last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
The following are comments received on the proposed Plan Amendment (ST07-CW-1CP - Transit-Oriented Development) published in the Staff Report dated January 11, 2007. These comments are summarized from written comments received by staff, written and non-written testimony at or prior to the Planning Commission Public Hearing (Feb. 8), and comments received by telephone, through February 16, 2007. The response column reflects Staff's response. Many comments have been paraphrased to fit into this format, and this document is intended only as a summary. This document does NOT substitute for full text of original comments submitted in any format, all of which were provided to the Planning Commission prior to this summary.					
Key to Resolution Column **I = Incorporated previously** **IR = Incorporated Revision** **NI = Not Incorporated**					
Ormsby	Sally	12-Jan	TOD PA should include only those things unique to TOD, which is just higher density mixed-use development. Better format would include a single objective, and more policies, including only those principles unique to TOD.	another approach	NI
Ormsby	Sally	PC	Policy should also apply to mixed use centers	out of scope of this PA as advertised, and as directed by BOS.	NI
Ormsby	Sally	PC	Environmental Benefits section is really Environ. Considerations, since it includes impacts as well as benefits.	See Revisions to Environmental Benefits	IR
Amick	David	17-Jan	Vision for community should retain reference to having plans start with PC and MD Supervisors. District Land Use Committees, such as Lee District, should be an exception if such language is not incorporated	Combination option provides balance of alternatives in strawman and recognizes that good ideas may come from a range of stakeholders	NI
Amick	David	17-Jan	Eminent domain should be addressed. Opposed to for commercial purposes, but good for truly public purpose. If 75% of neighborhood agrees to sell then commercial devel. Would be ok, but if landowner holds out, devel. Should occur around it.	Out of scope of this amendment, not specific to TOD	NI
Amick	David	17-Jan	TSA bdys for Franc-Spring station should extend beyond current to include Inova Healthplex and MetroPark area	Comment appropriate for Area Plan review, but out of scope of this policy.	NI
Riveros	Albert	18-Jan	Include bus transit stations in addition to rail transit, i.e. 7 corners, Baileys, which have no rail stations planned.	Scope determined by consensus at committee meetings with opening for family of guidelines in the future, which applies to other types of transit	NI

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Riveros	Albert	18-Jan	TOD parameter should be defined as 1/2 mile radius from rail and bus transit stations	Proximity determined by consensus at committee meetings, defined as 1/4 - 1/2 mile as guideline with Area Plan delineations	NI
Riveros	Albert	18-Jan	county should encourage bus/rail stations in revitalization districts	Comment appropriate for Area Plan review, but out of scope of this policy.	NI
Riveros	Albert	18-Jan	TOD guidelines should address commuter traffic from sprawling communities w/in wash. Metro area, i.e. PW County, Fredericksburg, Fauquier counties.	See Revisions to Regional Framework: added coordination with regional organizations	IR
Bottigheimer	Nat	18-Jan	measure distance from station entrance, not platform	Measuring distance determined by consensus at committee meetings	NI
Bottigheimer	Nat	18-Jan	We hope that the County's TOD policy will place a priority on the need to preserve and -- as both bus and rail ridership increase -- enhance transit access facilities within rail transit station areas, and that appropriate processes and standards are in place to permit the establishment of TOD plans that explicitly consider and address the inclusion of needed transit and transit access facilities (such as bus bays, parking, taxis, substations, etc). Perhaps an element of the public outreach process related to TOD plan development could include a study process identifying transit facility and transit access needs as part of plan development? Clarification: I'd want to underscore the value of obtaining fresh station access demand and station access facility need information when updating station area plans...in some places, we have needed to develop access demand information simultaneously with ongoing planning or development review processes and that's resulted in some "on the fly" analysis (and in full disclosure, it's appropriate to add that we at WMATA have sometimes been responsible for thi	See Revision to Public Facilities section	IR
Bottigheimer	Nat	18-Jan	Recommend that at some point the County consider the relationship between the intensification of development in transit station areas and the funding of associated transit facility replacement and/or enhancement. A phenomenon we've observed system-wide is the identification of transit access needs without the provision of funds linked to those needs. We would be happy to work with the County on strategies that assist in this area. We would hope, though, that the County TOD policy could play a role at a m minimum to identify this area as one needed further attention.	See Revision to Public Facilities section	IR
Trempel	Rebecca	5-Feb	Support recommendation that TOD should be at rail transit stations only.	Transit Proximity	I
			All TOD projects should also have wide community involvement in all stages of the planning	Community Vision	I

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	As WMATA's joint development program is so closely tied to the County's proposed TOD policy, I strongly recommend that action on the TOD policy be deferred until you have an opportunity to review and consider the recommendations of the WMATA Joint Development Task Force as they relate to the County's TOD policy.	timing	n/a
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Addressing these two potentially conflicting goals [transportation hub and good design] can be a challenge particularly as the station's function matures over time with changing conditions in the stations service area. One way to address this challenge is to undertake a vision or master planning process at each transit station. Such a process would attempt to address both the near term and long range needs at a station.	Implementation	n/a
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	transit agencies need to meet with community groups early and often to ensure proper coordination of the agencies' planning and development goals for the stations.	see Community Vision (re all stakeholders) and Regional coordination, where transit agencies referenced specifically.	I
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Among the considerations would be the need to accommodate changes in travel demand such as the need for more parking, changes in bus service, possible new transportation services introduced into a corridor, or even the possible reduction in demand resulting from an extension of service further out (i.e. West Falls Church with the introduction of Dulles corridor Metrorail service or Vienna with the extension of Metrorail or BRT to the west along I-66). At the same time the vision planning needs to consider the access and facility needs arising from the development of TODs in the area around the station area including possible modifications to provide effective and attractive access to the station that's paramount if the TODs are to be successful. And finally, the vision planning needs to address planned development on the station property itself.	See Revisions to Public Facilities and Infrastructure re current data on station access facilities and demand data.	IR
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Policy a: expand to refer to "areas of focused growth adjacent to and including transit station areas including transit station itself		NI
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	include connection btwn TODs and station itself		NI
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Design: TOD should be oriented to face the station	May be site-specific decision	NI
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Commuter parking should not be located at periphery. Should be w/in 1000 ft of station	Alt. Language, not included. See Parking: location of commuter garages should be sensitive to pedex and bicycle activity and adj. neighborhoods	NI
Bochner	Richard	6-Feb	Community Vision: more focused task forces have been shown to produce best results.	Community Vision section developed by consensus at TOD Committee meetings	NI

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
FairGrowth		6-Feb	Openess and transparency: Include the following language: The County recognizes that even the best plans can go awry if there is insufficient follow through. Proffers, TDM commitments, and other assurances both short and long term related to TOD projects must be vigorously monitored and enforced in a transparent and accountable manner. Any increased costs incurred to monitor and enforce provisions of TOD plans should be factored in to the cost of the project. Citizens should have full access to all data related to ongoing TOD projects. Such data will be made available on the County's web site whenever practical. Data that is not practical to supply online will be provided to members of the public upon request, without requiring residents to go through state Freedom of Information Act procedures and at no cost in the case of TOD projects. Citizen panels open to full participation by interested residents should assist in monitoring TOD progress and compliance with agreed-upon requirements.	Community Vision section developed by consensus at TOD Committee meetings; Community Vision section addresses community participation process.	NI
FairGrowth		6-Feb	Ensure frequent access to 3-D modeling to community	Specific tools are not addressed in Community Vision section	NI
FairGrowth		6-Feb	Add to Transit Proximity: The TOD planning process should safeguard lower-density zones ("green belts") outside of transit station area boundaries, and provide explicit protections against incidents of "density creep," where higher density is sought for lower-density areas that border transit station areas.	See Transit-Proximity: Area Plans provide delineations based on these criteria, including presence of existing development.	NI
Deasy	Charleen	6-Feb	Support development approach of focusing TOD projects in close proximity to rail transit stations	Transit Proximity	I
Deasy	Charleen	6-Feb	Early and continuing involvement of nearby communities in the planning of TOD projects is essential to ensure compatibility with the character of adjoining low-density neighborhoods. Transparency in decision making about allowable uses and degrees of density is of paramount concern to current residents in the vicinity of a proposed TOD project.	Community Vision	I
Deasy	Kevin	6-Feb	Higher density development seems appropriate for those who use heavy rail. However, bulk of population needs transit better suited to low-density lifestyle. TOD projects should have well-defined boundaries encompassing areas immediately around rail transit stations without encroaching into surrounding established low-density neighborhoods.	Transit Proximity	I

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Hall	Charlie	6-Feb	**What is the exact scope of this policy?** The current draft seems ambiguous, and potentially self-contradictory. I saw references to rapid rail transit, rail transit areas designated for mixed use, and just rail. One paragraph, Item 11, included VRE as an organization the county should communicate with. Does this policy specifically reject high-density mixed use development near VRE stations? If not, I believe more specific restrictions on the scope of this policy should be incorporated.	References to rail transit made consistent throughout - (6) revisions made. Scope clarified in 2 places: introduction and transit proximity section.	IR
Hall	Charlie	6-Feb	**What ridership thresholds should be established for TOD?** Ridership in an urban area may well be higher than at the end of the line, or compared to light rail, and almost certainly at VRE. Since the goal is to create synergy between high-frequency transit and development, the omission of any minimum ridership threshold to guide when TOD is appropriate seems like a significant gap.	This guidance is specific to particular rail lines and may be more appropriate in Area Plans, as referenced in the policy	NI
Hall	Charlie	6-Feb	**Density guidelines.** Density is one of the most emotional topics in specific projects, because it affects everything from traffic to visual impact. While Paragraph 2 notes that there are differences between projects in urban and more suburban areas, there is no guidance on how this might affect appropriate density choices. The same holds true for higher-ridership and lower-ridership stations. I believe that greater discussion of density would help the community anticipate what kinds of projects it might expect.	Policy defers to Area Plan guidance for appropriate designations on specifics related to a particular station.	NI
Hall	Charlie	6-Feb	Paragraph 2: It is not clear what guidance is offered by the statement that the characteristics of surrounding areas should be considered. Compatibility with surrounding areas is an important goal, and some further guidance may be appropriate as to whether a reduction in density may be appropriate in more fully suburban areas, while a higher-density approach may be appropriate in a more urban setting.	Incorporated: Station-specific Flexibility, and in reference to Area Plans to determine specifics for a particular station	NI
Hall	Charlie	6-Feb	Paragraph 16: A more specific discussion may be warranted in the paragraph on phasing, which was a hot issues at MetroWest. I would like a more explicit statement that it may be warranted, as a policy goal, not to let a developer proceed to later phases if it has not fulfilled earlier elements considered essential to the overall success of a project.	Comment appropriately addressed at the time of development review (i.e. with proffers), but out of scope of this policy guidance due to site-specific circumstances.	NI
McCleary	Hunter	PC	Support recommendation for Safe, convenient, covered bicycle parking	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access	I
McCleary	Hunter	PC	Provide bicycle access beyond TOD areas. 1/4 mile/15 minute walk may lead to insular, poorly accessible communities. A better definition would take into account that cyclists can travel several miles in 15 minutes	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access recommends considering differing distances traveled by pedestrians and cyclists and providing usable trails beyond the TSA	I

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Bowman	John	PC	PPEA redevelopment within TSA creates inherent conflict with open process in Community Vision and Public Facilities and Infrastructure sections. We would support PPEA proposals within TSAs being subject to these guidelines.	PPEA proposals tend to occur on abandoned public facility sites (i.e. old schools) and are unlikely to occur in TSAs. PPEA is subject to Plan guidance.	I
Bowman	John	PC	We disagree with language [in staff report] which states most development will be redevelopment. We feel that cumulative damage to SWM will be quite detrimental as a result of multiple "redevelopments" each of which are considered "neutral".	This statement was intended to provide support for recommending additional improvements in quality of runoff, beyond PFM for TODs, even if considered redevelopment.	I
Bowman	John	PC	We hope that transit proximity language protecting existing neighborhoods will help prevent spot changes to significantly increase density over that planned in existing neighborhoods far from transit	Implementation	n/a
Koch	Stella	8-Feb	The Audubon Naturalist Society is pleased to support the addition of the proposed TOD language to the Comprehensive Plan. This language should effectively guide the development of Fairfax County's rail and transit stations while adequately protecting the surrounding more suburban neighborhoods and open space.	n/a	I
Koch	Stella	8-Feb	We would ask that these principles be applied to both current and future rail stations. We support the language that allows for flexibility in defining the parameters of TOD areas according to varying geographic and community needs.	See Intro to Obj: "existing or planned rail stations". Also policies address future planning (future) and development review (current)	I
Koch	Stella	8-Feb	We have some concerns about the parking and pricing policies and suggest that further considerations be made and a clear more TOD oriented parking policy be established for the county.	Countywide comment - out of scope of this amendment	NI
			Would like to see clarification to rail: add "heavy and light"	This wouldn't address commuter rail; clarified with revisions to intro and transit proximity	IR
			Maintain flexibility to adjust boundaries from 1/2 mile radius - i.e. Merrifield as best example. However, any such expansion must be strongly justified.	Transit Proximity	I
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Ped/bikes: guideline calls for trails beyond TSA, but TSA not well defined. It is critical that trails and on-road bike lanes extend beyond the TOD and link to other destinations, offering alt. to auto trips	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access recommends considering differing distances traveled by pedestrians and cyclists and providing usable trails beyond the TSA	I
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Need minimum ratio or percentages for mix of use, not just reference to Area Plans. But for now suggest requiring full disclosure of land use categories, in percentages, before and after proposed TOD would be built to be part of application. Allows comparison of these values to similar values at known successful projects in similar environments	This guidance is site specific, and out of scope of this policy. These details may be appropriate for Area Plans, as referenced in this Policy.	NI

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Good design should be "essential" not just "encouraged"	Design: "Encourage Excellence in urban design" is summary principle.	NI
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Parking: how about time of day pricing, like with HOT lanes, to reduce need for parking?	Countywide comment - out of scope of this amendment	NI
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Vision: Suggest combination option of Community Vision - we are stuck in APR approach which is not good enough - need to start with a broader view then focus down on each site.	Community Vision	I
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Insert: "use a broad regional planning process to identify potential and targeted TSAs to be further planned" after the second sentence of the Alternative/Additional language. Both COG/TPB and USEPA have programs to support local TOD planning that Fairfax County should consider accessing.	Regional Coordination occurs at a higher level - we look at implications of future growth on a regional basis, and BOS may choose to incorporate if appropriate	NI
Deidrich	Roger	PC	Phasing: an area that can be a problem, and hopefully can be improved by setting out a schedule and building in mitigating measures during construction. Example of area where county needs to do extra diligence to avoid opposition to future projects. Need to add enforcement to guidelines. County already uses fines for not meeting TDMs, so need more clarity on how other operational measures will be followed through - i.e. as part of LDS make available status of proffers being met during construction and beyond.	Implementation	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Transportation emissions and global warming can be addressed in TOD	See Environmental Benefits	n/a
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Agree with Sally to include these guidelines for mixed use centers	out of scope of this PA as advertised, and as directed by BOS.	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Support parallel parking. A great traffic calming devise, as well as reduces structured parking need	Parking (on-street parking referenced, though parallel parking not specifically referenced)	I
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	The TOD area may be generally defined as, **but not limited to,** a ¼ mile radius from the station platform, with density and intensity tapering to a ½ mile radius from the station platform [or a 5-10 minute walk]. Station-specific delineations should allow for the consideration of conditions such as roads, topography, or existing development that would reduce **or increase** the frequency of pedestrian usage of transit and therefore reduce **or increase** the expected walking distance to a station within which higher intensity development may be appropriate.	see edits to Transit Proximity	IR
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Bike circulation - add distance people are willing to "walk <u>or bike</u>"	Guidelines built around pedestrian walking distance	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Current or future - should be open to BRT with dedicated lanes with similar capacity to rail, and also to permanent bus transit centers.	Scope determined by consensus at committee meetings with opening for family of guidelines in the future, which applies to other types of transit	NI

last name	first name	date	comment	response	resolution
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	Collaboration is good, but include more description/recommendation for use of visualization tools	Specific tools are not addressed in Community Vision section	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	• CTOD. *The New Transit Town* . 2004 (124). Streetscape, urban design, building orientation, and public places all influence the decision to walk. It is particularly important that surrounding neighborhoods have quality pedestrian connections to the development without gaps or major barriers.	these concepts covered	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	• EPA, *Getting to Smart Growth* . 2003 (35) Due to pedestrian amenities, pedestrians in Copenhagen are willing to walk more than a ½ mile to get to transit, on average.	these concepts covered	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	these concepts covered	these concepts covered	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	• City of Denver. *Design Guidelines for Denver Landmarks and Landmark Districts.* Jan 2004. "Pedestrian friendly" is a measure of the quality of an environment from the perspective of a person on foot. A pedestrian friendly environment is a place where people can enjoy public life in a comfortable setting. . . including approaches to land use, building design, historic preservation, streetscape design, transportation, mobility, traffic management, parking and economic development.	these concepts covered	NI
Schwartz	Stewart	PC	We recommend that follow-on measures be taken by the County to more effectively implement TOD, including staff specifically assigned to oversee TOD and mixed-use corridor planning along with the necessary funding. Updated sector plans should be developed using the collaborative processes recommended in these guidelines and using the latest visualization and design tools.	Implementation	NI
Horwatt	Michael	PC	There is a fear that TOD will be a subterfuge for density – we shouldn't let that fear get in the way. Should these factors apply to mixed-use centers? Maybe, but TOD is worthy of standing alone – TOD requires much more rigorous standards than mixed-use centers – i.e. pedestrian access and trails. We need a continuing rigorous focus on TOD.	Proposed as TOD policy. Application to mixed use centers would be out of scope of advertisement or BOS directive	I
Fairfield	Jeff	PC	Advocate in favor of preserving 1/2 mile area as outer boundary of TOD area - Arrowbrook is good example of where areas that should be within TOD are beyond 1/4 mile, but within 1/2 mile.	incorporated: Transit Proximity - Area Plans should determine	I
Fairfield	Jeff	PC	If the intent of the language is to stay w/in 1/2 mile area, can be stated more clearly. If not, should clarify that as well.	Distance and wording of this section determined by participants in TOD Committee meetings	NI
Bennett	Jody	PC	Reference to "certain" rail transit stations - does this imply there are transit stations not suitable for TOD projects? Is staff developing criteria that will be used to determine if a rail transit station is appropriate for TOD?	incorporated: Transit Proximity - Area Plans should determine	I

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Bennett	Jody	PC	"generally" should not precede 1/4 - 1/2 mile radius in definition of TOD nationwide. Boundaries should be defined exactly. Guidelines include disclaimers for setting guidelines: topography, existing developments, overcoming barriers, safe, comfortable, interesting walk	1/4-1/2 mile is a general guideline. Criteria for setting specific boundaries should be clearly delineated in Area Plans based on criteria laid out here.	I
Bennett	Jody	PC	What criteria? Radius circle, or safe, comfortable and interesting walk	All criteria, with radius circle as a general guideline. See rewrite of Transit Proximity, intended to clarify, but not change meaning.	IR
Bennett	Jody	PC	Criteria are silent in regards to putting TOD with densities higher than existing neighborhoods. Here is an opportunity to address adequate public facilities to accommodate increase in density. If language is in Plan, applicatations that negatively affect infrastructure can be turned down. If citizens in these neighborhoods are being asked to embrace TODs, then guidelines must specifically identify transportation and facilities impacts.	See revision to Public Facilities and Infrastructure: using current access and demand data. Also see non-degradation policy in Transportation and Traffic section (as previously proposed).	IR
Bennett	Jody	PC	Can language be inserted that assures more community participation and outreach in planning and design of TOD projects, as I understand occurred in Arlington? When same players appear on Task forces, citizens on sidelines feel disenfranchised.	See Community Vision section	I
Bennett	Jody	PC	Pedestrian and bicycle access: Encouraged is not strong enough. Use "shall" of goal is to have pedestrian and bicycle-oriented community.	Pedestrian and bicycle access is a principle.	NI
Bennett	Jody	PC	Mix of land uses: need statement including examination of unique characteristics of adjacent neighborhoods as well. Also need study of economic impacts of new TOD on established communities/businesses.	See station-specific Flexibility which references "larger surrounding area"	I
Bennett	Jody	PC	Housing Affordability: encourage is too loose.	See Revisions to Housing Affordability	IR
Bennett	Jody	PC	Transportation: include examination of impacts beyond TOD area. Reference to traffic flow on adjacent arterials serving the TOD, recommended remedy is to place dollars into a fund is not adequate, if something like a Silver line won't even reduce congestion. There should also be modeling to visualize trans. impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. How can this guideline be strengthened beyond putting mitigation money in a fund?	Intention of monetary contributions is intended to enable application of other techniques to minimize delays.	NI
Bennett	Jody	PC	Phasing: project monitoring is not mentioned, and should be included here.	Implementation - Development Review/Site Plan process/Proffers	NI
			Did we come up with a way of measuring trip reduction?	Need to research	n/a
Lawrence	Ken	PC	Believe in having a bright line defining TOD boundaries, and this line should be drawn at the Area Plan level	incorporated	I

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
			Buildings: add language about roofs that can handle weight loads for technologies such as extensive or intensive green roofs or extensive solar arrays - while technology may not be here yet, if roofs don't support that weight, buildings cannot be retrofitted in the future.	difficult to incorporate in proffers	NI
Reyher	Deborah	PC	The policy should affirmatively encourage supplemental transit systems to funnel people INTO the TOD area. By focusing only on road improvements (or lack of degradation) and parking, the policy assumes the continuation of a car culture. The TOD policy should affirmatively encourage the development of public access routes TO the transit hub. And this should not be limited to circulating shuttles, or trams, or buses, but also affirmatively encourage connection to the County's interconnecting parks and bike trails.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Access section recommends considering differing distances traveled by pedex and bikes and providng usable trails beyond the TSA; See revision to Open Space section.	IR
Reyher	Deborah	PC	The policy, as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, should also make it plain that density increases in TOD areas WILL be balanced by a commitment to preserve lesser density "green belts." As drafted, the policy will simply allow density creep in future APR cycles after a TOD project is approved, and eventually all our stable, tree canopied neighborhoods will be re-developed at higher densities due to the proximity of a TOD area. **I cannot stress this strongly enough, as it is ONLY in the Comprehensive Plan, NOT at the zoning stage, that the balance between high density TOD areas and lower density "green belts" can be protected. It is imperative to include language ensuring that once a TOD is approved, any APR or re-zoning applications to increase density in a surrounding area will face a strong presumption of continuing lower density.**	Policy defers to Area Plan guidance for appropriate designations on specifics related to a particular station.	NI
Reyher	Deborah	PC	The policy should be more specific about protecting our watersheds and tree canopy. It is indisputable that TODs will greatly increase impervious surface and decrease tree canopy. We have to deal with that directly and not just assume there will be "environmental benefits" elsewhere. In addition, while preserving tree canopy has long been known to improve air quality, new research shows that mere exposure to traffic fumes can dramatically decease heart rate and may be responsible for the increase in heart attacks observed in urban settings on smoggy days.	Stream Valley protection incorporated in Open Space Section. Also see tree preservation policy in Environment Policy Plan.	NI
Reyher	Deborah	PC	In sum, TODs should not be located in stream valleys, ever, and there should be some affirmative requirement to protect streams and preserve tree canopy, if not within the TOD area, then as part of a policy of protecting surrounding "green belts" as discussed above.	See Environment Policy Plan	NI
Turner	Keith	8-Feb	Introduction to Obj: Development of TOD	See edit	IR

last name	first name	date	ST07-CW-1CP Comments comment	response	resolution
Turner	Keith	8-Feb	Concerned about limitations to development of Tysons Corner due to limitation to 5-10 minute walk from station area. Insert in appendix: In areas of the county planned and designated for urban patterns of development, TOD may also be extended along transit served corridors leading to rail stations, in accordance with station area planning principles and process set forth here"	This policy defines and refers to TOD area as 1/4-1/2 mile, however, policy does not preclude Plan from recommending similar mixed-use development in employment centers in those areas designated as appropriate in Area Plans.	NI
Turner	Keith	8-Feb	Transit proximity: include "reduce or facilitate" and "reduce or extend" and in italics: "above or at the rail station"	see edits to Transit Proximity	IR
Turner	Keith	8-Feb	Transit Proximity: add "where appropriate and consistent with county plans, station area plans should also acknowledge the potential extension of transit-oriented development along transit corridors serving the station.	It should be noted that where stations are less than 1/2 mile apart, 14/-1/2 mile defined proximity could incorporate the transit corridor under this policy as proposed	NI
Turner	Keith	8-Feb	Mix of land uses: " . . .by examining the unique SITE SPECIFIC characteristics. . ."	unique and site-specific have similar meaning	NI