

HERNDON-MONROE COMMITTEE

08/16/10

Attendees

Nick Bauer, TF
John Bowman, TF
John Carter, TF
Mike Cooper, TF
Fred Costello, TF
Rustom Cowasjee
Arthur Hill, TF
Richard A. Lambert, Jr., Fairfax County Department of Planning & Zoning
John Lovaas
Doug Pew
Judith Pew, TF
Greg Riegler, TF
Joe Stowers
Gerald Volloy, TF

Meeting Notes

Open Forum

Greg Riegler—The committee has the general concepts well in hand; we now need to add detail. The committee recommendation does not end the process—there will be additional public input and debate within the full TF. The H-M committee should be consistent with other committees with respect to level of detail, etc. A performance-based approach would allow flexibility to address future needs; specific details can be addressed in the zoning review process.

John Carter—Arlington and Fairfax calculate FARs differently: Arlington based on net area; Fairfax on gross area (i.e., total includes roads, etc.). With increased density comes increased needs for other infrastructure, such as schools, transportation, etc. One way of approaching the overall density is to cap the density at the level at which the necessary infrastructure can be afforded.

Jerry Volloy—The main question should be what level of density is needed to achieve the desired objectives, looking across all station areas.

Arthur Hill—The current Comprehensive Plan for rail-oriented mixed-use development is the guide that has been in effect and is still the starting point. The Herndon area being considered for redevelopment comprises about 100 acres—far larger than the area in Fairfax County (south of the Toll Road) that is being considered for redevelopment. What happens in Herndon will be important to the overall success of the H-M station area.

Administrative

- No date has been set yet for the next full TF meeting.
- The next H-M committee meetings will be held:
 - Monday, September 13, 2010: 8:00 – 9:30 AM, RCC Hunters Woods

Discussion

Oral Comments on Draft Recommendations

- Various alternatives for parking at the station should be considered. These include (1) parking as proposed by the airports authority, plus additional access; (2) no new additional parking, and sharing parking with future development uses; and (3) tearing down the existing garage and moving parking to the western end of the County parcel (C2).
- The County is looking at recommended enhancements to the parking demand analysis.
- Traffic limits on Sunrise Valley Drive might be used as a numerical objective.
- Development most likely would not occur for several years at a minimum. Many unknowns will affect what will be feasible and desirable. The committee should establish a vision and detailed goals. Specific decisions about densities, etc. can be made by during the planning and zoning review at the time of proposed re-development.
- Recommendations should include statements about the character—look and feel—of future development.
- With an open parcel or one that will be completely re-developed, developers can prepare a plan to work with a given density. A partially developed site is more challenging.
- The existing area, especially parcel A1, is a successful employment center. Any additional development should not detract from that success.