



## Summary of Comments Received on Guiding Planning Principles

August 28, 2006

### ***Overall summary of comments received:***

- 29 total comments were received, including the following groups
  - Fairfax Citizens for Responsible Growth (Fairgrowth).
  - Fairfax County Citizens Committee on Land Use and Transportation
  - Westbriar Civic Association and Greater Tysons Green Civic Assoc.
  - The Town of Vienna
  - The Pimmit Hills Citizens Association
  - Fairfax County Parks Authority
- 8 people specifically identified themselves as Pimmit Hills residents
- 7 comments stressed the need for bike lanes and access
- 7 comments expressed concern about increasing density
- 7 comments expressed concern about traffic
- 5 comments stressed pedestrian accessibility
- 3 comments stressed the need to accommodate disabled access in planning
- 3 comments stressed the need for infrastructure to be in place prior to increasing density
- 2 comments questioned the value of retaining a planning consultant
- 2 stressed the need for public involvement
- 1 comment questioned need for new plan and principles when so much of existing plan has not yet been achieved

### ***Subcommittee Suggestions***

The Communications Subcommittee reviewed these comments and revised the language of the Guiding Planning Principles to reflect many of the important suggestions. Key changes to the principles included:

- A better introduction to reflect the history and purpose of the principles
- Added aesthetics, open space, and entertainment as important components of growth
- Added the desirability of demand-oriented transportation design
- Added shuttles to the list of desirable transportation improvements
- Identified the need for increased housing
- Increased the focus on environment and safety

***Specific language that could lead to changes in wording or principles:***

Most comments provided support or concern for existing issues such as accessibility as noted above. The following comment excerpts are those that directly suggest changes to the planning principles.

**Comment 6: Resident**

In the Planning Principal that starts with "Attract intense, mixed-use development", the words "transit connection locations throughout Tysons Corner" can be defined too broadly. Metrorail usage declines as the distance from the stations increases, so permitting high density development throughout Tysons is not smart growth and contradicts the Principal to "Retain compatible transitions...to adjacent neighborhoods".

Also, the term "service opportunities" does not embody a full mix of uses that would reduce car trips. Mixed-use development should include recreation for adults and children as a basic necessity located within walking distance.

Please consider making the following changes to the Principals:

Attract intense, mixed-use development and private investment to Metro station areas and transit locations in Tysons Corner, including a range of housing choices and price points, office space, retail, services, and recreational opportunities.

The word "entertainment" should be added to the principal that begins with "Engage people".

**Comment 8: Resident, OpenCarry.org**

Please ensure that the federal and Virginia Constitutional rights of citizens to move freely, assemble, communicate, and carry guns for self defense are supported by the land use planning objectives and principles being applied for management of development in the Tysons corner area and metro access.

**Comment 14: Resident**

There is an essential aspect of the community outreach results which does not seem to come through clearly in your Planning Principles.

The essential aspect is the community's need to decrease traffic and ensure that the infrastructure is sufficient to meet any increase in density. This implies that density increases through additional building should not be permitted until traffic improvements are in place. (For example, a major improvement cited in the current comprehensive plan consists of grade-separated interchanges at certain key intersections.)

**Comment 18: Resident**

Some of those principles may come into conflict with each other from time-to-time depending on circumstances. Should I infer a prioritization of them based on their rank order in the list?

**Comment 20: Fairfax Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc.**

The first draft principle should be re-written as follows:

- *Through consultation with the surrounding communities, propel Tysons Corner forward within existing boundaries as the employment and commercial center of the region and an expanding contributor to the tax base of Fairfax County.*

## Summary of Comments Received on Guiding Planning Principles

---

In the second draft principle, the words "at the edges" should be struck, and language added, so that it reads:

- *Retain compatible transitions to adjacent neighborhoods* in terms of some combination of use, intensity, scale and building heights. New planning language for specific sites should be crafted to conform to the community vision for the area.

Currently, the community is asked to comment on specific proposals. Instead, the community should first outline its vision for an area, and proposals should then be presented and considered in that context.

FairGrowth suggests that the sixth proposed principle be altered to read as follows:

- *While maintaining a balance with available public infrastructure of all types, attract measured mixed-use development and private investment to Metrorail station areas and transit locations in Tysons Corner*, including a range of housing choices and price points, service opportunities, recreational opportunities, and office space.

FairGrowth respectfully suggests referencing transit node coordination with the following additional planning principle:

- *Transit node sites will be coordinated with each other, and balanced with available public facilities*, in order to optimize the mixture of retail, residential, commercial, recreational and parking uses collectively and at each site.

### **Comment 21: Fairfax County Citizens Committee on Land Use and Transportation**

The Committee feels that "propel" is much too strong an action verb. Also, the concept of Transit Oriented Development, for which a sizeable area of Tysons Corner will qualify, is not to increase the tax base but rather to add balanced density within a walkable distance of transit stations. The current Comprehensive Plan designates Tysons Corner the "Urban Center" of the County. We do appreciate the protection of the existing boundaries, which is very important to neighboring communities. We recommend revising this principle to read: "As the designated Urban Center of Fairfax County, encourage a concentrated balance of office, retail and residential uses supported by a balanced transportation system within existing boundaries, using Transit Oriented Development where appropriate."

We recommend rewording #2 to read, "Ensure the tapering of uses toward the boundaries with adjacent neighborhoods, protecting them through reduced density, intensity, scale and building heights."

#3. The Committee questions whether Tysons Corner can be defined as a suburban office park. The current Plan provides for urban design standards and all development since that time, to our knowledge, has followed those standards, i.e., oriented to the street, structured parking behind buildings, etc. We recommend deletion of this principle because the points are covered in other principles.

#4. It would be more realistic to say, "Ensure completion of the transportation accessibility system to and within Tysons Corner to guarantee a functional system of Metrorail, transit connections, internal transit circulatory system, street grid, pedestrian walkways, trails, and bike routes, before increasing densities in the Policy and Area Plans."

#5. We suggest the following substitute principle: "Create discreet but connected livable urban neighborhoods throughout the Tysons Corner area with pedestrian and bicycle facilities and pleasant streetscapes to create a sense of place."