consult with the Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT) regarding the question. Chairman Murphy also inquired about increased transit service along Lee Highway and asked staff to consult with FCDOT to find out if the proposed Centreville – George Mason University (GMU) route could stop at transit stops in the Fairfax Center Area. Furthermore, he asked staff to find out what was preventing the creation of a Lee Highway transit route.

Following the transportation discussion, Ms. Rybold began the discussion on the land use alternatives based on feedback received at the March 19, 2014 meeting. Prior to going over the alternatives, Ms. Rybold presented a list of items to consider when formulating land use alternatives. Jeff Saxe suggested several minor text modifications to clarify the intent of the considerations. Ms. Rybold then proceeded to introduce the land use alternatives for Sub-Units M2, S1, and S3. She emphasized that these recommendations were based off of presentations and group discussion at the March 19, 2014 meeting and were subject to change based on input from the group.

Mr. Merce presented the land use scenarios for Sub-Unit M2 located north of Lee Highway. Under current Plan guidance, the 13.5 acre area would yield 27 single family detached homes at 2 du/ac. Alternative One, which called single family detached homes on the 6.72 acre parcel considered by Landmark Atlantic Holdings, LLC at the March 19, 2014 meeting, would redevelop at 4 du/ac. The remaining 6.78 acres would redevelop as single family detached homes at 2 du/ac. Alternative One yielded 40 homes. Alternative Two would redevelop the entire site at 4 du/ac and yield 54 single family detached homes.

Following the Sub-Unit M2 presentation, the group decided to eliminate the 1.07 acre parcel north of the 6.72 acre parcel from consideration since its density was more aligned with existing low density residential to the north, west, and east. All other parcels would be considered at the originally proposed densities.

Mr. Merce presented land use scenarios for Sub-Unit S1 located south of Lee Highway opposite of Sub-Unit M2. Under the current Plan guidance, the 18 acre area would yield 36 homes at 2 du/ac. Alternative One would redevelop the four acre motel site fronting on Lee Highway and the adjacent 2.06 acre parcel to the south as a congregate/assisted living facility at 0.50 FAR., yielding 132,000 sq. ft. of floor area. The remaining 11.94 acres would redevelop as single family detached homes under the current Plan guidance at 2 du/ac, yielding 24 units. Alternative Two considered full consolidation of the 18 acres and would redevelop at 4.4 du/ac as a mixture of single family attached homes fronting on Lee Highway and single family detached homes on the parcel adjacent to existing low density residential uses. The alternative would yield 67 single family attached and 12 single family detached homes.

After discussing the land use alternatives presented by staff, the group decided to eliminate the southern properties adjacent to the existing low density residential uses from consideration since there were not any proposed changes to its currently planned density. The group also decided that it would not consider an assisted living facility in this area, citing that the proposal presented at the March 19, 2014 meeting was shoehorned into the parcels and that it was not appropriate to extend a three-story building into existing single family neighborhoods. Any future proposals for assisted living or congregate care should be evaluated within the context of the residential density ranges proposed by the working group. They further stated that it was not appropriate to study speculative development during this study. The final alternatives would consider redevelopment at 4 du/ac and 8 du/ac on all but the two southernmost parcels removed from consideration.

Mr. Merce presented land use scenarios for Sub-Unit S3 located east of the previously discussed sub-units just west of the Fairfax County Parkway. Under the current Plan guidance, the 17.3 acre site would yield 34 single family detached homes at 2 du/ac. Alternative One would redevelop the front third of the large parcel fronting on Lee Highway as well as the adjacent parcel to the east as a congregate/assisted living facility at 0.50 FAR, yielding 132,000 sq. ft. of floor area. The remaining area would redevelop under the current Plan guidance at 2 du/ac, yielding 22 single family detached homes.

After discussing the scenario presented by staff, the working group decided to eliminate the subunit from consideration and retain the existing Plan guidance.

The working group decided to tentatively schedule the third meeting for Tuesday, June 24 at 7:00 PM. The meeting will be held at the Government Center in Conference Room 232. The meeting will focus on reviewing the impact analyses for the current Plan and the two alternative land use scenarios, in addition to policy and editorial updates.