

## Route 28 Station – South Study Meeting Notes

Working Group Meeting #26  
Hutchison ES Theater @ 7 PM, Tuesday 06-04-13

### **Administrative Items:**

- Chairman Jeff Fairfield opens the meeting with approval of the previous meeting's summary (04-30-13) as submitted. See the following link for the final meeting summary. [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/28\\_wg\\_meeting\\_summary\\_04\\_30\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/28_wg_meeting_summary_04_30_13.pdf)
- Jeff suggests there be a Work Group (WG) subcommittee to write a WG statement to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors that summarizes any potential divergence from the Staff Report and Plan text. The WG might also wish to use the recommendation to address other issues, such as suggesting Policy Plan changes.
  - WG members John Ulfelder, Greg Riegle, and Rae Noritake, along with Jeff, will lead this effort.
  - Jeff clarifies that prior to any final vote by the WG to endorse Plan text, Staff should provide the WG with this Plan text for consideration at least a full 5 business days beforehand.

**Wells & Associates:** Robin Antonucci and Will Johnson, transportation planners representing the Rocks property, provide comments on Fairfax County Department of Transportation's (FCDOT) grid of streets analysis. Their comments focus on the Rocks property and its periphery. See the following link for the presentation:

[http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/wells\\_and\\_associates\\_wg\\_ppt\\_06\\_04\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/wells_and_associates_wg_ppt_06_04_13.pdf)

- They focus primarily on the two main roads on the property; a north-south road through the center of the property and an east-west road along the southern boundary.
- They say that FCDOT's recommendation for a 4 lane north-south road negatively affects their site design. They suggest a 2 lane road is sufficient because, they contend, it would take a Level of Service (LOS) A intersection down to a manageable LOS B.
- They also suggest a roundabout for Sunrise Valley Drive beneath the Toll Road overpass. This would reduce the traffic (and therefore the need for a large road) going through the TOD area (their site).

**Draft Plan Text:** Jeff leads the group in a discussion of the draft Plan text dated 05-31-13. See the following link for draft Plan text:

[http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft\\_plan\\_text\\_05\\_31\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft_plan_text_05_31_13.pdf)

### **Discussion:**

- **Affordable and Workforce Housing** (p.4): There is discussion of the percentages of required Workforce Dwelling Units (WDU) as well as the non-residential development's contribution towards affordable and workforce housing.

- Several WG members express concern about the Plan’s tiered approach to linking FAR ranges to percentages of WDUs. It is preferred to proportionally link FARs to percentages.
- WG member Rae Noritake thinks the non-residential contribution of \$3/ non-residential sf is too high. This amount is derived from the Tysons Plan and Rae points out that our study area demands lower rents than Tysons or Reston or other areas like Arlington. Therefore, the amount should be lowered correspondingly.
- WG member Sarah Newman suggests that Arlington and DC have failed to provide adequate amounts of affordable housing. She also points out that WDU, which this Plan focuses on, are more expensive than Affordable Dwelling Units.
- WG member Greg Riegler offers that the WG could address ADUs & WDUs through suggesting add-on motions to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.
- Rae suggests we just require a non-residential contribution of less than \$3. The lower contribution should be determined by the proportion of lower rents demanded in Dulles than in Tysons. For example, if the Dulles area demands two thirds the rent of Tysons, then the contribution requirement should correspondingly be two thirds that of Tysons.
- Jeff moves that the WG approve the Affordable and Workforce Housing bullet with several modifications including:
  1. Any development proposal above a 1.0 FAR should have a proportional increase in the required percentage of residential contributions to WDUs, up to the cap of 16%. Staff is to craft the exact language.
  2. Any development proposal should contribute \$2 per non-residential square feet.
  3. Staff should fix the sentence about 25 cents to be clearer.
    - WG member Greg Riegler seconds the motion.
    - The present WG members approve unanimously.
- **Stormwater Management** (p.-14): Discussion focuses on the effects on smaller development sites that share stormwater (SW) facilities with larger sites. In addition, there is concern about the four numbered SW measures being feasible from an engineering standpoint.
  - Jeff and Rae express concern with the effect of SW requirements on smaller redevelopment sites. They want to know, if an application is submitted for a small site that was part of a larger previously rezoned site, would the smaller site get credit for their (now) offsite stormwater (SW) facilities that are part of the larger site. This concern doesn’t extend to new development sites.
  - Staff mentions that the SW text is a result of several staff agencies’ input, including experience with Tysons. Greg and several others still want to have their engineers double-check the feasibility of bullets #1-4.
  - WG member Bob Lawrence moves to table the SW bullets pending input from WG members’ engineering analysis.
    - Greg seconds.

- The present WG members approve unanimously.
- **Green Building** (p. 14-15): Rae says that the LEED Silver sentence should be tied to a year or time period, such as “LEED Silver Certification or equivalent at the time of approval”. He argues that this Certification periodically changes and so needing to adhere to the latest Certification might require submission of new plans/analysis and therefore additional cost to the developer.
  - Staff will double-check how we’re addressing LEED Silver Certification in Tysons. Is it through proffer negotiations?
  - The section is tabled pending this input from Staff.
- **Schools** (p. 17): There are two minor revisions suggested by WG members.
  - Rae moves to approve the Schools text with Staff incorporating these two revisions.
    - John seconds the motion.
    - The present WG members approve unanimously.
- **Public Facilities** (p. 18-19): Most of the text on each facility type is removed.
  - Rae moves to approve this section.
    - Jeff seconds.
    - The present WG members approve unanimously.

**Next Meeting Date:**

- 06-19-13 (Wednesday) @ 7 PM, location to be determined. Want FCDOT to present grid analysis and text. WG Report Subcommittee will briefly present to the WG.
- 06-27-13 (Thursday) @ 7 PM, location to be determined. Hope to approve all of proposed Plan text today.