

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS

Prepared by Planning Division of Fairfax County Department  
of Planning & Zoning for March 24, 2008  
Meeting of Tysons Land Use Task Force

Between late February and March 10, 2008, 63 people responded to an online survey containing the same questions that were discussed at the Task Force's workshops February 27 and 28. These 63 people provided 507 comments which are summarized in this document. Attached to this summary is a six-page document explaining staff's analysis. We have also created an Excel worksheet with more detail on the survey responses which will be available at the Tysons website.

Characteristics of the 63 respondents are as follows. Note that some respondents fell into two or more categories, so percentages exceed 100.

### Characteristics of Respondents

- Live close to Tysons 67% (42)
- Work in Tysons 32% (20)
- Own property in Tysons or work for developer 19% (12)
- Live in Tysons 6% (4)
- Other 5% (3)

### SURVEY QUESTIONS

- 1. Focus growth at Metro or at Metro and along circulators?**
  - Prototype A 53% (31)
  - Prototype B 28% (16)
  - Want less development than either prototype 9% (5)
  - Other 10% (6)
- 2. Reactions to suggested densities & locations of additional housing**
  - Approve of more new housing at Tysons 47% (27)
  - Want less new housing at Tysons 28% (16)
  - Build the infrastructure, including Metro, first 9% (5)
  - Prefer garden apartments and townhouses 5% (3)
  - Not enough housing to be a "real city" 4% (2)
  - Other 6% (4)
- 3. Additional measures to buffer surrounding communities**
  - Parks and green space 23% (12)
  - Improvements to transportation network 20% (11)
  - Lower heights & density at the edges 17% (9)
  - The Task Force has addressed this 17% (9)
  - Taller buildings in core & along Toll Road 13% (7)
  - Other 9% (5)

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS

Prepared by Planning Division of Fairfax County Department  
of Planning & Zoning for March 24, 2008  
Meeting of Tysons Land Use Task Force  
Page Two

4. **Focus on moving traffic through Tysons or internal circulation?**
- Network 1 38% (23)
  - Network 2 20% (12)
  - Implement both networks 33% (20)
  - Other 9% (6)
5. **Prefer circulator in traffic or on dedicated right-of-way?**
- Approve of circulator concept 75% (33)
  - Don't think circulator will work 16% (7)
  - Intensify around Metro, not circulator 7% (3)
  - Other 2% (1)
- 6a. **Agree with reduction of parking at Tysons?**
- Yes, need to reduce and manage parking 64% (37)
  - No, we still need parking 36% (21)
- 6b. **Other issues or considerations concerning parking**
- Charge for parking 28% (5)
  - Provide parking on edge & shuttle to Metro 28% (5)
  - Encourage shared parking 17% (3)
  - Provide centralized parking like Bethesda 10% (2)
  - Other 17% (3)
7. **Ways to make Tysons more friendly to pedestrians & bikes**
- Improvements to pedestrian facilities 45% (35)
  - Improvements to bicycle facilities 19% (15)
  - Transit-oriented design 9% (7)
  - Implement the grid of streets 6% (5)
  - Reduce automobile speeds 5% (4)
  - Impossible to make Tysons safe for bikes & peds 10% (8)
  - Other 5% (4)
- 8a. **Approve of tradeoff between open space & additional density along circulators?**
- Yes 48% (20)
  - No, prefer Prototype A 31% (13)
  - Want less density, such as Base Case 10% (4)
  - Other 11% (5)

## SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS

Prepared by Planning Division of Fairfax County Department  
of Planning & Zoning for March 24, 2008  
Meeting of Tysons Land Use Task Force  
Page Three

- 8b. **Approve of tradeoff between taller buildings & community benefits?**
- Yes 53% (20)
  - Yes, but buildings no taller than today 4% (2)
  - Tall buildings are ok close to Metro 11% (4)
  - No 32% (12)
- 8c. **More small neighborhood parks or fewer large community parks?**
- Both 39% (15)
  - Smaller parks 39% (15)
  - One large park & the rest neighborhood parks 13% (5)
  - Larger parks 10% (4)
- 8d. **How should parks be connected?**
- Walking paths and trails 36% (10)
  - Bike paths 29% (8)
  - Sidewalks 14% (4)
  - Pedestrian avenues 11% (3)
  - Other 11% (3)
9. **Suggestions for creating a sense of place; civic & cultural uses**
- Performing arts center/auditorium/music venue 18% (13)
  - Library 17% (12)
  - Parks & recreational facilities 13% (9)
  - Community Center 11% (8)
  - Public Art 7% (5)
  - Plaza for concerts, festivals, etc. 4% (3)
  - Schools 4% (3)
  - Small churches 4% (3)
  - Other 22% (16)

## DETAILED ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS

This document summarizes the analysis of 507 comments received from 63 questionnaires completed online between late February and March 10, 2008. The questionnaires contained the same background information and nine questions as those discussed by over 200 attendees at the workshops on February 27 and 28.

Of the 507 comments, some pertained directly to the question where they were entered. Others contained responses applicable to other questions. The first step in the analysis was to “parse” these multi-layered responses and enter the relevant information under the appropriate question. An Excel worksheet summarizing this first step will be posted at the Tysons website.

### I. **Development**

#### 1. **Focus growth at Metro (Prototype A) or at Metro & along circulators (Prototype B)?**

Of 58 responses to this question, 31 or 53% favored Prototype A. Another 16 or 28% favored Prototype B. Another 5 or 9% wanted *less* development than either prototype, while another respondent suggested that any new development wait for Metrorail to come to Tysons.

Of the remaining 5 responses, 2 wanted to see a development pattern that resulted in the lowest energy consumption; 1 wanted growth to be implemented in stages; and 2 wanted development to be scaled to infrastructure capacity. One of these respondents stated, “Neither prototype should be recommended until a comprehensive fiscal and traffic impact analysis is completed, with specific traffic mitigation measures tested and proven effective for the existing Tysons development base.”

#### 2. **Reactions to suggested densities & locations of additional housing in prototypes**

Of 57 responses to this question, 9 or 16% were in favor of Prototype A; 6 or 11% were in favor of Prototype B; and another 12 or 21% were in favor of more housing at Tysons in general. One of these respondents noted that “the cost of housing should be in line with the incomes of the people working at Tysons.” Together, respondents in favor of adding housing at Tysons total 27 or 47% of the responses to this question.

Another 2 respondents stated that they didn’t think the prototypes included *enough* housing to make Tysons a “real city.”

Sixteen respondents, or 28% of the total, stated that the prototypes contained *too much* housing. Another 5 respondents, or 9%, recommended that the infrastructure – including Metro – be built before housing is added. Another respondent said that jobs should be added before housing.

Of the remaining 6 responses, 3 would prefer garden apartments and townhouses to high rise buildings. One recommended relating building heights to street widths and stated that the plans for the area east of 495 call for too much density. One respondent pointed out that “Tysons will not develop independently of its neighbors,” and called for its development to be coordinated through a regional plan. The final respondent had no basis for evaluating the density and location of housing in the prototypes.

### 3. **Additional measures to buffer surrounding communities**

Of 53 responses to this question, 12 or 23% suggested that surrounding communities could be buffered by additional parks and green space. Another 9 or 17% recommended lower heights and density at the edges, with one commenting that “Residents along Lewinsville Road do not want more multi-colored light shows into their bedrooms at night.”

An additional group of 11 respondents or 20% recommended various enhancements to the transportation network, such as improvements to intersections; improved access so traffic doesn’t have to go through communities to leave Tysons; building the grid of streets; traffic calming measures; and adding bike paths and pedestrian connections.

A third group of 9 respondents or 17% could not think of any additional measures to buffer surrounding communities. One stated, “The Task Force has adequately addressed transitional areas.” Another said, “The people who live in McLean oppose anything. They have enjoyed incredible property value growth as a result of Tysons Corner and now they want all of us who work here to suffer. It is time to put the bigger needs of Northern Virginia first!”

Seven respondents or 13% recommended permitting taller buildings in the core of Tysons and along the Toll Road. One resident of Pimmit Hills even suggested increasing residential density in his community. Another respondent recommended scattering residential development throughout Tysons, and one respondent wants to “build Tysons as a net zero energy consuming community.”

Two respondents repeated the theme of basing recommendations on infrastructure capacity, with one person expressing particular concern about school capacity and the feasibility of using commercial office space for elementary schools.

## II. **Transportation**

### 4. **Prefer Network 1 (moving traffic through Tysons) or Network 2 (internal circulation)?**

Of 61 responses to this question, 23 or 38% preferred Network 1, or moving traffic into, out of and through Tysons. One person said, “I prefer Network 1 with widening of Routes 7 and 123, plus grade separated interchanges and ramps are needed to accommodate the doubling of density planned already. The County has failed repeatedly during the last 30 years to require Tysons landowners to proffer sufficient money to BUILD road improvements. Macerich and TYTRAN should implement shuttle bus service ASAP for commuters and residents of surrounding communities to show circulator feasibility and costs. Build several peripheral parking garages off Routes 7 and 123 and at Beltway/Toll Road from which free bus circulators operate to Tysons malls and offices. Priority should be the 80+% of commuters who will NOT use Metrorail.”

Twelve respondents or 20% preferred Network 2, while another 20 respondents or 33% would like to see *both* Networks 1 and 2 implemented.

Of the remaining 6 responses, 4 thought it was a waste of time to talk about non-funded circulators; one did not feel that either network was a realistic choice; and one wants to know the traffic impacts on Vienna and McLean.

## 5. **Prefer circulator in traffic or on dedicated right-of-way?**

There were 44 responses to this question. Eleven or 25% believed it was most realistic for the circulator to operate in mixed traffic. Fourteen or 32% would like to see the circulator built on a dedicated right-of-way. Another 3 or 7% of respondents believe that the circulator could operate *both* in traffic and its own right-of-way. Five respondents or 11% believe that Tysons should be served by an improved local circulation system, probably consisting of buses. Altogether, 33 respondents or 75% were in favor of the concept of a circulator.

Three respondents or 7% want to see density around the Metro stations, not around the circulator. Another 3 respondents or 7% are not sure that a circulator will increase transit ridership or alleviate traffic congestion, and 4 others or 9% don't think the circulator is feasible or realistic. One stated, "Projections of significant ridership on circulator buses are likely inaccurate and are merely justifications for excessive densities without rail transit access, to increase the value of this land to the benefit of the property owner and to the detriment of the public. The small gain in ridership associated with dedicated rights-of-way certainly will not justify the costs."

### 6a. **Agree with reduction of parking at Tysons?**

There were 58 responses to the first part of this question. Almost two-thirds (37 or 64%) agreed with the need to reduce and manage parking at Tysons. The other 21 or 36% believe that parking needs to be retained at Tysons.

### 6b. **Other issues or considerations regarding parking?**

Of the 18 specific suggestions, 5 or 28% recommended charging for parking. Another 5 or 28% of respondents suggested providing parking on the periphery of Tysons, to shuttle people from their cars to Metro.

Three respondents or 17% recommended using shared parking. Two respondents or 10% would like to see the County provide centralized parking facilities such as those found in Bethesda and Silver Spring. One respondent recommended providing bike parking, and another suggested minimizing trips at Tysons through an appropriate mix of land uses. Finally, one person suggested that County staff should calculate the impact of multiple Transportation Demand Management strategies through the use of multiplication, not addition.

## 7. **Ways to make Tysons more friendly to pedestrians & bikes, besides grid of streets**

There were 78 responses to this multi-part question.

Altogether, 35 respondents or 45% of the total recommended improvements to pedestrian facilities at Tysons. Of these, 9 respondents or 12% would like to see pedestrian and bike bridges at major intersections, or tunnels and overpasses where appropriate. Another 9 or 12% suggested well-marked crosswalks, longer crosswalk times, and median refuges for pedestrians. One commented, "Plan every intersection by picturing a mother pushing a stroller, with a youngster beside her, holding her hand – make it safe for them." Eight respondents or 10% would like to see wider sidewalks. Six respondents mentioned attractive streetscapes including street trees, benches and good lighting. Three respondents or 4% recommended reducing the use of grade separations, limiting the sizes of streets and intersections, or basically implementing transportation network 2

Another group of 15 respondents or 19% of the total recommended improvements to bicycle facilities at Tysons. Six respondents or 8% each mentioned dedicated bike lanes and separate bike and

pedestrian ONLY trails, with one suggesting that a bike trail could be included in a dedicated right-of-way for the circulator. Two respondents or 3% would like to see bike trails at Tysons connected to the Washington & Old Dominion (W&OD) Trail and other regional trails. One said it would be a good idea to attract bike riders from surrounding neighborhoods.

Four respondents or 5% would like to see automobile speeds reduced through high fines and strict traffic enforcement. One person suggested that on-street parking be short-term only. Another respondent would like to see a vehicle-free shopping and dining zone at Tysons.

Seven respondents or 9% suggested aspects of transit-oriented design, such as mini-parks (smaller than 5-10 acres); a “promenade of greens that becomes central to the urban landscape”; neighborhood retail; and clustered density.

One respondent would like to see a monorail at Tysons, and another is concerned about air quality, access to sunlight, and reduction of particulate waste during construction. This person had to move out of Tysons due to asthma attacks from construction dust.

Five respondents or 6% are anxious for the County to implement the grid of streets. Finally, 8 respondents or 10% believe that it may not be possible to make Tysons friendly to pedestrians and bicycles.

### III. **Quality of Life**

Question 8 has 4 parts; responses to each part are shown separately below.

#### 8.a. **Approve of tradeoff between open space & additional density along circulators?**

There were 42 responses to this question. Of this total, 20 or 48% approved of a tradeoff between open space and additional density along the circulators, as in Prototype B. Thirteen or 31% did not like this tradeoff but preferred the development pattern in Prototype A. Four or 10% of respondents would like to see *less* density at Tysons, as in the Base Case.

Three respondents said that green roofs, swimming pools and private recreation facilities should not be counted as part of the publicly provided open space to serve Tysons.

One person suggested that we “look at what uses are needed and make sure we have space for those uses.” Another said, “Rather than assume that we have to give away density to get amenities, we should have fundamental information about what the amenities will cost, who will pay for them, and what return can reasonably be expected for the parties who will profit from any density increases.”

#### 8.b. **Approve of tradeoff between taller building & community benefits?**

Of the 38 responses to this question, 20 or 53% said they approved of this tradeoff. Another 2 or 5% said they approved but wanted buildings no taller than they are today. Four respondents or 11% would like to see tall buildings close to the Metro stations only.

Twelve respondents or 32% did *not* approve of this tradeoff. One suggested “Six story buildings – think Paris, the City of Light.”

### 8.c. **More small neighborhood parks or fewer large community parks?**

There were 39 responses to this question. Equal numbers (15 or 39% for each group) said they preferred more small neighborhood parks, or a combination of both small neighborhood parks and large community parks. Of the remaining 9 respondents, 5 wanted one large park along with a number of smaller parks.

Only 4 people wanted all large community parks. One of these said, "Developers should be required to put artificial turf on every playing field for 10 miles in every direction."

Two other respondents, who did not want all large parks, commented:  
"Fewer large community parks is just another way of saying 'huge athletic field complex.'"  
"Should not expect to meet all recreation needs (ball fields) within Tysons."

Two respondents mentioned the need to preserve wildlife habitat, with one pointing out: "Take a wildlife survey first and see WHO ELSE lives here and how much space THEY need."

### 8.d. **How should parks be connected?**

Of the 28 responses to this question, 10 or 36% suggest walking paths and trails; 8 or 29% want bike paths; 4 or 14% want a network of sidewalks; and 3 or 11% suggest landscaped walkways or pedestrian avenues. One respondent each suggested that parks could be connected by the circulator or by a monorail. Another respondent wants pedestrian access between Magarity Road and the Tysons East Metro station.

## 9. **Suggestions for creating a sense of place; civic & cultural uses**

Respondents made 72 suggestions for creating a sense of place at Tysons. The most frequently mentioned civic and cultural use was for a performing arts center/auditorium/music venue. This was mentioned 13 times, or 18% of the total.

The second most frequent use was a public library, mentioned 12 times or 17% of the total. One respondent wrote, "The tiny strip-mall-sized library alluded to the in plan is not sufficient to serve an intelligent, cosmopolitan community. Fairfax County residents love their libraries. Libraries are cultural resources that will continue to be relevant and should be given prominent placement ... Plan for a grand, centerpiece type of a library, like the new San Francisco Civic Center Library."

The third most frequent use was a community center with public meeting spaces, mentioned 8 times or 11% of the total. Public art was mentioned by 5 respondents, or 7% of the total.

Each of the following uses was mentioned by 3 respondents, or 4% of the total:

- A plaza to be used for summer concerts, outdoor art shows, festivals and farmers' markets
- Schools
- Small churches

The following uses were mentioned by 2 respondents each, or 3% of the total:

- Branch of a local college or university
- Outdoor skating rink
- Open space
- Sports playing fields
- Restaurants

Finally, each of the following was mentioned by 1 respondent, or 1% of the total:

- Convention center
- Town center
- Community nonprofits
- Connections to existing cultural uses at Wolf Trap, McLean, Vienna & Falls Church
- Skate park
- Small park like one at corner of Dolley Madison & Old Dominion in McLean
- Fountains with outdoor seating
- Grocery store
- Movie theaters
- Vehicle free shopping zone
- Walkable streets
- Dedicated space at malls for cultural uses
- Housing & services for senior citizens so people can age in place
- Affordable housing
- Tysons' own zip code