

## ROUTE 28 STATION -- SOUTH STUDY

# ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

Work Group Comments on 1/17/13 Draft Plan Text

02-20-13  
Coates E.S.

Draft Plan Text: [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft\\_plan\\_text\\_01\\_17\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft_plan_text_01_17_13.pdf)

[Work Group Comments at Meeting](#)

[Work Group Comments by Email](#)

[Staff Comments](#)

### LAND USE:

- Add language to better reflect policy objectives aimed at encouraging more residential development to create desired mixed-use.
- **Planned Development Table:** [Staff had corrected the numbers in the table](#)
- **Existing Uses:** should acknowledge existing road and transportation infrastructure which should not have to be reconstructed for amended Comprehensive Plan.
  - Should balance road planning for “through movements” with need for reasonable access to current and near-term planned uses.
- **Affordable Housing:** [Intensity higher than 1.0 FAR should provide a contribution greater than current County-wide policies. \(page 3\)](#)
  - Suggestion to keep existing policy levels for this area
  - This has been done in Tyson’s, but higher development costs may suggest greater need for increased affordable housing there. That is not the case in this area.
  - Suggestion that asking for more of a commitment is appropriate
- It needs to be clearer that the percentages apply to the Tier and not individual properties.
- **Sub-Unit A-5:**
  - [Suggestion that the specific recommendations for parks and schools should be addressed for a wider area than sub-unit A-5. Otherwise there seems to be a disproportionate burden \(page 6\)](#)
  - Suggestion that intensity in draft is more than what is reasonable given transportation considerations
  - Suggestion that land use recommendation remain unchanged from existing (already adopted) Plan guidance for this area.
  - Proposed text does not have necessary incentives to encourage redevelopment in a way that contributes to vision developed by Work Group.
  - The Work Group vision notes the need for increased flexibility for which is largely absent in the draft text.

- Parks and Schools recommendation should apply to Land Unit A and not one Sub-Unit, specifically A-5.
- Building Height should not be the only measure of a good transition.
- **Phasing Among Uses:** Clarify the scope of the relaxation of the principle of use phasing due to market demands and reconcile it to the text in the Policy Plan.
- Clarify what becomes of property that straddles Tiers
- Clarify that FAR applies to each property not entire sub-unit or Tier
- Question: Should use percentages apply to individual property or sub-unit or Tier? Language should be clear to reflect how percentages apply.

#### **TRANSPORTATION:**

- **Land Use/Transportation Balance Monitoring System:** Who will bear responsibility for monitoring land use/transp. balance? (page 7)
  - County staff will, but will also require assistance of applicants.
  - Suggestion that monitoring every 7 years rather than 5 years.
  - Suggestion that monitoring be tied to levels of development not just number of years.
- **Road Network and Circulation (additional crossing of Centreville Road):** What is the source of the road transportation improvement of a new Centreville Road crossing at McNair Farms Drive? (page 8 & page 9 graphic) It is pointed out that this new road would cross FCPA wetlands.
  - Is it environmentally sensitive?
  - Will it need to address Arrowbrook owner's maintenance agreement?
- **Rock Hill Road Bridge:** Should the Work Group address the bridge issue, and if so, how?
  - Suggestion that Bridge be removed from planned network
  - The bridge is referred to as "Bridge over Toll Road to Loudoun County". Suggest it be given a name other than Rock Hill Road Bridge.
  - If the bridge is to be constructed, the design should reflect that it is the gateway into western Fairfax County. It should be iconic design, not a standard VDOT bridge.
  - The bridge cannot be a barrier. Its design should allow smooth and easy access under it to allow pedestrian and vehicular movement and access between the new Metro station to the developments on the opposite side of the bridge.
- **New street typologies and VDOT standards:** Don't these typologies' standards conflict with current VDOT standards? Won't these VDOT standards need to be changed or an agreement reached to allow these more "urban" standards? (pages 9-10)
  - VDOT has an agreement with the County on Tysons "urban" streets
  - County is negotiating a county-wide agreement w/ VDOT for "urban" streets (including our study area).
  - Road Classification should not apply to existing roads and should be applied to future development recognizing the amount of existing development that around it.
  - The Principle Arterial designation is not relevant to roads within Land Unit A

- **Grid of Streets Map too rigid:** The grid of streets concept needs to be more flexible than the current lines on a map suggest. If circumstances change, the same lines remain. (page 9 graphic)
  - Also, existing development will require flexibility on standards.
    - Staff acknowledges that we need to include additional text to provide for this flexibility, to support any map/graphic.
    - Questions about which links to include
    - Roads should reflect design of the Metro station and associated garage.
    - Suggestion that transportation map be deleted.
  -
- **Bicycle Facilities**
  - **Bicycle Facilities doesn't address trails:** The text doesn't address off-street bicycle trails. (page 10)
  - This is addressed in the draft Bicycle Master Plan document.
  - Arterial roads should allow for bike lanes or shared use markings and defer to master plan
  - Suggest road cross sections indicate that bike lanes should be buffered by cars
  - Suggestion that on street bicycle parking where there is on street car parking (p. 11 and 25)
  - Three streetscape cross sections should include bicycle facilities
  - Bicycle and pedestrian trails should be an integral component of the overall transportation plan for this study area utilizing the "complete streets" concept along with an independent trails network.
- **Transportation Demand Management:**
  - Clarify that applies to new construction
  - Are TDM objectives consistent with County objectives or similar transit station areas.
  - Add language that TDM programs include a plan to remedy failure to achieve objectives.
- **Parking maximums:** Is there current County policy addressing parking maximums for TOD areas as raised under the Parking Management section? (page 11)
  - Parking reductions/maximums aren't addressed specifically in draft text.
  - Current Zoning Ordinance requires minimums; maybe we could remove such requirements for this TOD area.
  - To encourage transit use, off-street parking within a ½ mile radius of the metro station should be restricted to maximum allowable rates (TDB). In addition, there should be further limits within the ¼ mile of the metro.
- Pedestrian Crossing of DAAR
  - Suggest that on maps this should not be dashed nor should it be shown as tentative.
  - This crossing should be part of Plan text
- Should balance road planning for "through movements" with need for reasonable access to existing and near-term planned uses.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP:

- **Noise:** Clarify residential uses may be located adjacent to the Dulles Toll Road and narrow the circumstances where post-development noise testing is required (i.e. only where evidence of noise pollution persists.)

#### URBAN PARKS:

- No comments.
- Suggestion that p. 14 indicate that that schools and parks should be accessible by bicycles and pedestrians.
- 

#### PUBLIC FACILITIES:

- **New Schools:** Would these schools be located in Land Unit A? (page16)
  - Suggestion that schools language should be stronger (and perhaps more specific).
  - Indicated new schools may be integrated into buildings in new development.
    - Staff is meeting with Schools staff to discuss inclusion of more detailed guidance in the Plan and Staff Report.
- **Level of Detail for Public Facilities text:** How does the WG want the Plan text to address public facilities text, more detail or less?
- Any new public facilities (schools, parks, recreation fields, public safety buildings, etc.) resulting from increased development within the study are need not be located entirely within the study area so long as they are within proximity to serve the study area.

#### URBAN DESIGN:

- **Policy Plan's existing Urban Design (UD) guidance:** Doesn't the Policy Plan include UD guidance?
  - No. Each Area Plan addresses UD individually. There is redundancy but staff plans to, at later point, look to address UD on a county-wide level. Another county-wide plan amendment.
- **UD universal applicability vs. unique approaches:** Are all TODs similar enough to use County-wide UD guidance, or should our TOD address UD uniquely?
- **Streetscape design flexibility and even more flexibility:** Suggestion to remove the word "pre-existing" to increase flexibility even more. (page 19)
- **Centreville Road into a Boulevard:** How will we convert Centreville Road to a boulevard streetscape? (page 20)
  - Either remove the Boulevard concept, or specify that it's a public responsibility to implement. Have now specified that if road is improved, Urban Design guidelines apply and pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be provided.

- Suggestion that Centreville Road is at the edge of the TOD area, so it seems less necessary to realizing the TOD environment. In Tysons, where the Plan also calls for a Boulevard concept, Routes 7 and 123 are directly in front of the Metro stations and therefore their transformation through the Boulevard concept is a requirement to realizing the TOD environment.
- **Bike Lanes in streetscape graphics and descriptive text:** Where are bike lanes addressed in the streetscape sections and text?
  - The streetscape sections only address building face to street curb. Facilities between street curbs, including bike lanes, are addressed in the transportation section.
  - Suggest there should be provision of bicycle parking in sidewalks in a way that doesn't interfere with pedestrians.
  - P. 25 say "Parking should be designed ... minimize conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles..."
  - Suggest text limit on-street parallel parking where adjacent to a bike lane.
- **Building Heights:** Suggestion for building heights to be addressed with more nuance than just relating to the Metro station, Route 28 and Toll Road. (pages 25-26)
  - Suggest not being vague and stipulate specific height.
  - Comment that proposed draft language should remain.
  - Building height may be appropriate along Rt. 28 or other roads or gateway locations.
- **Parking Design too focused on underground parking:** The bullet for underground parking seems too restrictive of other types of parking. (page 25)
- **Bulk, Massing and Step Backs**
  - Recognize that height is only one measure of an effective transition. There needs to be added emphasis on site design and other urban design in addition to height considerations.

#### **DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER (OUTSIDE LAND UNIT A & B-1)**

- We will focus on Land Unit A and B-1. Staff will provide some editorial-type changes to other parts of the Dulles Suburban Center text to ensure agreement between areawide and land unit-specific guidance.