

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PARKS COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2006**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District
Frank de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, At-Large
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District
Laurie F. Wilson, At-Large

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District

PARK AUTHORITY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Harrison A. Glasgow, At-Large
George E. Lovelace, At-Large
Winifred S. Shapiro, Braddock District
Harold L. Strickland, Sully District, Chairman
Frank S. Vajda, Mason District

STAFF PRESENT:

Michael Kane, Director, Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA)
Timothy White, Deputy Director, FCPA
Sandra Stallman, Park Planning Branch, FCPA
Scott Sizer, Park Planner, FCPA
Andrea Dorlester, Park Planner, FCPA
Regina Coyle, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Lorrie Kirst, Zoning Administration Division, (ZAD) DPZ
Chris King, ZAD, DPZ
Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Sara Robin Hardy, Assistant Director, PC Staff
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk, Planning Commission

//

Planning Commission Vice-Chairman John R. Byers constituted the meeting at 7:30 p.m., pursuant to Section 4-102 of the Commission's *Bylaws & Procedures*, in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035, and indicated that the first order of business was to elect a committee chairman.

Vice Chairman Byers MOVED TO NOMINATE FRANK A. DE LA FE AS CHAIRMAN OF THE 2006 PARKS COMMITTEE.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

//

Vice Chairman Byers turned the gavel over to Chairman de la Fe who said the first order of business was to approve committee minutes.

Commissioner Byers MOVED THAT THE PARK AUTHORITY COMMITTEE MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 2006 BE APPROVED.

Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

//

Chairman de la Fe recognized Harold Strickland, Chairman, Park Authority Board, Sully District, for introductory remarks.

Mr. Strickland said that County parks were being impacted by growth and changing cultures. He said a Needs Assessment Study, completed a few years ago, identified improvements necessary to serve citizens. He said approximately \$370-380 million would be needed over the next ten years to provide a reasonable standard of service to citizens. He explained that in response to concerns raised by the Park Authority Board to the Board of Supervisors (BOS), staff had been directed to examine the Zoning Ordinance provision that required developers to proffer funds and/or facilities to offset the impacts caused by new P District development and to determine if adjustments needed to be made. Mr. Strickland noted that the amount per unit contributed in accordance with this Ordinance, \$955, had not increased since 1997. He said staff responded to the BOS in a memorandum from Anthony Griffin, County Executive, dated August 1, 2006. (A copy of the memorandum is in the date file.) He said that \$150 million bond request for 2008 and \$150 million in 2012 would be included in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for parks. He noted that one of the goals of the Park Authority Board's recently revised strategic plan was to search for alternate funding sources.

Chairman de la Fe pointed out that the Ordinance requirement of \$955 per unit could be used by developers to provide recreational facilities and that the Park Authority only received the leftover amount which was not substantial. He noted that a "fair share" proffer of \$265 per resident was relatively new and emphasized that the donation of land for parks was also critical.

Mr. Strickland explained that the "fair share" per resident had included eight benchmarks costs for citizen services, not the entire cost for park and recreational facilities. He said that if the County was not providing a 100 percent level of service, it was not fair to ask a developer to provide 100 percent. He recommended asking for a fair share of the total cost of providing park facilities.

In response to a comment from Chairman de la Fe, Sandy Stallman, FCPA, said park contributions were requested for non-residential development if recommended in the Comprehensive Plan, such as Fairfax Center and Dulles Suburban Center.

Ms. Stallman narrated a PowerPoint presentation addressing the BOS directive in March 2006 to staff to examine the Zoning Ordinance that required developers to proffer funds and facilities for outdoor recreational and to consider what adjustments needed to be made. (A copy of the presentation is in the date file.) She made the following points:

- Two mechanisms were currently used to acquire funds:

P-District zoning regulations requiring \$955 per unit
"Fair Share" contributions of \$265 per resident

- Funding history January 2000 to the present:

Fair share – FCPA requested \$7.5 million and \$5.3 million proffered
P-District Fees – FCPA received \$1.3 million out of a \$16 million contribution

- P-District Regulation:

1973 – \$500 per unit required
1997 – \$955 per unit required
Construction costs increased 59 percent or \$1,500 per unit since 1997

In response to a question from Chairman de la Fe, Ms. Stallman said if the Consumer Price Index (CPI) had been used it would have shown a 21.3 percent increase, but that she believed a good case could be made to use the actual cost to construct facilities. She noted that the CPI was based on consumables, not construction costs.

- Proffers for Parks and Recreation:

Fair share formula elements – park facility service level standards; cost to develop nine benchmark facilities; actual facility service levels

In 2003 the cost was \$265 per resident; in 2006 it was \$320 per resident; with an average household size of 2.7 for a total of \$870 per unit

- In-kind proffers priorities:

Land in stream valleys; land in park deficient areas; land to support local serving facilities; land adjacent to existing parkland, trails and trail connections; active recreation facilities such as Briarwood Trace, Arrowhead, Merrifield Town Center, etc.

- Recommendations:

Authorize a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to increase P-District park contribution from \$955 per unit to \$1,500 per unit with provisions for escalation, if appropriate; possibly by a biannual ZOA or escalation clauses in proffers

Increase FCPA proffer contribution requests to \$320 per resident with annual escalation tied to formula; construction costs, and service levels and updated annually

Continue to request land dedications, restoration efforts and facilities when supported by Plan text and where impacts and deficiencies are great

Support from policymakers essential

Chairman de la Fe noted that the County Attorney had previously ruled that an escalation clause was not appropriate in a Zoning Ordinance. He suggested that the advice of the County Attorney be sought to determine if this was still the case. He noted that proffers now included an escalation clause.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Byers, Lorrie Kirst, ZAD, DPZ, said the Zoning Ordinance provision for a contribution for recreation facilities only applied to P-District as an incentive for providing open space, recreational facilities, and other amenities. She said applying that Ordinance to all development was a larger policy issue. Chairman de la Fe and Commissioner Alcorn agreed and said this was something that should be re-evaluated.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that the variable in the equation to predict the number of residents generated by development was the type of unit: townhouse, single family, or high rise apartment. Ms. Stallman said this was an excellent point.

Winnie Shapiro, Fairfax County Park Authority Board, noted that one reason the Ordinance applied only to P-District development was because larger contributions of land and facilities could be provided through proffers. Commissioner Alcorn said case law and legislation could apply and suggested that Karen Harwood, Esquire, Deputy County Attorney, be consulted.

Chairman de la Fe pointed out that if a Zoning Ordinance contained an escalation clause, it could not happen automatically as it could in a proffer and that the BOS would have to approve an increase each year.

Ms. Stallman continued with her presentation:

- Area Plans Update:

Existing text dated 1994; update on the Planning Commission's work plan; Policy Plan had been amended in 2005 which set the groundwork to update the Area

Plans; text included boiler plate text in districts and sectors; park inventory charts by classification; and recommendations for specific park development

District Wide Parks Charts by classification and sector need to be updated to reflect the new classification system adopted in the Policy Plan update

District Overview Recommendations also need to be updated

- Proposed changes:

- Update parks inventory and classifications

- Use amended Park Policy Plan as guide

- Remove outdated text

- Update park recommendations

- Replace charts with park maps.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Byers, Ms. Stallman said the FCPA and DPZ were responsible for updating Area Plans. Chairman de la Fe noted that the process would be the same as the process used to update the Transportation Plan and map with a recommendation to update Area Plans.

Ms. Stallman explained it was possible that some recommendations could be deleted from the Area Plans and be addressed in the Park Authority Master Plan.

Chairman de la Fe asked that staff consider reviewing park recommendations during the Area Plans Review (APR) process rather than by an Out-of-Turn Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Wilson commented that it would make the process more confusing if APR nominations included recommendations for parks together with the technical process to update Area Plans to incorporate Policy Plan changes.

Mr. Strickland said this issued needed more discussion and that FCPA staff had recommended to the Board that the park planning process be reviewed. Chairman de la Fe added that it was important to make sure that the Policy Plan and Area Plans agreed. He also said that the Park Authority public hearing process should include community involvement to resolve issues before the Planning Commission public hearing.

Mr. Strickland requested another committee meeting be scheduled to discuss Comprehensive Plan updates. Ms. Stallman said staff would present final recommendations to the committee concerning the Zoning Ordinance issue.

In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Stallman explained that a successful regional plan for Sully Woodlands had looked at all parkland in the area as a system with

connections to watersheds and other systems in the area. She said staff wanted to look at parks more systematically as they related to each other and the diverse communities they served.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.
Frank de la Fe, Chairman

//

An audio recording of this meeting is available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved: March 15, 2007

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission