



PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

ITEM: PA 2013-CW-2CP
January 15, 2014

GENERAL LOCATION: Countywide

SUPERVISOR DISTRICT: All

PLANNING AREA: All

PLANNING DISTRICT: All

SUB-DISTRICT DESIGNATION: All

PARCEL LOCATION: All

PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING:
Wednesday, January 29, 2014 @ 8:15 P.M.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING:
Tuesday, March 4, 2014 @ 4:00 P.M.

**PLANNING STAFF DOES RECOMMEND
THIS ITEM FOR PLAN AMENDMENT**

For additional information about this amendment call (703) 324-1100.



Reasonable accommodation is available upon 7 days advance notice. For additional information about accommodation call (703) 324-1100.

MAP NOT APPLICABLE

This page intentionally

left blank

STAFF REPORT FOR PLAN AMENDMENT 2013-CW-2CP

BACKGROUND

The Board of Supervisors adopted Fairfax Forward on July 9, 2013, establishing a new method to review the Comprehensive Plan through a Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and a new approach to conduct planning studies through greater community engagement. A pilot work program was adopted to implement the new process. The pilot work program lists planning studies currently underway and schedules new planning studies to begin over the next three years (2013-2016). The new studies cover a variety of issues such as land use, public facilities, transportation, and parks and recreation recommendations through areawide, neighborhood, and countywide planning studies. One such countywide study is the subject of this Plan amendment, which examines and proposes updates of the descriptions and references to procedures for review and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. The majority of the descriptions are located in the Policy Plan.

PLANNING HISTORY

In 1988, the county began Planning Horizons, a major review of the Comprehensive Plan. The outcome of this process was the adoption of the Policy Plan volume of the Comprehensive Plan in 1990 and the adoption of four Area Plan volumes in 1991. In 1997, the Board of Supervisors adopted three Plan amendments that updated the Preface and Introduction sections of the Policy Plan: PY-96-GI-09, PY-96-GI-10, and PY-96-GI-1. These amendments updated text to reflect major special studies adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1992 and 1993, the Plan review schedule between 1993 and 1998, and guidance about the future of the planning process, Plan monitoring, and implementation.

ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Attachment 1 contains a list of web links to the online version of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, referencing the portions of the Plan subject to this amendment.

PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT

The proposed Plan amendment assesses the descriptions of the county's planning processes in the Policy Plan and references to the processes within the Area Plan volumes. The amendment proposes to revise guidance regarding the Area Plans Review (APR) process to reflect the adoption of Fairfax Forward and amend references to other outdated procedures, such as the 456 Public Facilities review process. Editorial changes to other outdated references, such as "Office of Comprehensive Planning," now designated the "Department of Planning and Zoning," are also proposed.

ANALYSIS

The Policy Plan describes the history of planning in the county; provides guidance about amending and monitoring the Plan; and contains a series of goals, objectives, and policies for eleven functional areas, such as land use and transportation. Staff identified descriptions of outdated procedures in the Policy Plan, including the APR process, which was superseded by Fairfax Forward; Out-of-Turn Plan Amendments, currently referred to as Board authorized Plan amendments; and the 456 Public Facilities review process, now known as the 2232 Public Facilities review process. The majority of the identified procedures were added in the 1996 Policy Plan review year with Plan Amendments PY-96-GI-09, PY-96-GI-10, and PY-96-GI-1, as described previously.

The proposed revisions to these sections vary in complexity. Some revisions would result in minor text modifications, such as changing “456” to “2232” to accurately state the name of the public facilities review process. Other revisions are more substantial, such as updating the descriptions of the Plan review process to reflect the adoption of the Fairfax Forward Pilot Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program. These revisions propose to truncate and reorder sections of the Plan. For example, the proposed language would remove details about individual studies and references to specific Plan review schedules in favor of more generalized text. Further, some sections may be more appropriate within the Planning History section, such as the description of the Area Plans Review process.

In addition to proposing updates to the Policy Plan, staff identified outdated references in the four Area Plans. These minor editorial changes focus on capitalization and updating references to agencies to reflect their current names. The proposed updates change “Office of Comprehensive Planning” to “Department of Planning and Zoning,” “Office of Transportation” to “Department of Transportation,” and “Department of Public Works” to “Department of Public Works and Environmental Services.”

CONCLUSION

The proposed procedural updates to the Plan text would reflect the adoption of the Fairfax Forward Comprehensive Plan review process, generalize descriptions of the county’s planning process, and revise other outdated references. Although descriptions of the planning process are pertinent, the high level of detail would be challenging to maintain. The proposed text revisions would reflect a more manageable alternative that would continue to provide history of the Plan and guidance about the planning process.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Comprehensive Plan’s Area I-IV and Policy Plan volumes be modified as shown below. The proposed modifications are divided into four sections: 1) Modifications to Area Plans Reflecting Changes to Agency Name; 2) Modifications to the Policy Plan, Including Changes to Reflect the Adoption of Fairfax Forward; 3) Modifications to Policy Plan Reflecting Public Facilities Review Name Change; and 4) General Editorial Changes. Text proposed to be added is shown as underlined and text proposed to be deleted is shown with a ~~striketrough~~. Existing underlined text is shown with a double underline.

1. Recommended Modifications to Area Plans Reflecting Changes to Agency Name

1.1 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area I, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 6-4-2013, General Planning Area Recommendations, Transportation, Level of Service, page 15:

“... ”

‘Non-degradation’ Policy: The non-degradation policy requires applicants to ensure that the transportation system affected by the application performs no worse after the project is developed than it would otherwise. This approach is primarily a performance based approach which requires applicants to provide improvements or other guarantees to maintain certain performance levels. These levels would be measured by levels of service or critical movement volumes or other measures as deemed appropriate by the Department Office of Transportation.”

1.2 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 6-4-2013, General Planning Area Recommendations, Transportation, Level of Service, page 15:

“... ”

‘Non-degradation’ Policy: The non-degradation policy requires applicants to ensure that the transportation system affected by the application performs no worse after the project is developed than it would otherwise. This approach is primarily a performance based approach which requires applicants to provide improvements or other guarantees to maintain certain performance levels. These levels would be measured by levels of service or critical movement volumes or other measures as deemed appropriate by the Department Office of Transportation.”

1.3 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 6-4-2013, Environment, Difficult Run Watershed, page 16:

“... ”

Part of the Difficult Run watershed was the subject of an environmental and land use study, the Difficult Run Headwaters Land Use Study, April 1978, prepared by the Office of Comprehensive Planning, currently known as the Department of Planning and Zoning. The study area was analyzed for its ability to accept various residential densities and simultaneously maintain high-quality environmental standards. The primary environmental objectives for this area are designed to protect this fragile environment from the impacts of urbanization such as increased stormwater runoff, increased nonpoint source pollution loadings, stream channel enlargement, loss of high-quality wildlife habitats, increased number of septic fields and possible soil and groundwater contamination from septic effluent.”

1.4 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, McLean Planning District, Community Business Center, Amended through 11-19-2013, Plan History, page 22:

“... ”

In 1988, the McLean Central Business District Study was completed by consultants for the Office of Comprehensive Planning, currently known as the Department of Planning and Zoning, and the McLean Planning Committee. The primary purpose of the study was to establish parameters for new development and identify means of ensuring the continuation of the existing service function of downtown McLean. Another objective of the study was to address the perception that McLean lacks an identity and attractiveness which set it apart as a community. The study’s land use and transportation recommendations were incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as part of the Fairfax Planning Horizons process in 1991 and the study area became known as the McLean Community Business Center. Also, the study’s public space and building design guidance, described in the chapter ‘Proposed Urban Image and Open Space,’ became part of the Plan by reference at that time.”

1.5 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, McLean Planning District, West Falls Church Transit Station Area, Amended through 11-19-2013, Recommendations, Transit Development Area Conditions and Recommendations, page 78:

“... ”

3. Provide off-site public road improvements, or funding of such improvements to accommodate traffic generated by the development. If, at any phase of the development, further mitigation of traffic generated by the development is deemed necessary, provision and implementation of a plan which reduces development traffic to a level deemed satisfactory to the Department Office of Transportation through Transportation Systems Management (TSM) strategies, especially those which encourage the use of Metrorail.”

1.6 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, General Planning Area Recommendations, Transportation, Level of Service, page 15:

“... ”

‘Non-degradation’ Policy: The non-degradation policy requires applicants to ensure that the transportation system affected by the application performs no worse after the project is developed than it would otherwise. This approach is primarily a performance based approach which requires applicants to provide improvements or other guarantees to maintain certain performance levels. These levels would be measured by levels of service or critical movement volumes or other measures as deemed appropriate by the Department Office of Transportation.”

1.7 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, Environment, Difficult Run Watershed, page 16:

“... ”

Part of the Difficult Run watershed was the subject of an environmental and land use study, the Difficult Run Headwaters Land Use Study, April 1978, prepared by the Office of Comprehensive Planning, currently known as the Department of Planning and Zoning. The

study area was analyzed for its ability to accept various residential densities and simultaneously maintain high-quality environmental standards. The primary environmental objectives for this area are designed to protect this fragile environment from the impacts of urbanization such as increased stormwater runoff, increased nonpoint source pollution loadings, stream channel enlargement, loss of high-quality wildlife habitats, increased number of septic fields and possible soil and groundwater contamination from septic effluent.”

1.8 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Background, page 6:

“... ”

Major public facilities include the County public safety facility to be located on 110 acres next to the southern and western boundary of Dulles Airport; Ellanor C. Lawrence Park, a natural preserve located along Route 28 north of Centreville and I-66; and the Sully historic site, located north of Route 50 along Route 28 adjacent to Dulles Airport. Other public facilities include the Floris Elementary School near the intersection of Centreville and West Ox Roads; a fire and rescue center in the same location and another on Walney Road just south of Route 50. Two former sewage treatment plants have been converted to other uses: Flatlick Treatment Plant is used as open space and a plant nursery operated by the Fairfax County Park Authority, and Cub Run Treatment Plant is used by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services. Some public parkland associated with Environmental Quality Corridors (EQCs) has been dedicated in various locations throughout the Suburban Center, notably, in the Cub Run area south of Route 50 and surrounding the residential development in Floris.”

1.9 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Planning Issues, Development Potential and Transportation Imbalance, page 9:

“... ”

A central issue affecting planning in the Dulles Suburban Center is the imbalance between the zoned development potential of the area and the capacity of the 1991 Countywide Transportation Plan. Of the roughly 6,300 acres that make up the Suburban Center, approximately 4,800 acres are zoned for commercial or industrial development. As of January 1992, existing nonresidential development totaled approximately 15 million square feet of space. It is estimated that the planned roadway improvements for the area, which include 33 (one-way) lanes of road capacity, can accommodate a development level of approximately 34 million square feet and still maintain acceptable levels of service on the roadways in the area (Level of Service D/E as estimated by the Department Office of Transportation).”

1.10 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Implementation, Performance Based Strategy for Optional Uses, Transportation Generation Elements, page 19:

“... ”

In order for an optional use to be considered for approval, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Fairfax County Department Office of Transportation that the uses and intensities/densities proposed will result in lesser peak-hour traffic impacts than would be generated if the site were to develop at the maximum allowable intensity under the baseline recommendation of the Plan. The Fairfax County Department Office of Transportation and the

Department of Planning and Zoning Office of Comprehensive Planning will provide the applicant guidelines for this demonstration.”

1.11 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Performance Criteria for Optional Uses, page 20:

“... ”

- Provides an analysis that demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Fairfax County Department Office of Transportation, that the uses and intensities/densities proposed will result in lesser peak-hour traffic impacts than would be generated if the site were to develop at the maximum allowable intensity for the Plan baseline recommendation. In those land units where a range of intensities is specified (example: .50-1.0 FAR) the low end of the range should be used for calculating peak-hour trip equivalencies;”

1.12 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Performance Criteria for Optional Uses, Development Elements: Transportation, page 21:

“... ”

- For all options, the proposed use and intensity will have lesser peak-hour traffic impacts than would occur if the site were to be developed at the maximum intensity allowed in the baseline Plan recommendation. This should be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Fairfax County Department Office of Transportation and the Department of Planning and Zoning Office of Comprehensive Planning.”

1.13 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Dulles Suburban Center Area-Wide Recommendations, Public Facilities, page 42:

“... ”

- The Regional Stormwater Management Plan should be implemented as identified by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services.”

1.14 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Dulles Suburban Center Land Unit Recommendations, page 52:

“... ”

2. Provision of a phasing program which includes on- and off-site public road improvements, or funding of such improvements to accommodate traffic generated by the development. If, at any phase of the development, further mitigation of traffic generated by the development is deemed necessary, provision and implementation of a plan which reduces development traffic to a level deemed satisfactory to the Department Office of Transportation through Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies and Transportation Demand Management Programs (TDMs).”

1.15 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Land Use Plan Recommendations – The Overlay Level, Land Unit E, Recommendations, Additional Development Conditions Specific to Each Sub-Unit, Sub-Unit E2 (formally E3, E6, eastern edge of E5 and a small portion of E4, page 57:

“... ”

In conjunction with any development above the baseline level in this sub-unit, land consolidation should be adequate to provide for sufficient portions of the internal circulation system, as deemed necessary by the Department Office of Transportation. These improvements should be provided in order to achieve the Plan goals for the transportation network. Several acres of land suitable for active recreation facilities, such as ballfields (as determined appropriate by the Fairfax County Park Authority), should be dedicated. The recreational land is most appropriately located contiguous to the Rocky Run EQC on Tax Map 45-4((1))12, 20 and 21.”

1.16 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Land Use Plan Recommendations – The Overlay Level, Land Unit E, Recommendations, Land Use, Sub-Unit O4, page 94:

“... ”

A retail center should be approved only if the following transportation needs are met: retail use should be allowed only if it can be demonstrated that access can be provided to and from West Ox Road without impeding the operation of the Fairfax County Parkway interchange; traffic generated by the proposed use should not impact adversely the operation of the area road system; any proposed access design must be approved by VDOT and the Department Office of Transportation.”

1.17 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Recommendations, Land Use, page 102:

“... ”

Development of these sub-units should preserve and integrate tree cover to complement the design of the site. A 25-foot landscape buffer to include a berm not less than three feet in height with appropriate landscaping material as approved by the Department of Planning and Zoning Office of Comprehensive Planning and the county Arborist is recommended along the eastern boundary of the area planned for residential use in order to protect it from the commercial development existing or planned east of Ridge Top Road.”

1.18 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Upper Potomac Planning District, Amended through 12-3-2013, UP7 West Ox Community Planning Sector, Recommendations, Land Use, page 189:

“... ”

- A regional stormwater detention facility is constructed on Parcel 31 if deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services.”

1.19 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area IV, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, General Planning Area Recommendations, Transportation, Level of Service, page 15:

“...

‘Non-degradation’ Policy: The non-degradation policy requires applicants to ensure that the transportation system affected by the application performs no worse after the project is developed than it would otherwise. This approach is primarily a performance based approach which requires applicants to provide improvements or other guarantees to maintain certain performance levels. These levels would be measured by levels of service or critical movement volumes or other measures as deemed appropriate by the Department Office of Transportation.”

2. Recommended Modifications to the Policy Plan, Including Changes to Reflect the Adoption of Fairfax Forward

2.1 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Preface and Introduction, Amended through 2-12-2013, pages 13-17:

“HISTORY OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN FAIRFAX COUNTY

INTRODUCTION

The history of planning in Fairfax County goes back to the mid-1950s with the adoption of the first zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan. The decade of the 1970s was marked by increasing concern among citizens and public officials regarding the problems associated with rapid and generally uncontrolled growth. In February 1973, the County created the Planning Land Use System (PLUS), a major planning effort that resulted in the 1975 Comprehensive Plan. Thirteen years later, in 1988, the County undertook a major review of the 1975 Plan, during the Planning Horizons process. This process resulted in the adoption of the Policy Plan in 1990 and the adoption of the four Area Plans in July 1991. Many of the key components of the 1975 Plan remain in the revised current Comprehensive Plan, such as the emphasis on focusing growth in “Centers”; decreasing automobile dependency; and protecting environmentally sensitive areas and stable neighborhoods. What has changed are some of the means to achieve these ends. The following discussion highlights the evolution of the Plan from the 1970s to the present.

PLUS PROGRAM (1973-1988)

PLUS Components

In the fall of 1973, efforts began toward simultaneous preparation of updated countywide and area plans, components of the Comprehensive Plan. After analyses of existing conditions and countywide issues was completed, the Countywide Plan Alternatives document was published in September 1974. This reaffirmed the "interim development and redevelopment policies," later to be known as the "Board of Supervisors Policies" in the 1975 adopted Plan. These evolved into the "Goals for Fairfax County," adopted in October 1988.

The Plan updating process was structured by grouping the 14 planning districts into four planning areas. Ultimately the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, Virginia was adopted in five parts. These were Area I (adopted June 16, 1975); Area II (adopted August 25, 1975); Area III (adopted June 30, 1975); Area IV (adopted July 28, 1975); and Countywide (adopted September 8, 1975).

PLUS Principles

The Countywide Plan Alternatives document defined a specific approach to land use planning, the most important of which was the use of "planned development centers" as the focal point for future growth. Recommended as an alternative to sprawl, this development concept was designed to achieve the following principles:

- To increase local employment (in a period when Fairfax County was still primarily a bedroom suburb on the fringe of the urban core);
- To decrease reliance on the private automobile by reducing the length of work trips and making mass transit facilities more easily accessible;

- To reduce pressure for development in environmentally sensitive areas;
- To preserve stable neighborhoods; and
- To lower costs by more efficient provision of public services.

The Fairfax Planning Horizons and Beyond

FAIRFAX PLANNING HORIZONS (1988-2013)

~~Since Following~~ its adoption in 1975, the Plan underwent some revision through the Annual Plan Review process and several small-area studies. However by the late 1980s, the Board of Supervisors decided that it was time to reassess the cCounty's direction, and they appointed the Goals Advisory Commission in February 1987 to review the cCounty's goals and progress. In addition, the Board restructured the Annual Plan Review Process to create the 1988 Policy Review Year. This decision was based on a Planning Commission recommendation that a Policy Review Year would provide a needed opportunity to closely examine the countywide policy volume that was guiding decision-making about site-specific issues. The Planning Commission asked the Office of Comprehensive Planning, known today as the Department of Planning and Zoning, to conduct the Plan review and to coordinate the effort with other cCounty agencies. The effort was divided into Phase I, the review of the countywide policy volume, and Phase II, review of the other four volumes containing the Area Plans.

The process included examination of alternative concepts for future growth in population and employment. Six different land use concepts and three road networks were developed and tested for their potential impacts on the transportation system, the environment, water quality, sanitary sewer capacity, and fiscal implications.

The process of community participation for Planning Horizons was open to anyone wishing to participate. An extensive series of night meetings and Saturday workshops took place, as well as public meetings before the Planning Commission, a Planning Commission round table seminar, and formal public hearings. This process had widespread publicity, in order to keep the community informed. Eighteen working papers were distributed widely for community review.

~~The Policy Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 6, 1990, replaced the Introduction/Countywide volume of the Plan. The objectives, policies, and guidelines contained in the Policy Plan guide planning and development review considerations toward implementing County goals. The goals address the future development pattern of Fairfax County, and protection of natural and cultural resources for present and future generations.~~

~~The Area Plans are key elements for implementing the Policy Plan's goals and objectives at the more detailed Planning District and Community Planning Sector levels. The Comprehensive Plan Map illustrates planned land uses, transportation improvements and public facilities. Used together, these elements comprise a dynamic document which is used by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, County staff and the public to guide land use, transportation and public facility decision making.~~

The major product of Phase I of the Planning Horizons process was the Policy Plan. Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 6, 1990, the Policy Plan which contained a hierarchy of goals, objectives and policies for each functional area, such as land use, transportation, the environment and public facilities. These recommendations guide planning and development review considerations to implement county goals. The goals address the future development pattern of Fairfax County and the protection of natural and cultural resources for

present and future generations. Another, separate document was the Concept for Future Development, containing both text and maps, which highlighted a generalized land use pattern to guide future development for the cCounty. Particularly distinctive was the new Land Classification System, an element of the Concept for Future Development which identified those areas that were expected to share similar characteristics by the year 2010. The Concept and the Land Classification System were accepted by the Board of Supervisors on August 6, 1990, to be used as a guide for the update of the Area Plans during Phase II of the Planning Horizons process. The Concept for Future Development was revised in 2012 to update the character descriptions and the map.

The Concept for Future Development comprises two elements: the Concept Map which shows the general location and character of future land uses and the Land Classification System which divides the cCounty into eight broad categories that describe the desired future character for each area.

The Concept Map shows the general character of the County with respect to the location of each area type, metro stations and major roads. The Land Classification System, when graphically illustrated by the Concept Map, presents a future policy direction for Fairfax County.

The Concept for Future Development's policy direction is that almost all employment growth should occur within designated Mixed-Use Centers and Industrial Areas. When combined, these centers and Industrial Areas encompass about 10% of the cCounty's land area. With the exception of the Industrial Areas, some degree of mixed-use development is encouraged for activity centers ~~each of these employment areas~~. This emphasis on mixed-use development is designed to introduce a residential component into ~~these~~ employment areas. Mixed-use development is generally defined as two or more uses designed to be functionally, economically and aesthetically integrated. The boundaries shown for these nonresidential/mixed use areas coincide with the current boundaries of commercial, industrial, and mixed-use areas as generally defined by existing nonresidential zoning and/or the nonresidential/mixed-use boundaries traditionally identified in the Area Plans.

Within some of these employment and mixed-use oriented centers and areas, limited areas have been planned as "core" or "transit development" areas. Medium to high density development intensities within these core and transit development areas are planned to take advantage of transportation and other functional opportunities and are often centered around a transit station or planned town center. Lower intensities are encouraged outside the "core" and "transit development" areas in the remaining portions of these employment and mixed-use centers. Transitions are planned between core and non-core areas. These transitions are created through the tapering down of development intensity and building heights, changes in use, and through landscaping, screening and buffering treatments.

The remainder of the cCounty is composed of Suburban Neighborhoods and Low Density Residential Areas. In general, nonresidential development is not encouraged within the Low Density Residential Areas; when appropriate, neighborhood-serving commercial services and institutional uses are encouraged within the Suburban Neighborhoods if compatibly scaled with surrounding neighborhoods.

In summary, the Concept for Future Development is established a vision and direction for guiding Fairfax County's future growth and development. The Concept for Future Development generally describes the types of land uses that are appropriate throughout the cCounty and the character envisioned for them. It ~~is has been~~ used in conjunction with the countywide objectives and policies contained in the adopted Policy Plan and provides ~~ed~~ a foundation and framework for the Area Planning process.

Phase II of Planning Horizons included the adoption of the four Area Plans by the Board of Supervisors adopted in 1991. These volumes of the Comprehensive Plan contain detailed recommendations for land use, transportation, housing, the environment, heritage resources, public facilities and parks and recreation. These recommendations refine the guidance provided in the Policy Plan and were developed within the framework of the Concept for Future Development.

Each Area Plan is subdivided into Planning Districts, which, in turn, are subdivided into Community Planning Sectors, the smallest geographical components of the Plan. The Community Planning Sector text provides details on existing development and planned land use. For purposes of development review and other land-use related decisions it is emphasized that the planning guidance for each Planning District is contained in the Area Plan text; on the Area Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map; in the Policy Plan; and in the land use guidelines contained in the Concept for Future Development and Land Classification System.

The primary planning objectives in all Area Plans are to:

- Realize the objectives and policies of the Policy Plan in planning and development decisions;
- Utilize the Concept for Future Development as a guide to land use planning decisions when Plan amendments are considered; and
- Employ site-specific guidance to review and formulate recommendations for development requests in furtherance of the public health, safety and welfare as provided in the Code of Virginia.

The Policy Plan Action Agenda and Planning Commission ‘Super-Priorities’

The December 1989 draft version of the Policy Plan contained an ‘Action Agenda’ with over 350 items thought worthy of consideration. Given the large number of suggested actions contained in the Action Agenda, the Board of Supervisors requested that the Planning Commission consider and prioritize the Action Agenda. The Planning Commission working through its Major Plan Review Committee formed four subcommittees to examine the areas of 1) Land Use; 2) Transportation; 3) Public Facilities, Housing, Human Services and Fiscal; and 4) Environment, Parks, and Heritage Resources. County agencies provided support to the work of these committees. Six major countywide organizations concerned with the Comprehensive Plan were invited to attend and participate in the deliberations. A public workshop was held and public comments were solicited as part of the deliberations. In March of 1992, the Planning Commission presented to the Board of Supervisors a list of ten ‘super-priorities’ that included about 45 of the ‘agenda’ items. The commission felt the identified actions were important for advancing Fairfax County’s adopted Goals.

Monitoring and Review

In 1993, the Board of Supervisors initiated a four-year Comprehensive Plan review process. The review process supported the goal of regular review, assessment, and revision of the Comprehensive Plan. The inaugural cycle included the 1995 Plan Monitoring Year, the 1996 Policy Plan Review Year, and the 1997-1998 Area Plans Review (APR) Years. As part of the 1995 Plan Monitoring Year, a series of reports were published to describe the existing conditions and trends in the county. The reports covered socio-economic characteristics, land use/housing,

transportation, the environment, public facilities, heritage resources, and parks and recreation. The final product of the Policy Review Year was the 1996 State of the Plan report, which presented the results of the evaluation and suggested potential new actions that warranted consideration. The 1996 Policy Plan Review Year involved evaluating the county's progress on the Planning Commission's "super priorities" and key objectives in the Policy Plan. The APR years followed the Policy Plan Review Year, evaluating proposed Plan amendments at the planning district, community planning sector, and site-specific levels. In addition to major planning studies, the APR cycles evolved to be the focus of work over the next decade.

Fairfax Forward

Following the 2008-2009 North County and 2009-2010 South County APR cycle, a retrospective of the APR process that included extensive public outreach indicated minor changes to the APR process would not address recurring issues, related to timeliness and the fragmented nature of amending the Plan. The effort concluded with a recognition that a more substantial change to the Plan review process was necessary. In early 2012 at the direction of the Planning Commission, the Department of Planning and Zoning began Fairfax Forward, an effort to develop a new means to review the Comprehensive Plan. In order to develop a strategy for the future, staff evaluated recent Plan activity, the strengths and weaknesses of the current APR process, and best practices for Plan review at a local and national level. During the same period, Plan amendments between 2002 and 2010, themes resulting from the amendments, and changes to planned development potential between 2000 and 2010, were assessed. In 2012, a State of the Plan was published to summarize the results of the county's efforts to implement planning policies over the previous ten years. In addition, the Concept for Future Development and Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map were updated to reflect Area Plan recommendations. Portions of the Policy Plan and the Area Plans were also revised to reflect current land uses.

The research efforts contributed to recommendations for a major shift in the county's planning process. The proposal that emerged expanded upon the successful aspects of current planning studies, namely related to review and evaluation, and modified areas that needed improvement, including public participation and the organization of the Plan review. Extensive public outreach was conducted to confirm the recommendations. Fairfax Forward culminated in the adoption of a new Plan amendment review process and the implementation of the Pilot Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program in July 2013.

THE FUTURE OF THE PLANNING PROCESS (2013-Present)

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program is the new approach to the planning process that emphasizes greater community engagement. The current planning processes and practices should be monitored to ensure that the objectives of increased public participation and more cohesive planning are met. The recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan should continue to be assessed to gauge correlation with the county's goals and objectives. This activity is also necessary to project trends for the future and will aid the community in understanding the evolution of the county and the growth and development issues that confront it.

Plan Monitoring and Review Process

~~The initial stage of Fairfax Planning Horizons was completed with the adoption of the Policy Plan and the four Area Plans. This was followed by the completion of several major special studies. Recommendations for Lorton Route One South, the Dulles Suburban Center,~~

and the Tysons Corner Urban Center were subsequently approved in 1992 and 1993.

~~A schedule supporting the regular review, assessment and revision of the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1993 by the Board of Supervisors. 1994 was designated as a year for the Review of the Area Plans. This review was conducted and resulted in eighty-one amendments to the Area Plans. A subsequent four year cycle was initiated to implement this process and was organized as follows:~~

- ~~1995— Plan Monitoring~~
- ~~1996— Policy Plan Review~~
- ~~1997— Area Plan Review~~
- ~~1998— Area Plan Review~~

~~The State of the Plan report, which provided background data and suggestions for nominations to amend the Policy Plan, was the culmination of the 1995 Plan Monitoring Year.~~

The Future of the Planning Process

~~Following the completion of the review of the Policy Plan in 1996 and the review of Area Plans in 1997 and 1998, it is expected that the current planning processes and practices will be reviewed to ensure that the County's growth and development patterns are adequately monitored. This activity is necessary to project trends and plan for the future. The community, decision makers and the staff will continue to track the progress of Plan implementation through the Plan monitoring process, which in turn will aid all in the community in understanding the evolution of the County and the growth and development issues that confront it.~~

[Page break omitted in this staff report for display purposes only.]

IMPLEMENTATION/PLAN MONITORING/CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

INTRODUCTION

~~The Comprehensive Plan is a dynamic document that is used by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, county staff, and the public to guide decisions about the built and natural environment, as well as the conservation of cultural and heritage resources. It is important to note that the Comprehensive Plan provides policy guidance to both public and private initiatives. The Policy Plan contains the Board of Supervisors' Goals for Fairfax County and countywide objectives and policies related to the Goals. This hierarchy of policy guides decision-making for countywide, area, and site-specific issues. The Policy Plan is used to provide direction for the Area Plans and guide existing implementation mechanisms (i.e. provide direction for evaluation of zoning proposals). The Area Plans provide detail at the planning district and community planning sector level.~~

~~There are many a variety of ways to assess how the Comprehensive Plan is evolving to meet local and regional goals-assure the dynamic nature of the Comprehensive Plan. One is to monitor the Plan on a frequent basis. The Board of Supervisors adopted a goal to regularly review, assess, and revise the Comprehensive Plan in-in order to ensure a thorough on-going review of the Comprehensive Plan, a goal supporting the regular review, assessment and revision of the Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. A four year cycle was initiated to implement this process and insure maximum citizen participation. Citizen~~

participation is the foundation of the planning process in Fairfax County, and a wide range of participation opportunities assures active involvement of the public in county planning.

~~Implementation, monitoring and citizen participation mechanisms for the Comprehensive Plan are elaborated in the following sections.~~

MECHANISMS TO IMPLEMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COUNTY PLANNING POLICY

~~The Comprehensive Plan - The Plan is, in itself, a mechanism for implementing the Board of Supervisors Goals for Fairfax County. This is carried out through the Policy Plan which contains countywide objectives and policies relating to the Goals. This hierarchy of policy guides decision making for countywide, area, and site specific issues. The Policy Plan is used to provide direction for the Area Plans and guide existing implementation mechanisms, (i.e., provide direction for evaluation of zoning proposals).~~

~~The Area Plans are key elements for implementing the direction from the Policy Plan to the more detailed Planning Districts and Community Planning Sectors, both during the Area Plan update process and during the development review process. Also considered are existing conditions and issues applicable to the immediate area around the subject site. Community attention and participation are inherent in both the Plan update and zoning process because both directly affect residents and the business community.~~

The Zoning Ordinance - This ordinance and its accompanying map(s) prescribe both the size (intensity and bulk regulations) of lots and the uses which may be placed on the property. All property in the County is mapped to a certain zoning district. The Zoning Ordinance Map, therefore, is a primary means by which the use and intensity for specific land use recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan are implemented. An important component of the rezoning process is the proffer system, which enables a property owner to commit to conditions voluntarily which supplement the Zoning Ordinance and ensure conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Subdivision Regulations - This is the basic tool for controlling the subdivision of land. It contains the regulations for dividing parcels of land into lots of any size less than five acres and for the provision of public facilities, if required, to serve the lots so formed. Lots to be developed must conform to applicable zoning regulations.

Public Facilities Manual - This document sets forth the guidelines which govern the design of all facilities which must be constructed to serve new development. Both the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance make specific reference to the requirements of this manual. The sections of the Policy Plan concerning the environment and public facilities provide guidance to implement the Public Facilities Manual requirements.

Capital Improvements Program - This document is intended to implement the public facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan, serving as a guide toward the efficient and effective provision of public facilities. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document is published annually and proposes the development, modernization or replacement of physical public projects over a multi-year period. The CIP shows the arrangement of projects in a sequential order based on a schedule of priorities and assigns an estimated cost and anticipated method of financing for each project.

~~By looking beyond year-to-year budgeting to project what, where, when, and how capital investments should be made, capital programming enables public bodies to maintain an effective level of service for present and future generations, better use Programming capital facilities over time can promote better use of the cCounty's limited financial resources, and assist in the coordination of public and private development. In addition, the programming process is valuable as a means of coordinating among cCounty agencies to avoid duplication of efforts and to take advantage of joint planning and development of facilities where possible. By looking beyond year to year budgeting to project what, where, when, and how capital investments should be made, capital programming enables public bodies to maintain an effective level of service to the present and future population. The CIP is intended to implement the public facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan.~~

~~Although the Policy Plan presents a twenty year projection of types of facilities and approximate measures to determine their numbers, fTiming of facility construction is dependent upon a number of variables. For example, in addition to the Capital Improvements Program, projects are evaluated on an annual basis through the cCounty budget process, to determine viability in light of fiscal constraints. Additionally, facilities proposed now may not be necessary in the future due to any number of factors, such as the provision of services through the private sector or changes in f Federal policy and funding.~~

Conclusion

~~The previously discussed implementation mechanisms are representative of the major tools that Fairfax County uses in development review. All mechanisms which reference the Comprehensive Plan as providing guidance to their function remains as implementation mechanisms even though they may not be specifically mentioned in this document.~~

MECHANISMS TO REVIEW THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The implementation of the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan is monitored regularly and rigorously to ensure the county is achieving its goals. The primary mechanism for reviewing the Plan is through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program schedules planning studies for a three-year period through areawide, neighborhood, and countywide studies. The schedule and order of studies on the work program will be reviewed approximately every two years in order to keep the schedule responsive to community needs, changes in circumstance, and other priorities. The schedule ensures that all elements of the Plan are up-to-date and relevant based on current and future needs.

New planning studies on the work program should be selected using the following criteria based on Comprehensive Plan policy and the experience of past planning efforts:

- Reflect previous authorizations by the Board of Supervisors or deferred Area Plans Review nominations;
- Address emerging community concerns or changes in circumstance;
- Respond to actions by others, such as federal, state, or adjacent jurisdictions;
- Advance major policy objectives, such as promoting environmental protection, fostering revitalization of designated areas, supporting economic development, preserving open space, providing affordable housing, or balancing transportation infrastructure and public facilities services with growth and development;

- Better implement the Concept for Future Development;
- Reflect implementation of Comprehensive Plan guidance through zoning approvals; and/or
- Respond to or incorporate research derived from technical planning or transportation studies.

Between work program reviews, the Board of Supervisors may authorize the consideration of Plan amendments, if circumstances warrant such exceptions. In order to identify those situations when an amendment may be considered, the Board adopted a screening criterion on December 8, 1986. It states that consideration of Board authorized Plan amendments:

‘...will be limited in any year to those that result from emergency situations in which the public health, safety, and welfare or sound land use planning will be harmed if action were deferred until the next appropriate Plan Review Year. Issues of sound land use planning will be evaluated in terms of oversights, inconsistencies, or land use related inequities.’

A request to initiate a Board authorized amendment must be made directly to a member of the Board of Supervisors to sponsor a motion to consider the amendment. If the member agrees to sponsor the motion, the Board must vote to direct staff to evaluate and make a recommendation on the proposed amendment. The Planning Commission subsequently holds a public hearing and makes its recommendation to the Board. The Board of Supervisors holds a public hearing and determines if the amendment should be adopted.

PLAN MONITORING

Board of Supervisors Goal:

Monitoring – The County's performance in achieving these goals should be regularly and rigorously monitored, and the goals themselves reviewed at least once every four years.

The Policy Plan Action Agenda and Planning Commission “Super-Priorities”

The first Policy Plan, which was produced as a draft document in December of 1989, contained a list of actions. The “Action Agenda” contained over 350 items thought worthy of consideration. Given the large number of suggested actions contained in the Action Agenda, the Board of Supervisors requested that the Planning Commission consider and prioritize the Action Agenda. The Planning Commission working through its Major Plan Review Committee formed four subcommittees to examine the areas of 1) Land Use; 2) Transportation; 3) Public Facilities, Housing, Human Services and Fiscal; and 4) Environment, Parks, and Heritage Resources. County agencies provided support to the work of these committees. Six major countywide organizations concerned with the Comprehensive Plan were invited to attend and participate in the deliberations. A public workshop was held and public comments were solicited as part of the deliberations.

In March of 1992, the Planning Commission presented to the Board of Supervisors a list of ten “super-priorities” that included about 45 of the “agenda” items. The Commission felt the identified actions were important for advancing Fairfax County’s adopted Goals.

The County's progress on these priorities and key objectives in the Policy Plan were evaluated as part of the 1996 Plan Monitoring Year. The State of the Plan report presented the results of this evaluation and contained suggested new actions that should be pursued.

As the 1997 and 1998 Area Plan Review Years would mark the last two years of the 1995—1998 Plan Review cycle, the Board requested that the Planning Commission examine the process of Plan monitoring before commencement of the next four year cycle to consider whether additional focus on potential implementation methods would be useful and, if so, how best to incorporate such focus into the Plan review cycle.

Plan Monitoring and Review

The 1995 Plan Monitoring Year began with the preparation of a series of reports describing existing conditions and trends in the County. The reports addressed seven areas:

- socio-economic characteristics;
- land use/housing;
- transportation;
- environment;
- public facilities and services;
- heritage resources;
- parks and recreation; and
- revitalization.

The State of the Plan report, which provided background data and suggestions for nominations to amend the Policy Plan, was the culmination of the 1995 Plan Monitoring Year.

Out of Turn Plan Amendments—Between Plan Reviews, the Board of Supervisors may consider Out of Turn Plan amendments, if circumstances warrant such exceptions. In order to identify those situations when an out of turn amendment might be considered, the Board adopted a screening criterion on December 8, 1986. It states:

“Consideration of Out of Turn Plan amendments will be limited in any year to those that result from emergency situations in which the public health, safety, and welfare or sound land use planning will be harmed if action were deferred until the next appropriate Plan Review Year. Issues of sound land use planning will be evaluated in terms of oversights, inconsistencies, or land use related inequities.”

To initiate an Out of Turn Plan amendment, the applicant makes a request directly to a member of the Board of Supervisors to sponsor a motion to consider the amendment. If the member agrees to sponsor the motion, the Board must vote to proceed with an evaluation of the proposed amendment. The proposed Plan amendment is then submitted to the planning staff for evaluation and recommendation. The Planning Commission subsequently holds a public hearing and makes its recommendation to the Board. The Board of Supervisors holds a public hearing and determines if the amendment should be accepted.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Board of Supervisors Goal:

'Public Participation - The Fairfax County community should be encouraged to take part in the shaping of policies and plans that will affect the environment in which they live and work. Active and timely public participation in actions involving areas of public concern in the cCounty should be encouraged and promoted.'

Community Participation Mechanisms

Community involvement is important, both to ensure that the Plan is being implemented as intended and to ensure that the Plan reflects current needs, through periodic review. A variety of opportunities exist for a member of the community to become active in the planning process, including the following:

- **Plan Monitoring:** The process for periodic review of the status of the Plan includes publishing a status report and holding public hearings to capture public sentiment about the achievement of Plan policy.
- **The Plan Amendment Process:** The Plan is subject to amendment through the Plan Review process and through the ~~Out-of-Turn~~ Board authorized Plan amendments and special studies process for urgent cases. Citizens, both as individuals and as members of task forces, can review proposed amendments, make recommendations of their own, and testify at public hearings.
- **Magisterial District Citizen Groups:** Local planning groups monitor planning and zoning activity for their district. These groups often are involved in review of proposed Plan amendments, rezoning cases, and proposals for siting of public facilities.
- **Special Study Task Forces:** When the cCounty undertakes a special planning study of a small area, the Board of Supervisors may appoint a special task force to participate in this project. Such a task force is composed of a cross section of the community, in order to reflect a broad spectrum of views. Public meetings conducted by the Task Force may be held to involve the community.
- **Board-appointed Committees and Commissions:** The Board appoints citizens to be members of standing committees and commissions to advise them on a wide range of issues, including many that are related to countywide planning. These include the Wetlands Board, the Environmental Quality Advisory Council, and the History Commission to name just a few. The Board also periodically appoints a commission to address a specific task in a finite period of time. For example, the Board appointed the Goals Advisory Commission to review and revise the cCounty's goals in the period of one year.
- Technology: Public participation through online and mobile social media tools and websites enhances public participation by making information available at the convenience of the users.
- **The cCounty bBudget pProcess and the Capital Improvements Program:** Public hHearings are held during the review of the proposed cCounty budget and also for

the Capital Improvements Program. These hearings offer an important opportunity for the community to be involved in the funding of pPlan implementation.

- County Authorities: The Board of Supervisors, with s State mandate, appoints quasi-governmental authorities such as the Park Authority, Housing Authority, and Economic Development Authority. Appointees from the community serve as members of these bodies. The general public can participate in their public meetings and hearings.
- The list above describes the highlights of the opportunities available to the community to become involved in the planning process. Even if a citizen is not a member of an organized group, he or she can:
 - Follow local issues in the press and cCounty staff reports;
 - Attend public hearings to voice opinions on rezoning cases or Plan amendments;
 - Vote on bond issues;
 - Attend meetings of the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and other commissions and authorities;
 - Propose a Plan amendment through the appropriate process; and
 - Be active in a neighborhood association to monitor local planning and zoning activity.

All of these aspects of public participation strengthen the planning process by tapping the community's most important resource, those who have a stake in enhancing the community's quality of life.”

2.2 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Land Use, Amended through 2-12-2013, Appendix 10: Guidelines for Mobile Home Retention, page 32:

“Mobile homes provide an important alternative source of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households. In Fairfax County, this is a relatively small but important segment of the housing inventory. However, in many cases the existing Plan designation and the underlying zoning are in conflict. Further, many of these mobile home parks can be redeveloped in other uses as a matter of right, leading to a loss of affordable housing and the displacement of residents. It is recommended that this issue be studied further ~~in the Area Plan Update Process (Phase II of the Comprehensive Plan Review)~~ to determine whether it is appropriate to re-plan these sites to continue their use for mobile home parks...”

2.3 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Land Use, Amended through 2-12-2013, Appendix 11: Guidelines for Transit-Oriented Development, 10. Vision for the Community, page 36:

“Broad-based support and collaboration can be achieved through planning processes that encourage involvement and participation. These processes should utilize a range of tools and techniques for engaging the community and other interested stakeholders. While the particulars

of the process should relate to each station, planning processes should include the use of citizen task forces, ~~the Area Plans Review process~~ and other means to result in the following: (1) a collaborative and interactive formulation of a cohesive vision for the transit station area before specific development proposals are formally considered; (2) a TOD vision that is integrated with and complements surrounding neighborhoods; (3) incorporation of a broad range of aspirations and needs of those communities; (4) active participation by county planning officials, supervisors, community groups and developers to identify, and encourage broad-based involvement and participation by, a wide range of stakeholders, including all interested citizens' associations; and (5) continuing stakeholder involvement on a collaborative basis in framing development proposals ultimately considered for specific parcels.”

3. Modifications to Policy Plan Reflecting Public Facilities Review Name Change

3.1 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Public Facilities, Amended through 4-30-2013, Countywide Objectives and Policies, Objective 5, page 4:

“Policy g. Use the ~~2232~~ ~~456~~ review ~~p~~Process to determine the siting suitability and appropriateness of facilities in relation with the Comprehensive Plan.”

3.2 MODIFY: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Human Services, Amended through 8-5-2002, Countywide Objectives and Policies, Objective 3, page 3:

“Policy g. Regulate group facilities and halfway houses through the special exception and the ~~456~~ ~~2232~~ rReview process when such regulation is in accordance with state and federal guidelines and regulations.”

4. General Editorial Changes

4.1 MODIFY: Change “County” to “county” when not used as a proper noun within the Policy Plan and Area I – IV volumes of the Comprehensive Plan.

4.2 MODIFY: Change “Federal” to “federal” when not used as a proper noun within the Policy Plan and Area I – IV volumes of the Comprehensive Plan.

4.3 MODIFY: Change “State” to “state” when not used as a proper noun within the Policy Plan and Area I – IV volumes of the Comprehensive Plan.

PLAN MAP: The Comprehensive Plan map will not change.

ATTACHMENT 1: ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT WEB LINKS

Below are links to the online version of the Comprehensive Plan. Refer to the referenced page numbers to identify the location of the adopted Comprehensive Plan text recommended for modification. Previous versions of the Comprehensive Plan may be found at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/planhistoric/>.

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Preface and Introduction, Amended through 2-12-2013, History of Comprehensive Planning in Fairfax County, pages 10-17:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/preface.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Land Use, Amended through 2-12-2013, Appendix 10: Guidelines for Mobile Home Retention, page 32:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/landuse.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Land Use, Amended through 2-12-2013, Appendix 11: Guidelines for Transit-Oriented Development, page 36:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/landuse.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Public Facilities, Amended through 4-30-2013, Countywide Objectives and Policies, page 4:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/pubfacilities.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Policy Plan, Human Services, Amended through 8-5-2002, Countywide Objectives and Policies, page 3:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/humanservices.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area I, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, General Planning Area Recommendations, Transportation, Level of Service, page 15:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area1/overview.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, Environment, Difficult Run Watershed, page 16:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area2/overview.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, McLean Planning District, Community Business Center, Amended through 11-19-2013, page 22; and

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area II, McLean Planning District, West Falls Church Transit Station Area, Amended through 11-19-2013, Recommendations, Transit Development Area Conditions and Recommendations, page 78:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area2/mclean.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, page 16:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/overview.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Planning Issues, Development Potential and Transportation Imbalance, page 9; and

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Area Plan Overview, Introduction, Amended through 12-3-2013, Environment, Difficult Run Watershed, page 16:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/overview.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Background, page 6;

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Implementation, page 19;

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Performance Criteria for Optional Uses, page 20;

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Performance Criteria for Optional Uses, page 21;

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Dulles Suburban Center Area-Wide Recommendations, Public Facilities, page 42; and

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Dulles Suburban Center, Amended through 12-3-2013, Dulles Suburban Center Land Unit Recommendations, page 52:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/dulles.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Land Use Plan Recommendations – The Overlay Level, Land Unit E, Recommendations, Additional Development Conditions Specific to Each Sub-Unit, Sub-Unit E2 (formally E3, E6, eastern edge of E5 and a small portion of E4, page 57;

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Land Use Plan Recommendations – The Overlay Level, Land Unit E, Recommendations, Land Use, Sub-Unit O4, page 94; and

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Fairfax Center Area, Amended through 4-9-2013, Recommendations, page 102:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/fairfaxcenter.pdf>

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2013 Edition, Area III, Upper Potomac Planning District, Amended through 12-3-2013, UP7 West Ox Community Planning Sector, Recommendations, Land Use, page 189:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/upperpotomac.pdf>