

Discussion Document for Reston MasterPlan Special Study Steering Sub-committee Meeting  
 Wednesday April 6, 2011

Comparison of Two Approaches to Jobs:Households Balance Issue

	<b>Option A:</b>	<b>Option B:</b>
	<p><b>3:1 jobs:hh ceiling community-wide</b></p> <p>(there will be some discussion about whether that is too high, that overall Reston should use new growth to eventually get to 2:1 jobs:hh per APA paper; have that discussion but my sense is the majority will not force that; holding what we have now will be challenging enough)</p>	<p><b>Set TSA-specific ratios without regard to an overall jobs:hh target</b></p>
Goal	At full build out Reston's current +/- 3:1 jobs:hh ratio cannot be exceeded. At interim stages it of course can be (res and office unlikely to develop concurrently and in desired balance), but goal is to stay under a +/- 3:1 jobs:hh community ceiling at fully projected build out.	To set TSA-specific jobs:hh ratios or targets that are appropriate to and achievable at each TSA: regional urban center paradigm for TC and urban transit neighborhood paradigm for Wiehle and H-M.
First decision: setting the TSA mixes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decide TC first since it is easiest to define and with highest densities will impact the equation the most. Assume current Town Center Committee recommendation of 4:1 jobs:hh for any new development that takes the higher FAR option holds (though of course that can be revisited).</li> <li>2. We know that will grow Reston's existing and overall 3:1 jobs:hh balance (has to). How much? Do some modeling.</li> <li>3. We now have to use redevelopment at the other TSAs and village centers to get the overall ratio back under the 3:1 overall ceiling. Based on some modeling we can come up with reasonable needs. Wiehle and H-M will have to be less than 4:1 jobs:hh but probably need not and should not be less than 2:1 jobs:hh (which should also roughly equate to 2:1 SF res:office). Wiehle Committee recommendation is just under 4:1 jobs:hh.</li> <li>4. In assessing those ratios, consider to what extent village centers are likely to be able to contribute to helping us stay under the ceiling, ascribing reasonable projections to each. Depending on what can be picked up there, you might be able to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assume TC at 4:1 – fits within CTOD and other research for downtown/regional center paradigm and with analogs on the ground (again, can be revisited, but this is easiest station to define and there is intellectual and experiential support for the 4:1).</li> <li>2. Research and experience suggest urban transit neighborhoods can fall anywhere from exclusively res with supporting retail to +/- 2:1 jobs:hh on the higher end (data point: Courthouse, Clarendon, and Va Sq are all +/- 2:1). Regardless of literature/analog on the ground, there is no overall community ceiling under this model so we could also choose to go higher. I doubt many will want to go higher than the 4:1 recommendation for TC (note Wiehle Committee recommendation is just under 4:1) – I think the essential arguments are what the Wiehle Committee and others have said: a) regardless of what might be ideal in the CTOD or other literature or exists in ArCo, we can't realistically get materially below 4:1 given what we have on the ground (we can encourage more, and do, but you can't require it; just not realistic); and/or b) we think to be a successful place we will need office at near the 4:1 mix; and/or c) we see great benefit to keeping this as a robust employment corridor and we would rather have no less than a 4:1 mix because of the value we attach to that.</li> </ol>

	get to +/- 3:1 ratios at Wiehle and H-M and still keep Reston overall at or near the +/- 3:1 ceiling.	3. Have this discussion and vote on the ratios the majority wants.
Second decision: converting to agreed SF ratio and setting any exemptions	<p>1. TC and Wiehle (I think) used 1200 SF condo and 300 SF office job (thus, 1:1Sf res:office roughly equates to 4:1 jobs:hh). Note John Carter's point: more than just office. However, ArCo data suggests the res:office ratio ends up getting you fairly on track with jobs:hh. Apparently not enough other "stuff" to really impact the ratio much. Are these conversions acceptable? Wiehle might be a little bigger on office and housing space (less expensive), but ratio wise probably same effect.</p> <p>2. TC exempted from the non-res side of the equation both retail (want to encourage) and hotel (want convention and doesn't act like office). Wiehle also exempts retail (want to encourage) and educational. H-M probably just retail? No other exemptions to maximize scarce res footprint?</p> <p>3. What about exempting civic/cultural for each TSA?</p>	Same as Option A
Next Decision Points	<p>1. Are these hard requirements or soft targets?</p> <p>2. Do we impose lot-by-lot or by land bay or by TSA, each with trading or not, or just set an overall target for the TSA and let County manage?</p> <p>3. Land banks?</p> <p>4. Incentive for tear down versus infill?</p> <p>Note: answers to these may be different for each station. Density and X factors related, but initially just try to conclude on your residential/office emphases and station profiles.</p>	Same as Option A
Note	Under either Option A or B, to achieve residential ratios at either Wiehle or H-M at less than 4:1 jobs:hh (i.e., higher res models) will likely require higher FARs. Key issue that may have to be confronted early in the discussion: would the community rather have more overall growth but with higher res component or lower overall growth but with relatively more office?	A third option: setting a corridor- (not community-) wide target. Data point: R-B minus Rosslyn is currently 2.8:1 jobs:hh and projects to that through 2040; with Rosslyn (which is 5.5:1 jobs:hh, larger than anything we would have) the corridor ratio climbs to 3.5:1. If desired, just overlay on Option B a corridor-wide target and then fit the three TSAs within that goal.

\* Sam Zimbabwe of CTOD says R-B is a model for a linear line extending into suburbia. I'd propose we start there. This would exclude Pentagon and CC, though adding those doesn't change the ratio much (those two stations are currently at 3:1 jobs:hh and are projected to be at 3:1 in 2040, so they would not materially impact the below). Here's a table based on the ArCo Round 8 forecast

[http://www.arlingtonva.us/departments/CPHD/planning/data\\_maps/pdf/file79200.pdf](http://www.arlingtonva.us/departments/CPHD/planning/data_maps/pdf/file79200.pdf) (and I'll round off):

<b>RB Corridor (Rosslyn, Courthouse, Clarendon, Va Sq, Ballston)</b>	Jobs	Res units	Jobs:HH
2010 (actual)	99,000	29,000	3.4:1
2040 (projected)	133,000	38,000	3.5:1
<b>RB minus Rosslyn (we have no analog like Rosslyn in Reston- Herndon corridor)</b>			
2010 (actual)	61,000	22,000	2.8:1
2040 (projected)	78,000	28,000	2.8:1