

Seven Corners Community Business Center Plan Amendment - Task Force Comment Compilation and Staff Response

Task Force Comments addressed by staff were received prior to 7/4/2014. Comments received subsequent to 7/4/2014 will be addressed at upcoming meetings

Ref. #	Proposed Plan Text	Commenter	Comment	Response
General Comments				
1		Karl Moritz	In general, the text is very clear, well-organized, and comprehensive. I appreciate the care that went into the creation of this draft. I will generally focus on things that I think are either incorrect or missing, but the great majority of what I'm reading is well done.	Comment noted.
2		Karl Moritz	I think the Plan could use some additional language about the retail strategy – the types of retail that these areas are most likely to attract as well as the types that we residents hope can be attracted. In the last meeting, staff talked about a mix of neighborhood-serving retail (meeting daily or weekly needs), some region-serving (such as Target, Home Depot, the fabric/craft stores, Barnes and Noble, serving weekly/monthly needs), and a variety of restaurant types. I think the surrounding neighborhoods would value additional specialty retail, which may become more and more feasible over the long term as the Plan is implemented and there is a broader mix of incomes within walking distance and transportation options improve. I'm pretty clear about the retail concept for the main streets of Willston and Town Center areas but not as clear on what types of retail are anticipated or desired for both sides of Leesburg Pike. All of this should be able to be addressed in a paragraph or two. It would also help to have a map that shows primary and secondary retail street frontages (This may be something that has already been presented to us).	Comment noted. The draft Comprehensive Plan recommends a mix of uses, including retail, within the Opportunity Areas. More descriptive guidance for the retail vision along Leesburg Pike can be added to the draft text, however, the specific mix of retail types is something that would be difficult to implement through the rezoning process. Likewise, a discussion of the types of people the area should attract is not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan guidance, as there is no regulatory mechanism to achieve this. While the Plan text provides a general description of where retail is envisioned, a map illustrating these locations may be too prescriptive for the Plan guidance.
Development and Planning History				
3	Page 3, Planning History	Jim Edmondson	Omitted is any mention at this early part of the significant size of the affordable housing supply here, requiring that special attention be paid to its replacement under the new plan. More specifics later. The workforce housing parameters that have been used for Tysons (per the Policy Plan) are woefully inadequate as a guide to replacement housing in Seven Corners. Indeed, using them would result in wholesale displacement of current residents.	Received 7/7/14
Concept for Future Development				
4	Pages 3-5, Concept for Future Development	Jim Edmondson	"By encouraging the highest quality development..." No one will argue with the goal of high quality development, but there must be some concession to economic realities. Seven Corners will not in our lifetimes attract Tiffany's and Sachs Fifth Avenue. It will, in fact, serve mostly mid-scale and down-scale retailers and many low- and moderate-income residents in its core. A plan that demands or even implies "upscale" will wait a long time for implementation. The proposed plan should reflect reality as well as the rational dreams of planners, citizens, and landowners.	Comment noted. "Highest quality development" is meant to encourage development that could improve the quality of life and living standards of area residents, shoppers and employees. The Comprehensive Plan does not single out any particular tier of retailer or demographic.

5	Page 5, Concept for Future Development	Jim Edmondson	Suggested addition: "Objective 13 - Recognize that the economics of a revitalization area with a significant concentration of low-income households and community retail facilities will require more than basic market-rate financing and traditional incentives and guidelines for re-planning to assure that implementation by both the County and landowners occurs in a timely manner."	Received 7/7/14
6	Page 5, Concept for Future Development	Jim Edmondson	Suggested addition: "Objective 14 - Create incentives in the Plan to assure that the permanent dislocation because of non-affordability of both current residents and retailers does not occur."	Received 7/7/14
7	Page 5, Concept for Future Development	Jim Edmondson	The objectives do not mention one of the most critical elements to an ultimately successful revitalization of the area - a connection to Metro. I suggest that we either add the concept of a shuttle-type connection to the East Falls Church Metro stop to Objective 10, or add an Objective 15 to say it explicitly. It is not sufficient to make the first mention of the Metro link on page 19.	Received 7/7/14
Areawide Recommendations				
8	Page 5, Areawide Recommendations	Jim Edmondson	I do not understand the use of the term "Redevelopment Option." It is a question of both semantics and substance. Perhaps it is just a redundancy. As an owner, you redevelop if the numbers make sense, or you don't. Either the landowners comply with planning terms ("elements" is the Plan's phrase) set forth later, or they stay with their properties as-is. "Option" suggests to me that choices apply within some ranges. A decision to proceed with redevelopment under a set of planning prescriptions is not an option.	Received 7/7/14
9	Page 6, Areawide Recommendations	Jim Edmondson	There is no mention on page six of a direct connection to Roosevelt Street from the <u>Route 7 side of the area to serve as a convenient access to Metro.</u>	Received 7/7/14
10	Page 7, Willston Village Center	Jim Edmondson	Where substantial of replacement affordable housing units must be produced, relatively elaborate architectural features will complicate the financing of such housing. It's a worthy goal, but elaborate facades and low rents do not always match. Perhaps the requirements relating to design go too far.	Received 7/7/14
11	Page 8, Seven Corners Town Center	Pat Hoar	I'm not sure that we should make it a requirement in the text that this site continues to be the location for the transit center. I can envision moving it to the Willston Village Center in the future.	Comment noted. The 6/23/14 draft Plan text indicates that in addition to the transit center in the Town Center, an additional transit center north of Arlington Boulevard and south of Wilson Boulevard should be considered (page 26).
12	Page 8, Seven Corners Town Center	Pat Hoar	What does "modern" mean in this context? Does Fairfax typically use this adjective in the Plan?	Agree. Will add language to better define the intent: (In the town center) "Architecture is envisioned to have an urban character, distinct from the two villages...". We can elaborate further in Urban Design Guidelines.
13	Page 8, Leesburg Pike Village	Pat Hoar	Just a note that this site has two office buildings, not one.	Agree. The Plan text will be updated to reflect this.
14	Page 8, Leesburg Pike Village - The second to last sentence of this section references "provision of street-level retail (along Leesburg Pike) so as to reinforce the transit boulevard character that is envisioned."	Dick Knapp	Please recall that our retail and professional office space may occur at strategic building corners and side streets - this can provide a two-sided restaurant, convenience retail and professional office environment. The language you use boxes us into linear retail along a transit boulevard which may not be leasable.	Comment noted. Street level retail along Leesburg Pike is seen as an important element in reinforcing the transit boulevard character of Leesburg Pike. "Street level" in this context refers to the fact that the retail is located on the ground floor of buildings; however, the text does not specify that it should line the entire building frontage along the street. Within the Land Unit C guidance (page 34) it is noted that retail within this land unit is an option.

15	Page 8, Emphasizing Form...	Pat Hoar	Figure 26 should be Figure 27.	Agree. This figure number will be corrected.
16	Pages 8-9, Emphasizing Form Instead of FAR; and Figure 26 - Opportunity Areas Redevelopment Option.	Dick Knapp	There's a conflict here between the County's worthy goal of promoting form based zoning relating to scale, livability, height and other discipline principles, versus a straightjacket approach to FAR which is embodied in Figure 26. This particularly affects the Sears site, in which great efforts were made toward form based code, yet we feel constrained by the arbitrary and inflexible imposition of FAR.	Comment noted. Figure 26 does not refer to FAR, but does provide some overarching guidance as to the maximum amount of development recommended within the land units. These figures are derived from the inputs received at the 2013 land use charrette, which examined form and massing of development within the Opportunity Areas.
17	Page 9, Figure 26 - Opportunity Areas Redevelopment Option Table	Pat Hoar	Recommend adding a column with "Total SF" to the table.	Discuss with Task Force. This column may be added depending on Task Force consensus.
18	Page 9, Figure 26	Pat Hoar	Need to add a column for "FAR" since we later mention stormwater requirements related to > 1.0 FAR (see page 17).	Comment noted. Although the Plan text does not use FAR as a measure of overall development potential within the Opportunity Areas, any redevelopment proposal will be translated into FAR during the rezoning process. At this point, staff will be able to determine if the 1.0 FAR threshold has been met.
19	Page 9, Figure 26 - Opportunity Areas Redevelopment Option Table	Mark Silverwood	Land Unit C with the current proposal appears too dense along Route 7, and after all (community) comments, perhaps it should remain at the original planned 655,000 SF and not connect to the neighborhood streets.	Discuss with Task Force.
20	Page 9, Figure 26 - Opportunity Areas Redevelopment Option Table	Jim Edmondson	This figure makes reference to "sub-units." Those of us on the Task Force understand, but the draft does not show what these sub-units are until page 51. Figure 39 needs to be moved up in the text, or the sub-unit parcels need to be identified. Also, I see no reason to preclude a modest retail option for both Sub-units A-1 and A-2	Received 7/7/14
21	Page 9, Figure 26 - Opportunity Areas Redevelopment Option Table	Mark Silverwood	I don't understand how the number of 176,700 SF of retail was arrived at. I also don't understand why there would be a loss of SF as per the indicated notes. Somehow 1,200,000 minus 176,700 leaves only 1,010,000 SF. A loss of 13,300 SF. Clarification of this calculation including assumptions of store depths, etc. would be appreciated. On this same issue, I suggest the following language under the Sub-unit A-1 on page 52: "Under the redevelopment option, this sub-unit is planned for a maximum of 1,200,000 square feet of multifamily residential use, with the option to reduce the residential square footage by up to 176,700 square feet in order to create ground floor retail and other commercial uses fronting the spine road that traverses the length of the sub-unit, should market conditions permit." Also, correct the line "As described in Recommendation 9," it should be "8."	Received 7/7/14
22	Pages 9 and 13	Karl Moritz	I see that the land use allocations in Figure 26, while somewhat specific, are flexible in accordance with the language under "Alternative Land Uses" on page 13. In the short term there will be market pressure for more residential and less commercial; possibly over the life of the Plan that will change. In general, I'm thinking it would be good to discourage conversions (for lack of a better word) of non-residential development potential to residential – but to be more permissive of conversions of residential development to non-residential, including cultural. As you know, retail does best when there is a healthy daytime population (workers) as well as evening and weekend populations (residents). In addition, I think there is some community sentiment that more retail might ultimately be desirable that what the tables show.	Discuss with Task Force. The existing language is not specifically intended to support the conversion of nonresidential development to residential development; rather, it supports the inclusion of uses such as hotels or community uses in areas where they may not be explicitly defined in a Plan recommendation but may be compatible. If there is a desire among the task force to specifically address the conversion of residential to non-residential uses, this may be added.

23	Page 10, Figure 27 - Max Building Heights	Dick Knapp	You show a razor thin and unbuildable strip of six story product along Leesburg Pike. You need to widen this band to reflect conventional apartment depths. To avoid unnecessary confusion at this early comprehensive planning stage, we urge you to delete the scale.	The intent of this figure is to provide general guidance on building height within the Opportunity Areas. The building heights map is conceptual and there should not be a literal application of the map scale. Add note to the map that states, "This map represents the general distribution of the building height, but does not portray actual building depth."
24	Page 10, Figure 27 -Max Building Heights	Pat Hoar	Recommend adding this data in a table as well.	Comment noted. Given the generalized nature of this diagram, it is not intended to be a highly detailed and specific map where these ranges can be related to specific geographic areas within a table.
25	Page 10, Figure 27 - Max Building Heights	Jim Edmondson	A section of A-2 is limited to 6 stories, while the adjoining parcels allow 7 and 10. There seems to be little reason for step-downs along the Arlington line and that small frontage on Wilson Blvd. (I think this possible change is not likely to result in taller buildings being built. Tall buildings will be non-feasible for a long time.)	Received 7/7/14
26	Page 10, Building Heights	Karl Moritz	Building height measured in stories (rather than feet) is a very good idea.	Comment noted.
27	Page 10, Base Development Option	Jim Edmondson	The paragraph at the bottom of Page 10 misuses the concept of "option." Sub-unit A-2 has its as-is use and zoning. It exists above its 20 du/ac category, which I guess is its "base development level." It will not redevelop until its redevelopment value is far higher than its current value as an ongoing operation. This misuse continues on page 11. I suggest that the first sentence under the heading "Redevelopment Option" read as follows: "The Plan will permit redevelopment under its terms if the landowner meets the requirements of the Plan, including these elements:" - These elements are not "a variety of benefits." They are required terms of development, not benefits to the developer. They are not unreasonable, but let's call them what they are.	Received 7/7/14
28	Pages 10-11	Karl Moritz	The language on page 10-11 outlines the link between the increase in development in exchange for uses, facilities, and other elements. The eight categories seem to me to be the right ones. How number 1 and 2 are implemented is key. There is considerable interest on the part of the community, and I'm sure it will be helpful to potential developers too, to have implementation expectations as clear as possible. Whether this is through additional implementation language in the Plan itself (the Annandale Plan is somewhat more specific about what must be provided to achieve the increased density) or through another means (an implementation or phasing plan, rezoning guidelines, etc.), I don't have an opinion yet. I note that urban design guidelines are to follow this plan; possibly the implementation guidelines could follow as well. If they do follow the plan, community members will want to know what the parameters of these guidelines will be before the plan is adopted.	Discuss with Task Force. Determine if there is a desire by the Task Force for additional language regarding implementation.
29	Page 11, #4 - Public Parks	Jim Edmondson	Refers to Figure 34. I think it should be Figure 38 or page 50, but I'm not sure.	Agree. Reference to figure number has been changed.

30	Page 11, #8 - Provide a Significant Affordable Housing Component	Dick Knapp	The last sentence of Section 8 states that the recommended FAR in Figure 26 has the density bonus included in, not on top of, the recommended FAR. This is contrary to practices in Fairfax County. In the case of the Sears site, the 720,000 sf includes 108,000 (15%) of affordable housing and/or workforce housing within the 720,000 sf. This leaves only 612,000 sf of FAR for economic uses, and is below our level of feasibility. The 108,000 sf of affordable and/or workforce housing should be added to the 720,000 sf, consistent with county practices, to allow for 828,000 sf. This figure of 828,000 sf is the minimum FAR we will need to induce redevelopment of our holdings.	Comment noted. In areas where form based planning has been adopted, Comprehensive Plan buildout is expressed in terms of building height and massing, rather than solely relying on floor area ratio or density. To maintain the vision for scale and massing, housing bonuses are considered to be included. Such an approach is also found in Annandale (page 28 of the Annandale CBC).
31	Page 11, #8 - Provide a Significant Affordable Housing Component	Mark Silverwood	Item 8 needs to clarify that in providing 1:1 replacement of "affordable units" that there are no other layers of Affordable Housing or Workforce Housing Units required in these sub-units A-1 and A-2. (Mr. Silverwood has provided Chairman Thillman a revised Figure 28 to reflect the percentages required of Sub-units A-1 and A-2 for the various AMI requirements)	To be discussed. Have not received proposed text. This seems to be consistent with intent.
32	Page 11, #8 - Provide a Significant Affordable Housing Component	Jim Edmondson	This is the biggest problem. Like the Tysons Plan, it does not address any needs for truly low-income households, new or replacement. The wording calls for 1:1 replacement of affordable units in A-1 and A-2, an appropriate goal. However, the income tiers in Figure 28 - in effect, the Tysons tiers - bear no resemblance either to the incomes or current residents or to the housing needs of households with incomes far below 60% of area median, of which there will be thousands in Fairfax more over the next 20 years	Comment noted. The proposed tiers are segmented in ranges that state "up to" for each income level. At the time of rezoning, a development proposal may voluntarily designate a greater number of units to be affordable to those at lower income levels. Recommending the provision of housing at levels not already supported by the Comprehensive Plan could produce unintended results and dampen the achievement of the objective.
33	Page 11, #8 - Provide a Significant Affordable Housing Component	Jim Edmondson	The resident households in A-2 (284 units, always full) have incomes that typically range from \$30,000 to perhaps \$50,000 per year. The 2BR units typically have 3 or 4 members and rents of about \$1250. The incomes for a 4-person household are mostly less than 50% of area median. How will making 2% of the affordable units priced for households at 60% of median (about \$65,000 per year) meet the needs of hundreds of households at 45% or 50% of median or below? The Policy Plan mix just doesn't work for Seven Corners. See the GMU/CRA study regarding the changing demographics (including incomes and housing needs) for the DC area over the next 20 years. The Policy Plan fails to come close to meeting those needs.	Comment noted.
34	Page 11, #8 - Provide a Significant Affordable Housing Component	Jim Edmondson	This is where the Plan simply must give a nod toward reality. The Tysons mix of affordable units or the "Policy Plan" mix (figure 28) simply cannot rationally apply to an area where many hundreds of households live, whose incomes are far below 60% of median. Further, there will be no redevelopment of A-1 or A-2 in the near term or intermediate term unless low-income housing tax credits and/or tax exempt bonds with county capital subsidies are available. No-cost capital will be essential to build new or replacement units priced at \$1,000 to \$1,300+ per month to serve current residents. This substantial problem recurs in the language on page 52.	Comment noted. As funding options are programmatic in nature, staff assumes this as an observation rather than a recommendation.

35	Page 12, Figure 28 <u>Affordable Housing</u>	Pat Hoar	I think we need to discuss the distribution of the affordable housing tiers. I think there is argument in this particular area to have higher weighting on the lower end given current residents income levels... Some of the developers are already referring to it as "workforce housing" rather than "affordable housing."	Comment noted. Please see response to #32.
36	Page 12, <u>Affordable Housing</u>	Karl Moritz	Just to confirm: When a developer is required to replace existing affordable housing units, his requirement is not to provide the same level of affordability as the units he is replacing. Instead, he is required to meet the affordability spectrum in the chart at the top of page 12. Since that chart requires affordability across a broad range, and since it is good practice to mix a variety of housing affordability levels, I think this makes sense.	Agree. This is correct.
General Land Use Guidelines				
37	Page 13, Discouraged Uses	Karl Moritz	Does "auto-oriented uses" include auto repair or auto sales? I would support discouraging them, in any event.	Comment noted. No. It does not include auto repair or auto sales. "Auto-oriented uses" are meant for high trip-generating uses, such as gas stations and fast food restaurants. If the Task Force would like to identify auto repair and auto sales to be discouraged, then the Task Force will need to discuss it.
39	Page 14, Parcel Consolidation	Karl Moritz	On page 14, parcel consolidation is encouraged. There isn't any incentive for consolidation, or penalty for not consolidating – is that right?	Comment noted. There is not an intensity-based incentive for consolidation; however, development proposals that do not have a consolidation of sufficient size to allow for a well-designed project may not be seen as being in conformance with the Plan objectives for this area.
Heritage Resources				
38	Page 14, Heritage Resources	Pat Hoar	I am not sure what to make of the text that states alternatives to demolition of the Willston site should be considered?	Comment noted.
40	Page 14, Heritage Resources	Mark Silverwood	We take great exception to any label of historic significance to the non-descript red brick buildings on Sub-unit A-1. This is completely contradictory to the realignment and grid of streets that the plan is based upon. We will oppose any action to have these buildings listed on any historic inventory.	
41	Page 15, Heritage Resources	Karl Moritz	I don't doubt the value of the Doctor's Building as an example mid-Century modern architecture but worry about saying it should be an example for the new architecture that may be planned. Some key elements of the design, particularly placement on the site, the blank walls on much of the first floor, and the skewed upper floors are design elements that are hard to fit the framework of pedestrian oriented design.	Comment noted.
Environment				
42	Page 16, Stormwater Design	Dick Knapp	July 1, 2014 begins a stringent period of new stormwater regulation. It seems unnecessary to list in this section county regulations which only make redevelopment of Seven Corners more difficult.	Comment noted.

43	Page 16, Stormwater Management	Karl Moritz	I'm not qualified to review the stormwater management elements of the plan but note that property damage from stormwater runoff is also occurring, just outside the CBC in my neighborhood, that could potentially be exacerbated or mitigated by redevelopment in sub-unit F-3 and possibly sub-units B and F-2. If there is a way to incorporate concerns about the property damage from stormwater (as well as the environmental damage), that would be very helpful.	There is standing Policy, in addition to the Adequate Outfall Policy in the Public Facilities Manual that addresses this issue. This policy sets up negotiations for on-site retention during the rezoning phase. If there is an immediate issue, the community should contact the Stormwater Management Division in FFX Public Works and Environmental Services. These notifications will assist county in being aware of issues when a property comes up for redevelopment.
44	Page 18, Noise	Dick Knapp	Same issue as Stormwater comment, in that the county is in the process of passing a noise ordinance - there seems no reason to proliferate more language on this matter.	Comment noted. Plan text addressing noise reflects existing Comprehensive Plan guidance as outlined in the Environment element of the Policy Plan.
45	Pages 15-18, Environment	Karl Moritz	In addition to Air Quality and Noise, Light pollution is also an issue in the CBC and it affects the surrounding neighborhoods. The lighting of the McDonald's parking lot is sufficiently bright to be easily seen from my backyard – it is not quite like perpetual sunset, but it is brighter than necessary now that there are light fixture that are very effective at eliminating light spillage. Some of those new fixtures may have been installed on Arlington Blvd recently. Can we have some text that calls for the use of lighting fixtures in the CBC that reduce or eliminate spillover into neighborhoods outside the CBC?	Comment noted. County Policy Plan already addresses the issue of light pollution. This may be further detailed in the Urban Design Guidelines.
Transportation				
46	Page 29	Jim Edmondson	You report one full paragraph.	Agree. Correction has been made.
Urban Street Network Design				
47	Page 29 - Urban Street Network Design	Jim Edmondson	The choice of standards for the streets in the CBC is fully defensible as a planning instrument. For parts of Sub-unit A-1 and A-2 with large portions and absolute numbers of affordable apartments, it becomes burdensome - both because it is very expensive and it consumes a lot of land, reducing the building footprints of the required buildings. In other words, elevating standards for all streets may deter the development of replacement housing.	Received 7/7/14
48	Page 35, Figure 35 - Major Avenues and Avenues	Mark Silverwood	Figure 35 (Major Avenue) shows a width of between 96 feet and 108 feet, building to building. Is this dimension used when the grid of streets were laid out for the plan?	Not specifically. Initial master plan concepts were not developed to that level of specificity or precision. Typical right-of-way dimensions were used in the development of the concepts. Will check against existing right-of-way and add overall right-of-way dimension to all proposed cross-sections in the Comp Plan.
49	Page 37, Figure 36 - Local Street Cross-section	Mark Silverwood	Some of these streets are shown at the B.F. Saul shopping center (Seven Corners Shopping Center). I question the viability of having a raised floor (2.5 - 3.0 ft) where retail may occur in the future given the need for handicapped ramps.	See note under image. Images are for illustrative purposes only and text explains that raised floors and steps in the Building Zone are only applicable in residential areas.
Urban Design				

50	Page 41, Urban Design	Karl Moritz	In the discussion of windows it may be useful (or it could be deferred to the design guidelines) to note that windows on active street frontages should not have walls or static displays just inside the window that block views in and out of the building that undermine the purpose of windows in these important locations. In Alexandria we periodically have this situation, particularly with drug stores and grocery stores, but usually we can find a solution that works for the retailer and allows passersby to see into the store.	Concur with this comment and will incorporate general language to this effect in the Comp. Plan. Further elaboration of these elements are appropriate to detail within the Urban Design Guidelines.
51	Page 41, Urban Design	Karl Moritz	The discussion of the Doctor's Building indicates that the preference is for modern or contemporary architecture, which makes sense to me. A statement to this effect might also belong in the discussion of architecture.	Comment noted. Will address in Urban Design Guidelines.
52	Pages 43-44, Step-Backs	Dick Knapp	Step-backs and shadow studies are generally appropriate in high-rise areas such as Tysons Corner, rather than for the abundance of 3 to 5 story product contemplated at Seven Corners. We suggest that you limit this section to developments in excess of 10 stories.	Staff anticipates that new development may maximize building heights, which have the potential to create monotonous building frontages. Addressing step-backs will create façade variation, even along tall buildings. Will incorporate language to state that such treatments and studies to be done where appropriate.
53	Page 44, Structured Parking	Dick Knapp	The language appears to recognize economic requirements that parking often be above grade. But it should allow more flexibility in allowing for above grade garages to be partially open on certain sides - where such openness doesn't interfere with livability and compatibility with adjacent uses -- in order to allow for cost effective and more sustainable non-ventilated garages.	Agree. Will add language to clarify, "No more than 20 percent of the <i>pedestrian-oriented</i> street frontages should be faced directly by garage and service bay openings..."
54	Page 44, Structured Parking	Jim Edmondson	"Underground parking is the least intrusive form of parking on the built environment and is the preferred method of providing parking in Seven Corners." This statement is fatuous. It diminishes the credibility of the entire Plan. Please let reality prevail in that structured parking will be the norm.	Received 7/7/14
55	Pages 44-45, General Parking Recommendations	Karl Moritz	The discussion about parking is very good and I agree strongly that underground parking should be preferred with structured parking "appropriate in some circumstances." In other contexts, I have seen some confusion about the meaning of "underground parking" where there is a grade change. Since developers will be making use of the grade changes in Seven Corners to achieve "underground" parking in some cases, it might be useful to have some language here, or in the design guidelines to follow, on this topic. Also, is the guidance that "Vehicular access to parking lots and parking garages should be limited to local streets or service drives when feasible" sufficient? I'm particularly interested in having the entrances to parking garages for residential buildings located on the least prominent block face and preferably using a service drive or alley shared with another residential building parking garage entrance.	Comment noted. Add text in second bullet in general parking recommendations: 'Vehicular access to parking lots and parking garages should be limited to local streets or service drives where feasible. The garage entrance for residential buildings should be located on the less prominent block face and preferably using a service drive or alley shared with another residential building parking entry'.
56	Page 45, Architectural Elements	Karl Moritz	Architectural elements: To encourage high quality architecture, the Plan could encourage the use of high quality materials, particularly at the first floor and most especially on the main retail or walking streets. These include materials such as glass, stone, brick, and metal.	Discuss with Task Force. Determine if there is a desire to specify materials to be used on the buildings. This information may be more appropriate in the Urban Design Guidelines.
57 8/6/2014	Page 45, Fenestration and Transparency	Jim Edmondson	"...the facades of the first floor should be primarily transparent." Is this level of intrusiveness into design necessary?	Received 7/7/14

58	Page 46, Public Art	Mark Silverwood	Given the scope of redevelopment, should a dollar figure be given to "art contribution" whether on-site or off-site but in the neighborhood, at \$.30 per new square foot of building?	Comment noted. Typically done during the rezoning process.
Parks, Recreation and Open Space				
59	Page 47, Typology of the Parks	Karl Moritz	It is possible these can't be amended, if they simply restate typologies already adopted in another planning document. If so, there may be other locations in this plan where these two ideas can land: A. Common green, page 47: I suggest removing "community garden plots" from the list unless this does not include plots that are allocated to individuals. In my experience, the people to whom these plots are allocated quickly feel they "own" those plots, which creates a variety of unintended consequences, such as users renting their plot to someone else, and in another case, leaving their plot to a family member in a will. In general, anything that privatizes shared open space should be avoided. B. Civic plazas, page 47: I suggest including in the list of possible features: "...seating, including movable tables and chairs and umbrellas, public art..."	Agree. Staff feels that this would be appropriate.
60	Page 48, Concept	Jim Edmondson	Figure 29 is not the proper reference.	Agree. Correction has been made.
61	Page 49, Recreation-Focused Urban Park (Land Units A and C).	Dick Knapp	We think the inclusion of Land Unit C is a typo (it belongs in the category above, relating to "Pocket Parks and Linear Green Spaces."	Agree. Within the 6/24/14 Plan text draft, the heading has been corrected to read: "Recreation-Focused Urban Park (Land Unit A)"
62	Page 49, Recreation-Focused Urban Park (Land Unit A).	Jim Edmondson	Obviously it would be nice to set aside a few acres for a ball field in A-1 and A-2. This is not consistent with the requirement to do 1:1 replacement affordable housing in these parcels. Pocket parks make much more sense when trying to develop a relatively dense low-rise buildings with large numbers of deeply discounted apartments	Received 7/7/14
63	Page 50, Figure 38 - Seven Corners Parks and Recreation Concept Map	Dick Knapp	Land Unit C can be interpreted as having half the intended building envelope through a literal reading of this diagram. For example, the "Planned Linear Green Space" is shown at a huge scale, especially at the north end. There's also a reference to both a "Pocket Park" and the above mentioned Planned Linear Green Space. This is inconsistent with Figure 26, which clearly sets forth the intent of a total of "1 acre Park." Thus, Figure 29 should make clear the requirement of 1 acre of open space can be satisfied by the Planned Linear Green Space and then a Pocket Park as necessary to achieve 1 acre. Finally, the scale needs to be removed.	Comment noted. The intent of this figure is to provide general guidance on the location of park and recreation amenities within the Opportunity Areas. In the 6/24/14 draft Plan text, Figure 26 has been modified due to an inaccuracy in the calculation of planned park and open space. Plan text on page 49 of the 6/24/14 describes what is envisioned for pocket parks and linear green spaces the Land Unit C. The planned linear green space in Land Unit C was derived from the 2013 land use charrette, and is intended to serve as a buffer to the existing single family neighborhood to the south and west. A scale is included on the map to be consistent with accepted cartographic conventions.
Land Unit Recommendations				
64	Page 51, Opportunity Areas	Jim Edmondson	It is not "possible" that redevelopment will happen in phases. It is certain, at least in A-2, if only because of the financing for replacement affordable units. In the near or intermediate terms, full consolidation is highly unlikely. The factors most affecting development to the parcels' full potential are a) building heights and their effect on cost, b) parking requirements and their cost, c) street design and its cost, and d) proffer contribution demands and their costs. I suggest that the language in the Plan should fully recognize the development realities.	Received 7/7/14
65	Page 51, Opportunity Areas	Karl Moritz	I think Page 51's discussion of consolidation, and what is expected when consolidation does not occur, is very good.	Comment noted.

66	Page 52, Land Unit A	Karl Moritz	Starting on page 52, there are several variations on the following sentence: "Design and/or contribution should be provided...as deemed appropriate." What is meant by "design?" Stronger language could be: "Since the transportation improvements for this land unit are essential components of the overall concept and essential to achieving both the vision of a mixed use walkable village center, construction of, or contributions toward the construction of the spine road....." The language in the subunit sections is more specific, which is good.	Comment noted. Design in this case can be engineering. Engineering costs can sometimes be 10% of a total project cost that includes construction and right-of-way. I think adding some of Karl's suggested text about essential components is good and perhaps we can clarify this some more.
67	Page 52, Land Unit A	Jim Edmondson	(Refer to comments 32-34) The language in each section (for A-1 and A-2) means that wholesale displacement of current residents will occur. Few of the residents in A-2 could afford replacement units that were priced according to the County's Policy Plan. Surely this is not the Plan's intention.	Received 7/7/14
68	Page 52, Sub-unit A-2	Jim Edmondson	If parcel A-2 at less than 12 acres were to lose about 2 acres to a recreation park and 2 acres to the enhanced street design requirements, another acre to SWM uses, and covered no more than 50% of the remaining ground with building footprint (much of which would be reserved for surface parking and parking decks), then we'd have to have 7-story buildings to get to 1 million sf. This will not work with wood-frame construction, which will be required for financial feasibility.	Received 7/7/14
69	Page 53, Sub-unit A-3	Karl Moritz	In subunit A-3...isn't there an expectation for a community center, government center, or multicultural center.. Or some sort of civic building, or civic use within a private building?	Comment noted. Yes, this is discussed in the third sentence of the second paragraph for Sub-unit A-3.
70	Page 53, Land Unit B	Pat Hoar	No mention of the common green shown in Figure 27?	Agree. A reference to the common green can be made within this paragraph, as it is a focal feature within the sub-unit.
71	Page 54, Land Unit C	Pat Hoar	I am not sure if Land Unit C should really get an additional option for retail or if it should be trading residential for retail...	Discuss with Task Force. Determine what the appropriate amount and mix of uses should be in Land Unit C.
72	Page 54, Land Unit C	Karl Moritz	I agree that redevelopment of this site will take place, and it would be better to have redevelopment that is consistent with the vision for the Seven Corners Town Center. It is important to have the grid network match the spine road, which I think will provide the best exit/entrance to the site that does not impact residential neighborhoods nearby. I worry that without additional density, redevelopment will be something like self-storage that does not contribute to the vitality of the area in any way. Nevertheless, I'm not convinced the amount of density requested by the developer is the minimum necessary to provide a redevelopment incentive. The request for the landscaped buffer and internal grid network of streets is a relatively minor set of amenities. Unless this development project is expected to contribute greatly to offsite improvements, I don't think the Plan is expecting enough from this site for the amount of development that is being provided. Overall, this site to me is not as critical to achieving the plan vision as the other two Land Units and it is also the most concerning to the community, so care should be taken that the plan for this Land Unit be comprehensive. I would be willing to support lower densities on this site.	Comment noted.

73	Page 54, Land Unit C	Karl Moritz	I also worry about stacking on Patrick Henry in the morning. I don't remember if we have a study about it, but it does seem like something that could be a problem.	Comment noted. This street and intersection is in the Seven Corners Transportation Study. Stacking on Patrick Henry could get worse, especially if Juniper Street is closed. Generally, to help with stacking we add additional lanes at an intersection. I also think closing the service drive, could help alleviate some of the problems seen here, as we can short the signal length thus giving more signal time for vehicles on Patrick Henry Drive.
74	Page 54, Land Unit C	Karl Moritz	Nearby residents have indicated a preference for a larger component of ground floor retail and less housing. I mentioned I'm not completely clear on the vision for Leesburg Pike-fronting retail (the Plan seems to encourage it, but the Plan doesn't show much retail on the Sears side of Leesburg Pike). I'm thinking that it is not necessary to limit retail in this subunit to 36,000 sq feet even if this landowner doesn't currently see a need for it. The flexibility to provide a greater proportion of retail makes sense to me.	Comment noted.
75	Page 54, Land Unit D	Karl Moritz	Is it worth mentioning that a plan amendment may be considered in the future if it is needed to implement the ring road? Something to that effect?	Comment noted. If a Plan amendment is needed, it is not something that would need to be explicitly pointed out within the Plan recommendations in order to occur.
76	Page 57, Minimal Change Area	Karl Moritz	For the minimal change areas, would it be helpful to mention that they were not studied during the 2012-2014 plan update? That way it is clear that the recommendations are carried over from the previous version of the plan, and may well be studied and revised in future studies.	Agree. It may be helpful to note that the focus of the land use study was within the Opportunity Areas and that land use recommendations were not modified within the Transitional and Minimal Change Areas.
77	Pages 55-57, Land Units F-H	Pat Hoar	Please confirm all the option language in these areas simply match what is already in the current Plan?	Comment noted. The recommendations match what is in the adopted Plan text. In instances where a recommendation states that an area should remain at its current intensity, we have added an FAR measurement to reflect what that existing intensity is.