1. Transit Proximity

- Transit Proximity-define transit station and transit location
- Definition should provide for less density at transit locations other than Metro
- Define TOD areas, discourage TOD creep
- Protect existing neighborhoods
- 5. Transit proximity-"station area", 1/2 mile radius, include other modes (light rail, trolley, high capacity bus)
- Place more intense mixed-use development as close to transit station platform as possible
- Connect station platforms directly with parking areas, walkways, pedestrian system
- Transit Proximity-clear boundaries should be defined that limit where additional density will be considered. Highest intensity should be within 1/4 mile of platform and taper to pre-existing zoning at 1/2 mile
- Transit Proximity-density and intensity should decrease as distance from station increases, focus should be on walking time rather than distance; highest density should be within 10 minute walk at a reasonable pace
- Transit Proximity. "TOD should be focused and concentrated close to a metro transit station. This TOD area may be generally defined as a 1/2 mile radius from a metro transit station, which distance is proposed for general guidance based upon the ability of an average person to walk to a metro transit station within 30 minutes. TOD density and/or land use intensity should decrease as distance from a metro transit station increases, unless there are unique circumstances that warrant higher densities or intensities."
- Transit Proximity-1/2 mile, 10 minute walk as standard planning area; densities should taper, but it should be stated that highest densities should be in the first 1/4 mile radius; discussion of barriers could be changed or added to with a discussion of how creation of pleasant urban spaces can double the distance people are willing to walk (reference to Cervero, The Transit Metropolis, 1998)
- Agree with general idea of tapering off density with distance from transit stations
- Transit Proximity: Insert the words "above or" after the word "concentrated" in the 1st sentence. Reason: to support and not preclude air rights development
- Transit proximity: 1/4 mile = 5 min walk on average, not 10 mins, 1/2 mile = about 10 mins on average
- Add steep grades as possible limiting factor on size of TSAs
- Add 'generally' in the line 'should not decrease…"
- More inclusive definition of TOD so as not to preclude bus rapid transit, light rail or streetcar (TOD becomes more linear rather than circumferential); Route 1 and Arlington County examples of where transit service is headed
- Appropriate circumference for TOD-Tysons has 1000' and 1600'. GSA uses 2500' when build or lease a building, most in industry favor a 2-tiered system that allows for gradual reduction in density as you move away from the station; for Metrorail stations, 1/4 mile is good for TOD and 1/2 mile good for TAD (transit-adjacent development). In a linear corridor, the level of density may approach what you may have in the TAD ring for a Metrorail station, and tapering off after about 200-400' depending on the area and the routing of transit
- If TOD is defined by transit usage rather than by transit proximity, recommended policy language: "Generally, TODs are only appropriate within an approximately 10-minute walk of a transit station, and provided such development can demonstrate that 30% [?] or more of all trips will be non-auto trips. Higher density may be appropriate based upon attainment of higher levels of non-auto trips. Specific areas for the location of potential TODs shall be as defined in each area plan. However, TODs are not appropriate beyond a 1/2-mile radius from the platform of a transit station or when abutting existing established single family neighborhoods."
- Having had the experience of the recent nominations proposing TOD density increases on parcels the terms "near" or "close to" the transit station does not work. When it was pointed out the parcels had only a small corner touching the 1/2 mile density circle, then the proposal became

"transit friendly." Arlington was very specific in stating the distance from the station platform. Why is that such a difficult concept for us to accept?

- The identification of the station is not the same as station platform in defining the density distance.
- In the introduction, there are other definitions of TOD that should be used. This one is way too vague.
- Site-specific density circles are just too flexible. There should be specificity.....not a criteria that is so broad it could mean anything the applicant or even staff would desire.
- "Transit Proximity" section in the October 12 draft of the Strawman is much improved from the 9-27-06 draft. I am convinced a well-planned TOD can be located greater than a ¼ mile distance from the station. However, I think it better to avoid any reference to walk times but rather to emphasize safe, direct, convenient, enjoyable pedestrian connections. If walk times must be included, I recommend 5-20 minutes to account for variations. I have no problem with the language that generally the highest density should be within the ¼ radius and generally decrease as distance from the station stop increases.
- Transit proximity is generally a ¼ to ½ mile radius, <u>or within a 5- to -10-minute walk.</u> I can't figure out what is inadequate about a distance, which is measurable on a map, versus a walking time, which isn't. If the goal is to say the radius might be smaller where easy walking paths aren't available, maybe it should be said that way. I've already heard one lawyer at the TOD meetings extolling the virtues of fast walkers, and a number of us really didn't like the walking time formulation—including staunch supporters of MetroWest.
- Densities should diminish as distance increases. We submitted a formulation that stated where density should be left in its pre-existing state: maximum density within ¼ mile, tapering down to pre-existing densities at ½ mile. The straw man seems to flail at that with a number of sentences but never quite says it. Because this is such a central point—probably the single biggest question for surrounding neighborhoods, can't we use a simple, clear formulation to say what we mean?
- Delete as too subjective: "or within a 5- to 10- minute walk from the station"
- 1st and last sentence are redundant or unclear
- I suggest a fairly extensive rewrite, as I don't think this fully achieves two key goals: Creating clear boundaries that protect neighborhoods, or assuring that development will be close enough to assure active ridership. Specifically, I'm very uncomfortable with how the 5- to 10-minute walk is handled here. As an example, in the case of Poplar Terrace, could this be used to justify a TOD redevelopment?
- The highest density/land use intensity should be focused and concentrated close to the transit station, and where feasible, above the transit station. Subject to site-specific considerations, this transit-oriented development area may be generally defined as a ¼- ½ mile radius from the station, Generally, Transit Development Areas, or the core areas planned for the highest intensity in the TDA, are located within a ¼ mile from the station, and density and building heights should taper down to reach pre-existing zoning limits at ½-mile. To protect existing neighborhoods in the general vicinity of transit but not planned for transit-oriented development, station-specific areas planned for transit-oriented development should be clearly delineated in Area Plans. Once the TSA is defined through a community planning process, spot expansions of the TSA should be strongly discouraged. Station-specific delineations should consider barriers such as roads, topography, or existing development that would reduce the frequency of pedestrian usage of transit. In such cases, the TDA should be scaled back to account for reduced ridership.
- Example*: **Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is moderate to higher-density development, located within an easy walk of a major transit station, generally with a mix of residential, employment and shopping opportunities designed for pedestrians.***

  Page 2: Transit Proximity
  What is the definition of close?
  When it is stated the guidelines are subject to site-specific, does that mean each site could have different guidelines?
  Nation wide TOD boundaries are defined as ¼ mile from transit station (or transit station platform) for the most intense density and use that will taper down in density and use ½ mile from the transit station (or transit station platform).

Along with the distance boundary is added the 5-10 minute walk from the station. What is meant by the statement that tries to define barriers? Does that mean that boundary line for intense development will be expanded?
The statement that density and land use intensity use should generally decrease as distances from the station increases. What is meant by generally….does density and use intensity decrease or not increase? What are the factors that would not support why the density and land use intensity should or should not be increased?

- Transit Proximity: Time to walk should be the sole defined criterion recommended in the guidelines. In certain cases, there is no existing residential development within several miles from the proposed station. In such cases, where existing commercial, industrial or retail already exist, to set specific ¼ mile distance limitations can be counterproductive in achieving the desired results. Where there are no existing residential properties near a station, the intended desire is to create a live work environment. Consider NYC; a one mile walk is the equivalent of 10 NYC blocks, a walk New Yorkers make routinely to access a Subway station. If an opportunity exits to concentrate density along a one mile area, having set tapering restrictions would decrease design flexibility of where to place residential, retail and commercial development. A possible compromise solution is to have a TOD zoning district that is broadly defined as within a 10 minute walk, or a ½ mile radius dependant on prevailing surrounding conditions. Maximum allowable FAR should remain constant rather than tapering off with any arbitrary distance from the Metro Stop.
- **Transit Proximity:** Define TOD as ***one-half mile radius from the station, or a 20 to 30 minute walk)***. . . Higher intensities within ***or near*** the delineated area may be appropriate if barriers are overcome and demonstrable opportunities exist to provide pedestrians a safe, comfortable and interesting walk to transit. . . Density and land use intensity should generally decrease as distance from the station, ***or from stops of related transit modes*** increases.
- (1/4 mile is an approximate value for representing a 5 minute walk. Should we be careful not to make it a scientific/specific calculation that introduces other constraints like roads, topography and other "obstacles"? If we were targeting the "creative class" we could certainly expect that many young professionals would be willing to walk even further through great streets and open space amenities. Getting very scientific could be very limiting in the long run.
- In applying this provision, consideration should also be given to additional forms of transit that provide easy connection to rail stations and promote greater accessibility and transit use, such as light-rail, trolley, and high-capacity bus corridors. Such modes of transit can also support greater density than those served only by automobiles and standard bus service. It is important to include other forms of transit beyond Metro-rail)
- It is also of critical importance to make sure that these TOD principles, which are meant to apply to all of the transit stations in Fairfax County, do not in any way, unnecessarily limit the redevelopment of Tysons Corner as Fairfax County's Urban Center. There should be language in the TOD policy as well as the Tysons Plan that makes this abundantly clear.
- We write to express our support for … and highlight the importance of defining a "transit-oriented development area" as an area within a 1/4 to a 1/2 miles radius and within a 5 to 15 minute walk of the transit station. This definition is in accord with the rest of the Comprehensive Plan . . . . And, because it is commonly stated that for the average person, 35 steps per minute equals 15 minutes per 1/2 mile or 30 minutes per mile, a 1/4 to 1/2 mile and a 5 to 15 minute walk is an easy and walkable distance for the average person and one readily walked by the users of transit in our region (cites several examples).
- Distance should be measured from the station entrance pavilion.
- Distance should be measured from the station platform (x2)
- **<u>Transit Proximity (Suggest changing to Boundaries of Transit Oriented District)</u>**
- The major criteria used in defining the boundaries of the Transit-Oriented District are: Guidelines call for densities to be the highest at or when possible above the station platform. Therefore, a radius that extends up to ¼ mile from the rail station platform is used as a guiding principle for higher density development. The ¼ mile principle adheres to the concept that the average person will walk up to ¼ mile to access transit.

- Guidelines call for densities to decline from the core of TOD. Therefore, a radius that extends up to ½ mile from the rail station platform includes the highest density near the rail station platform with density and land use intensity generally decreasing to achieve development transitions into the surrounding area.
- Areas within each radius could have conditions such as roads, topography, or existing development that could affect density and land use intensification. A general Guideline should be that the highest density/land use intensity should be focused and concentrated close to the station platform and where feasible, above the station platform.
- To protect existing neighborhoods in the general vicinity of the station platform, Area Plans should include clearly delineated boundaries based on the guidelines for transit-oriented development.
- Transit Proximity: Site specific "considerations" - As stated does this leave the guideline open for defining the TOD area? If the Guidelines qualifies the station area, then it would be okay to use this statement.
- The highest density/land use intensity should be focused and concentrated close to the transit station, and where feasible, above the transit station. Subject to site-specific considerations, this transit-oriented development area may be generally defined as **within** a ~~[Option 1: "¼ mile"] [Option 2: "~~ ½ mile ~~"]~~ radius from the station **platform** ~~[Option 3:"~~, or **generally** within a **1**5- to ~~1~~**-20**- minute walk from the station~~"]~~. To protect existing neighborhoods in the general vicinity of **the station that are** ~~transit but~~ not planned for transit-oriented development, station-specific areas planned for transit-oriented development should be clearly delineated in Area Plans. Station-specific delineations should allow for the consideration of **pedestrian** barriers such as **major** roads, **difficult** topography, or existing development that would reduce the frequency of pedestrian usage of transit**,** and therefore reduce the expected walking distance to a station within which higher intensity development may be appropriate. Higher **development** intensities within the ~~[Option 1: "¼ mile radius"] [Option 2: "~~ ½ mile radius~~"] [Option 3:"~~**or 1**5- to ~~1~~**-20**- minute walk from the station~~"]~~ may be appropriate if barriers are overcome and demonstrable opportunities exist to provide pedestrians **with** a safe, comfortable and interesting walk to transit. Density and land use intensity should generally decrease as distance from the station increases. Please refer to the relevant Area Plan for specific boundaries delineated for Transit Station Areas (TSA) as well as for Transit Development Areas within TSAs, which may reflect a smaller or larger area for high intensity development around a station based on site-specific conditions.
- I think one key barrier to the success of TOD that has not been fully discussed is how to achieve the critical mass or parcel consolidation necessary to meet the goals of TOD. Only parcels of sufficient area will be able to accommodate the urban design principles discussed in the TOD Committee, such as pedestrian-friendly streetscapes, mix of uses, tapering of density to meet adjacent development density and intensity, and the integration of usable urban open spaces. Many of these goals cannot be met, or only partially met on smaller sites, whereas larger parcels will have the flexibility to accommodate these varied design principles. Therefore, I urge the TOD Committee to consider adopting the proposed language in order to incentivize the creation of sites of sufficient size so as to accommodate TOD principles and support the creation of true transit communities. Please find the suggested revisions: "The highest density/land use intensity should be focused and concentrated close to the rail station, and where feasible, above the rail station. Subject to site-specific considerations, this transit-oriented development area may be generally defined as **a 5-minute walk** or ¼ mile radius from the station platform, with density and intensity tapering to a **10-minute walk** or 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 increase or reduce the frequency of pedestrian usage of transit and therefore increase or reduce the expected walking distance to a station within which higher intensity development may be appropriate. Higher intensities may be appropriate for any property within **[deleted "delineated area"] this transit-oriented development area** if [**deleted "barriers are overcome" since barriers are no longer referenced]** demonstrable opportunities exist to provide **pedestrian-friendly streetscapes** and pedestrians a safe, comfortable and interesting walk to transit. Density and

land use intensity should generally decrease as **walking** distance from the station increases. **However, for sites 10 acres or greater which fall within a 1/2** mile radius from the station platform**, site massing will be site-specific and higher density may be permitted over the entire site provided that massing more than ¼ mile radius from the station platform must taper to meet adjacent development density and intensity, except where bounded by highways. . . .**"

2. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

- Connectivity-pedestrians and bicyclists
- Walkability and pedestrian access
- Access to retail/entertainment without needing a car
- Build pedestrian, bicycle, handicapped, internal circulation system
- 6. Walkability and Bicycle Access--include other modes
- Access and connectivity-pedestrian, bicycle, Fairfax Connector
- Provide bicycle racks/lockers in close proximity to transit stations (provide for at least 1000 bike commuters)
- Provide public shower and changing facilities for bikers and runners
- Include "on-road bicycle lanes" and "on-road bicycle routes" in the list
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Friendly-may need to lobby for more flexibility by VDOT so that doesn't always emphasize maximum car flow
- Walkability-full mix of uses, stores, office, parks, design of road grids to promote reduced auto usage and greater foot traffic
- 2. Walkability and Bicycle Access--Walksheds up to 1 mile and bicyclesheds up to 3 miles; guidelines should focus on creating a quality urban environment that fosters more walk and bicycle trips-along with addressing barriers and incomplete facilities.
- Street design-including street cross-sections and intersection geometry are critical determinants of pedestrian and bicycle environment and access. Suggestion to place 'street design'-regarding carriage way/travel lane width, on-street parking, intersection dimensions-in this section rather than design.
- Guidelines should incorporate the proposed practices from the Institute for Transportation Engineers draft manual ("Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities") Street design elements such as narrowed street widths/travel lanes, on-street parking, reduced crossing distances are key elements to improving pedestrian safety and convenience. Street dimensions are the main determinants of vehicle speeds and safety. Narrower streets and slower speeds are safer. In TOD areas where high pedestrian activity is encouraged, streets should be designed for 20 and 30 mph vehicle speeds. On-street bicycling facilities are also important features that should be identified in the guidelines.
- Add covered walkways and pedestrian aids, moving sidewalks, escalators
- We should be thinking of a broader objective to promote use of bicycle other than travel to and from the station area.
- I'm unclear about the meaning of the last sentence, and I fear it could be used to justify an expanded TDA. I believe the intent is better served by the following: Bicyclists typically travel longer distances than pedestrians. To maximize ridership, and to better integrate surrounding communities to the TOD community, usable trails and other systems should be encouraged beyond the TDA.
- Techniques to encourage safe pedestrian and bicycle travel to and from the station area should be encouraged. This may include an integrated pedestrian and/or bicycle system plan, on-road bicycle lanes, walkways, trails and sidewalks, amenities such as street trees, benches, bus shelters, adequate lighting, covered walkways, pedestrian aids such as moving sidewalks and escalators, covered and secure bicycle storage facilities close to the station, shower and changing facilities, a pedestrian-friendly street network, and appropriate sidewalk width. <u>Bicyclists typically travel longer distances than pedestrians. To maximize ridership, and to better integrate surrounding communities to the TOD community, usable trails and other systems should be encouraged beyond the TDA.</u>

- What is meant by the last sentence: Consideration should be given to the increased distance that bicyclists will travel to transit when compared to pedestrian? Does distance that bicyclists will travel influence density and use or expand the density circles?
- Change: "This may include an integrated pedestrian and/or bicycle system plan . . ." to "This includes an integrated pedestrian and bicycle system plan with such possible features as on-road bicycle lanes . . ." There should be no doubt that there will be a plan for pedestrians and bicyclists. . .we should not be choosing between walkers and bikers - we should plan for both. Your wording is too tentative. Also, the current sentence is written so that everything that follows "plan" in the series is separate from the plan, when they are actually what the plan would be about. I would also like to make sure that the plan includes adding bike racks to the local buses. I am not sure when to do this, but it probably comes later, when the planning begins.
- Walkability and Bicycle Access: Does the county want to make the TOD near rail stations to also be bicycle-friendly. If so, I suggest the term "pedestrian-friendly" in the Objective be changed to "pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly" or "pedestrian/bicycle-friendly".
- Techniques to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel to and from the station area ***and from stops for other modes of at-grade transit*** are encouraged.
- Bicyclists typically travel longer distances than pedestrians. **There is not an argument with this statement. Would suggest, however, the following: To reach a transit station, cyclists often travel greater distances than do pedestrians. To encourage the use of bicycles and to encourage the integration of the TOD community with adjacent communities, there should be path and trail system connectivity with the TOD community and adjacent communities.**
- insert the following sentence after the second sentence: "Conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists should be minimized. This may be achieved through the appropriate location of parking facilities including kiss-and-ride facilities, and the appropriate location and design of access roads to the rail station."
- Last sentence: Should include **bike lanes** in addition to trails.

3. Station-specific flexibility

- Station-specific flexibility-closer to end-of-the-line stations should have lower residential densities
- 7. Station-specific flexibility-Critical to successful implementation and esp. important in Tysons (include modes beyond Metro)
- a) Station specific flexibility: Each TSA needs to be defined individually to address topography, geography, character and existing use. Only consider extending TSA beyond 1/2 mile with community benefits and support established during TSA planning process
- Geographical factors and longstanding agreements with community can justify drawing a smaller TSA
- Once TSA is approved, no additional spot rezonings should be considered to extend those boundaries
- 3. Station-specific flexibility-depending on engineering and architectural aspects of building designs, developer may wish to build structures allowing for easy access to and from the station on to their adjoining property-this should be facilitated without any impact on FAR
- 3. Station-specific flexibility. "It is important to be flexible when determining "Transit Proximity" in order to allow for the unique character of different metro station areas in the County and in consideration of barriers (such as roads or existing development) and topography that may shorten or lengthen the walking distance to a metro transit station within which higher intensity may be appropriate. Station-specific flexibility is provided as noted in the land use text for specific properties."
- Allowing for some flexibility to any geographic formula due to site-specific characteristics
- What is the definition of station area?
- Station-specific flexibility. Is this language so broad that it undermines the general guidelines in previous passages? Can future developers and planners say, "We understand those general guidelines, but this case really is unique, and increased density should be approved ¾ to 1 mile from the station"? If they can, then again this passage needs to be reworked. It cuts to the heart of what destabilizes neighborhoods.

- ~~transit-oriented development principles, such as the appropriate mix of land uses and~~ the appropriate development intensity and mix of uses, and the mix of uses nearby. Care should be taken not to destabilize existing neighborhoods.
- 3. **Station-specific flexibility.** Each of Fairfax County's planned and existing Metrorail stations has a unique character in terms of surrounding land uses and roadways, environmental and topographical characteristics, and location within the Metrorail system. These guidelines should provide for the flexibility to examine the unique characteristics of a particular station area in relation to ~~transit-oriented development principles, such as the appropriate mix of land uses and~~ the appropriate development intensity and mix of uses, and the mix of uses at areas and stations nearby.
- Each of Fairfax County's planned and existing Metrorail stations has a unique character in terms of surrounding land uses and roadways, environmental and topographical characteristics, and location within the Metrorail system. Where there are compelling community benefits for doing so, these guidelines should provide for the flexibility to examine the unique characteristics of a particular station area in relation to transit-oriented development principles, such as the appropriate mix of land uses and the appropriate development intensity. The guidelines set out in "Transit Proximity" should be modified as little as possible, to achieve the perceived community benefit, and in general should be adhered to.
- Why should flexibility be a guideline?
- Given that the entire intent of TOD is to get people out of their cars, the current transit usage characteristics of a site should be taken into account. Therefore, I propose that in Guideline #2 of the Nov. 1, 2006 draft, 7th line, should read as follows "... in relation to transit-oriented development principles, such as the appropriate mix of land uses, the existing transit usage characteristics of a site, the appropriate development intensity ...." Or wherever it would be appropriate to acknowledge the existing transit usage should be a factor in determining whether a strict application of the 1/4 radius should prevail.
- This is critical to the successful implementation of the TOD principles and is especially important to Tysons, Fairfax County's identified Urban Center, where modes beyond just Metro should also contribute to transit-friendly development and greater density.
- "… should provide for the flexibility to examine the unique characteristics **and needs** of a particular station area…
- 3rd line: substitute guidelines for principles in order to be consistent
- Why are the examples of stable residential neighborhoods, revitalization area, urban center referred to?

4. Mix of land uses

- Mix of land uses-define mixed-use development
- Primary use should be office, residential, retail and recreational uses within walking distance of project
- 8. Mix of land uses-24 hour is optimistic: suggested 'morning to night, not just rush hour'; Broad definition of sustainability included here
- Create mixed use development to attract and retain activity for at least 18 hours per day
- Mix of uses-office, retail, services, governmental, residential
- b) Mix of uses-All uses may not be appropriate at every TOD, in general the uses should reduce the need for auto use. Mix of housing, commercial, retail including grocery stores and other convenience shopping, park and recreation use. The mix should balance transit ridership to/from the development and create a '24 hour' community
- Mixed land uses to create ridership and street life during all hours of the day is critical to making TOD successful.
- Emphasize need for balanced TOD development in outlying stations, should not emphasize park and ride lot stations
- Mix of Land Uses-add a balance of flow in both directions as an objective of good balance of uses

- Add a balance of uses as a prime objective, with clear definitions; ideally there should be a balance of jobs and resident labor force in the combined area of the TOD and the immediately surrounding area; that is a prime way to reduce traffic in the peak period as well as in the off-peak
- Mix of land uses is covered in Objective 2, Policies a and c, and Objective 6, Policy b of the Land Use Policy Plan (see proposed Policy Plan amendment under "Other").
- There should be consistent standards for TOD development, not standards that are so flexible and unique that any proposed development could fall under the TOD umbrella.
- Add: "and the needs of the communities and TSAs nearby. Thus, not all uses may be appropriate at all TSAs."
- The appropriate mix of uses should be determined by examining the unique characteristics of each <u>transit</u> station area <u>and the needs of the communities and TSAs nearby.</u>
- Transit-oriented development should include a mix of uses to ensure the efficient use of transit, to promote increased ridership during peak and off-peak travel periods in both directions, encourage different types of activity throughout the day, <u>and reduce the need for workers and residents to drive automobiles elsewhere to meet basic needs</u>. A balanced mix of residential, office, retail, service, governmental, institutional and recreational uses should be provided to encourage a critical mass of pedestrian activity as people live, work and play in these areas. <u>Where TOD communities are big enough to require new playing fields, sufficient space for organized recreational activity should be included in the TOD project or within walking distance</u>. The appropriate mix of uses should be determined by examining the unique characteristics of each station area.
- How will the balance be determined?
- Who will determine the mix of uses?
- In determining the mix of uses, will other uses outside the TOD be factored into the equation for determining the balance of uses?
- The current language includes, " The appropriate mix of uses should be determined in Area Plans by examining the unique characteristics of each station area." This glosses over the concept of Transit Node Specialization that highlights the importance of examining transit lines comprehensively, instead of in a piecemeal fashion. SUGGESTED LANGUAGE: After "station area," add: "and the interplay of uses and impacts among stations along similar transit lines."
- "The appropriate mix of uses should be determined in Area Plans by examining the unique characteristics **and needs** of each station area. . . ."
- Add: "by examining the unique characteristics of each station area **and the interplay of uses and impacts among station along similar transit lines**."
- Mix of Uses: use "strongly" discouraged.
- Include "entertainment" in list of uses.

<u>5. Housing affordability</u>

- 9. Housing affordability: suggested text (appeal to wide variety of individuals and families)
- Include as much affordable (workforce) housing as possible
- High concern for public (along with traffic and public facility impact)
- c) Affordability-Component of affordable and workforce housing, senior housing, and guarantees or other techniques to enable 'mom and pop' shops to compete with chain retailers
- Affordable Housing-should be a significant component
- 5. Housing affordability-definition of 'affordability' can change with time, location, and economic conditions. Best to allow the market to determine prices. With significant density increases there will be a corresponding reduction in land/unit costs as well as more units on the market which should help bring prices within affordable reach of the workforce
- 5. Housing affordability-Creating housing for a full range of income levels should be the goal of this guideline, including low, moderate and middle income housing. For workforce (moderate and middle income) housing (HH earning 60-120% AMI), County should rely on bonus densities, parking reductions and more modestly-sized units and other non-monetary cost-reducing techniques as key ways to increase affordability. For HH earning below 60% AMI, assistance through partnerships with non-profit housing developers and public financial support is needed to

reach these lower income households. Scarce public financial resources should be conserved to serve HH below 60% AMI.

- Encouraging more modestly-sized units is a good way to provide more housing opportunities, and more affordable housing opportunities near transit. The current market is building larger and larger units while HH size continues to decrease. Convenience of compact, walkable communities near transit can offer benefits to compensate for more modest sized homes and less parking. Reduced parking requirements for below market, affordable and senior housing is also important to give residents the full cost-saving benefits of mixed-use and transit-oriented communities. Separating the cost of the parking from the unit is the most effective and fairest way to ensure that residents only pay for as much parking as they need (reference included).
- 5. Housing Affordability: After the word "costs" add "comparable to the percentage of Fairfax County household income brackets." The present text doesn't define "mix" and will lead to abuse.
- Housing affordability-add 'low and moderate income' in the definition and reference generally accepted definitions of these terms as well as workforce housing
- Land Use Policy Plan references diverse housing stock in Objective 4, Policy a (see proposed Policy Plan amendment under "Other").
- I DO NOT believe that the County should dictate what type of people (according to income) move into new developments, rather leave this to the supply and demand forces of a free market economy. In general less government intervention is best. I ask that you strike this item from the guidelines.
- Add: "Preservation of existing affordable neighborhoods within the TSA is also desirable."
- Does this mean there will be a mixture of townhouses, mid-rise and high-rise dwelling units within the designated TOD area?
- In Tysons Corner, where the land value is high, the housing types begin at cost levels that are way beyond young single professionals and mid income ranges.
- **Housing affordability:** Residential uses should also incorporate a mix of ***urban*** housing types and sizes where possible.
- Include: "…housing for seniors <u>and others with special needs</u>"

<u>6. Design/Street Design</u>

- 10. Design-add 'open space preservation'
- Street Design-suggested text (street design encouraged to support additional modes…)
- WMATA design standards
- Design-exceed standards of architecture elsewhere in Washington region
- Well-landscaped public spaces that encourage pedestrian use and assembly, including water features and green spaces as prominent elements of an urban community
- Memorable, well-designed public spaces and buildings that will attract substantial community use
- Consider vertical mixing of uses within structures
- 4. Village Concept: Design should be based on village concept and include balance of housing, retail, commercial, park, recreation and open space. Project should be people-oriented.
- Design-Techniques to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel/integrated pedestrian system plan, trails and sidewalks, bicycle storage facilities, a mix of uses that encourage walking and biking, pedestrian friendly street network and appropriate sidewalk width
- Workable Street Systems-grid systems that allow traffic flow and are pedestrian-friendly and allow people to move freely to destination on foot
- 6. Design-Attention should be given to keep the overall theme "urban"; side streets in a grid system should be narrow and pedestrian friendly; streets should be truncated to allow for cars to drop off riders without holding up traffic
- 6. Design--street-oriented building forms, short blocks and street grids are essential elements. Concepts of Form Based Coding can be presented here.
- Form-based zoning--allows citizens to participate directly in shaping how communities should look; zone by form rather than use. Current planning and zoning process is highly technical, and citizens and other stakeholders tend to get bogged down in arcane details; form-based zoning enables all stakeholders to actually see what they are discussing, in the form of detailed visual

renderings put together in design charrettes. The county commissioned a study of form-based codes last year, and results of that study should be integrated into the committee's deliberations.

- These guidelines, even after being further refined, represent only the first step in implementing good TOD. Good design requires specific rules and standards. While flexibility is important, developers must be held to clear, measurable standards and these must be vigorously enforced.
- Design-use more general term of 'traffic calming' and add 'on-street parking' as an example
- Design includes more than street grids. Therefore, this section needs to be further developed.
- I am concerned about the current policy of placing "commuter garages" immediately adjacent to transit stations. During my experience with the recent development plans for the Vienna, Huntington, and Dunn Loring Stations it has always been a problem as to how to handle the increased traffic from these garages and still provide safe and convenient access to the station for pedestrians, as well as buses serving the station. The location of parking garages near the station also presents a real obstacle for the creation of a vibrant and stimulating walking environment for pedestrians that should be encouraged to walk to the station. As such, I would suggest that the following language be added (perhaps under guideline #6, Design - "Street Design", or other appropriate section): **"To facilitate bike and pedestrian access, high volumes of traffic should be discouraged near the station by locating commuter garages at the periphery of the TOD boundaries, rather than immediately adjacent to the station."**
- Street design should be encouraged to support additional modes of transit, to serve greater density and increase transit ridership.
- Street design should incorporate elements such as lighting, appropriate street width, sidewalk width and intersection dimensions to allow for safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle and multi-modal vehicular use, and should be designed to provide universal access to people with a range of abilities and disabilities. The design of streets should also encourage lower traffic speeds and superior pedestrian circulation**,** ~~through provision of on-street parking~~ and the use of street trees.
- We agree with adding language, but would not say "periphery," but instead would say, **not directly adjacent to the station.**

7. Parking

- Parking-more parking at end-of-the line stations
- Ordinance changes to encourage maximum usage of shared use parking, recognizing that TOD requires less parking
- Contracting with adjacent property owners who have surplus parking
- Parking and commuter drop off facilities should be distributed on both sides of transit stations
- Encourage parking below grade
- 6. Parking-Ultimate goal is to reduce auto dependency--restricted parking and pricing mechanisms should be incorporated to increase the cost of owning and parking more than one car
- 7. Parking-to the extent developers wish to provide their own tenants with space beyond code they should be permitted to do so as long as it is sub-surface and meets safety requirements. Any maximum set should be fair so as not to disadvantage the properties
- 7. Parking--Reduce and share parking, effective management programs, support transit use and increase walk, bike and bus trips. Pricing and management techniques include: selling parking separately from housing and commercial spaces, using market pricing to match supply with demand, residential parking permit programs that graduate prices, sell excess daytime curbspace to other users and use revenue for local streetscape improvements; allowing parking reductions with qualified TDM measures such as transit passes, bicycle parking/showers for workers, carsharing services, parking cashout, etc.
- New parking standards that encourage less space given over to parking and less automobile usage are also needed.
- separate parking structures from stations by a few minutes walking distance
- allow for maximum mixed-use TOD-type development within 5 minute walking distance of the station
- less costly development of parking when located within 5 min walk
- increased walk-in use of retail and services between parking and station

- Guidelines should suggest that parking structures for transit riders be located at periphery of the 1/4 mile (or walking distance); this would maximize the mixed use within the TOD, provide more appealing pedestrian route, reduce pedestrian/automobile conflicts in the vicinity of the station, reduce the size of roadways nearest the station, and reduce automobile/bus conflicts
- Vienna has heavy traffic right at the entrance to the station-this should be avoided (wide roadways immediately adjacent to the station, unappealing approach, limited opportunities for mixed uses adjacent to the station)
- The only criteria that has had success in reducing the SOV is pay for parking.
- Parking. It says the county should encourage the use of maximum parking requirements. I don't understand what that means. Is a maximum parking requirement 4 spaces per unit versus 3? Or does it mean stricter parking requirements that reduce the units per household? My preference would be the latter, as literature says fewer parking spaces correlates with fewer cars.
- Address parking needs at metro stops where surrounding topography within !/2 to 3/4 miles is a deterrent to use of the metro system.
- I don't have a specific recommendation for this, but I would like an answer as to why the county doesn't have the authority to enforce this kind of provision. This should be written to maximize county leverage.
- Need to state that TOD is to provide a walkable community. TOD development offers "location efficiency" enabling residents to get by with few cars than they might otherwise own. Therefore, there should be a guiding principle about reducing the parking requirement.
- Parking. Incentivize use of structured and below grade parking. Wherever possible, structured parking should not be permitted to front onto a vibrant pedestrian friendly street, as it contributes to a decrease in the activity of the street life.
- Why "maximum" parking requirements?
- What is meant by "neighborhood parking programs"?
- Provide "urban design elements" where and why?
- what about the adverse visual impact of on-street parked cars and other vehicles?

8. Transportation and Traffic

- Transportation and Traffic-improvements to roads, transit facilities, schools and parks
- Address traffic patterns and impact on surrounding routes
- Transportation impact study needed (as done in Vienna)
- 5. Transportation and Traffic-encourage land uses that are more likely to create transit users. Transit service, capacity and transit alternatives must be coordinated with the proposed development. Shuttle services, TDM, traffic calming measures
- 8. Transportation and Traffic--Create Transportation Management Associations for major station areas to ensure development within TOD areas adopt and implement effective TDM programs. TDM standards for discretionary approvals should be established so that developers and residents will know what to expect.
- Need recognition that decently planned TOD will reduce area wide traffic and that well-done TOD will reduce local traffic
- Transportation and Traffic-change term at end of paragraph ('should be evaluated') to something like 'should be an essential part of TOD planning'
- Transportation and land use link is addressed in Objective 6, Policy a of Land use Policy Plan (see proposed Policy Plan amendment under "Other").
- A requirement should be to complete a traffic impact on nearby roads. All improvements should be costed out....bus, shuttles, road improvements, etc.
- Add: programs should be "funded and" implemented
- Also, transportation demand management (TDM) must be funded from the onset, since future homeowners and business will want to spend as little as possible on TDMs. The TDM penalties imposed on builders can be circumvented by them just by scheduling traffic counts during inclement weather such as an intense cold spell, or during rain or snow storms. The traffic counts would be lower at those times, letting the developers off the hook. That's why TDM funds are much more important than TDM penalties.

- Transportation Demand Management programs should be funded and implemented…
- Impacts on transit service and capacity as well as on traffic should be evaluated in a transit-oriented development, and improvements evaluated where needed. Choice in transportation modes should be offered (such as feeder bus routes, shuttles, bicycle usage, carpooling) to provide convenient and reliable alternatives to driving to a station area. Anticipated mode-split should be part of the evaluation of transit-oriented development. Transportation Demand Management programs are a crucial component of TOD. Programs should be funded and implemented to very significantly reduce automobile usage throughout the morning and afternoon rush hour. In addition, some significant reduction in automobile usage should be attained during evening and weekend hours, by creating communities where families can viably choose to live with one or no cars. Traffic-calming measures and design techniques to discourage cut-through traffic and to allow for appropriate drop-off points should be incorporated into development designs.
- TOD development around transit stations can produce "congestion conundrum" or spot congestion. While TOD is to encourage transit use for employment and other daily life activities, unfortunately, this is not always the case. Therefore, adjacent neighborhoods, side streets, and major arterials are further degraded by the increase in vehicle trips resulting from the increase density and land use. With this said, the first statement is very important that impacts on transit service and traffic should be evaluated. Therefore, in the presence of modern technologies, there should be modeling of generated traffic and flow.
- Cumulative impacts should be explicitly mentioned, especially with regard to potential multiple TOD sites and again in context of Transit Node Specialization. SUGGESTED LANGUAGE: Re-word the first sentence to begin, "Cumulative impacts on transit capacity (for individual stations as well as transit lines overall) and traffic...
- Isn't one purpose of a grid of streets to encourage use of alternative routes to destinations? Perhaps the above should read: "Traffic-calming measures and design techniques to discourage REGIONAL MOTORIZED cut-through traffic, AND TO ENCOURAGE NON-MOTORIZED TRAFFIC. Design techniques that allow for appropriate drop-off points should be incorporated into development designs.
- Change “cut-through traffic” to “through traffic”.
- TDM Programs should be “funded . . .”
- Consider impacts on “roads, traffic” in addition to those already listed.
- Add "Cumulative" to impacts.
- Transportation impact studies should be a requirement for all TOD application. Transportation impact studies should include visual modeling.
- Change the last sentence to read: “Traffic calming measures, design techniques, and road alignment to discourage cut-through traffic…..”
- Does “Impacts” refer to new development?
- Edit: A variety of choices of transportation modes should be offered…”
- Edit: “Anticipated mode-split should be part of the evaluation of any transit-oriented development.”

9. Efficient use of Transit

- 13. Efficient use of transit: Combine with guideline 8 (Mix of Land uses-encourage principles such as multi-purpose, single-trips (to work, shop, daycare, etc.)
- 8. Non-Metro Transit: Feeder systems to get communities to Metro; Bike and pedestrian trails to Metro
- 9. Efficient use of transit-a good mix of retail at street level with perhaps the County participating in providing some support such as skating rink, open air concerts, etc.
- 9. Efficient use of transit--Compact development at certain thresholds of units per acre or jobs per acre are standard factors for measuring the efficiency of providing transit services. Minimum densities and parking maximums might be considered as tools to ensure that transit and other public investments are not wasted.

- It occurs to me that in most any planning documents around metro stations in VA and MD, I have never seen any reference to density ceilings around metros in accordance with maximum capacity capability of the Metro. I read that metro will surpass its maximum capacity by 2012. Already the capacity problems are terrible on the orange line. It seems developers see a golden opportunity to build Ballston style developments around metros, without any apparent regard to the metro capacity. Planning should consider that development may strangle the metro system with additional riders if there is no coordination (or new lines added).

10. Vision for the community

- Protect existing neighborhoods
- Sustainable communities (rename Vision for community and move to #1)
- 2. "Community-First" Visioning and Planning: TOD contingent on community willingness to accept greater densities in exchange for perceived community benefits
- Special study group open to all citizens should be convened before specific development proposals are considered
- Broadly inclusive planning and community visioning process, including the use of charrettes and other tools, prior to debate by PC and BOS
- Visualization-community planning process--visual aids to see how different proposals look, internally and in relation to surrounding communities
- Community Benefit is an Essential-alleviate densities elsewhere, reduce auto congestion, 'otherwise just digging a deeper and deeper hole for ourselves'
- Broader Vision-positive tradeoffs, such as increased protection for green belts, single-family neighborhoods, not just more development at TOD site and everywhere else
- 10. Vision for community-Safety and ease of mobility will enhance the street life of the area. The County will need to do its part by providing for police and fire stations nearby.
- 10. Vision for the community--Process for arriving at a community vision is crucial, as are the tools for ensuring it is implemented. Form-based coding offers one of the most effective approaches to capturing a community vision and translating it into implementation guidance. Charrettes and other small area planning process techniques should be highlighted as the approaches the County needs to take to form a shared community vision for creating great places.
- According to the Tysons Corner outreach reports from the community visioning, the community says no increase in density. How much influence does the community yield when there is an appointed task force with a different vision?
- Vision for the community. What is a community-focused vision? Is that a vision the community helps generate? Or is that a vision that planners and developers generate among themselves, while thoughtfully keeping what they believe to the community's interests in mind? Need to involve the community as early as possible in evaluating how a station area should be redeveloped, following the model of Arlington and others. I understand that's a culture change for Fairfax, but unless I'm misreading it, I don't see anything in this policy that changes the status quo concerning community involvement in TOD land use cases. Again, a number of us with very different views of MetroWest strongly agree on "community-first" planning as a matter of principle.
- Add: The surrounding communities (residents and businesses) should be invited to be a part of the planning process.
- **Vision for the community.** The planning for transit-oriented development areas should be community focused, and should provide a vision for the future that addresses desired uses, activities, design, and the character of the community. Benefits and impacts to the surrounding community as well as the immediate area should be evaluated as part of this process. <u>To insure the achievement of this goal, the broader community should be actively involved at all stages of a TOD replanning, beginning with the definition of the TSA, the visioning for what mix of development is desired for each TSA, and finally the visioning of projects proposed within each TSA.</u>
- This section needs to emphasize the policy is to involved an extensive community participation process, similar to the approach Arlington County used for planning the development around transit stations in the corridor. Recently, there has been extensive criticism of the Tysons Corner

Task Force and the Vienna MetroWest Task Force approach where the members of the task force were appointed by the supervisors.

- Delete the entire "Vision for the Community" paragraph. The TOD Committee, the Tysons Land Use Task Force and any rezoning in Fairfax County are already inclusive, collaborative, community processes. What is being required that isn't already being done? Are you trying to say that a TOD area should have to go through a more detailed process then the one that already exists? Please define "broadly inclusive", and "community process". If this paragraph is not deleted it needs to be either more general or more detailed.
- Support pending re-write of Vision for the Community section.
- We support good stakeholder involvement and its inclusion in the Guidelines. I defer to the committee on the specific language, but I do strongly encourage inclusion in this item of the specific tools that were included in the draft BOS policy: **GIS, 3-D visualization, charettes, workshops and visual aids such as small-scale models.**

11. Regional framework

- Infrastructure improvements should be regional
- List as #2 Principle
- 2. Regional framework (Arlington R-B corridor benefits)
- Use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDR's) should be encouraged to relocate zoned density if it results in zoning that agrees with Comprehensive Plan recommendations.
- Reword: . . . ~~existing and planned~~ transit station areas. Maximizing development around transit station areas can be a benefit regionally by accommodating and making transit accessible to some of the region's ~~projected~~ employment and residential growth~~, as well as making jobs accessible by transit~~.
- 10. **Regional framework**. Transit-oriented development can provide more efficient regional land use patterns by concentrating growth around ~~existing and planned~~ transit station areas. Maximizing development around transit station areas can be a benefit regionally by accommodating and making transit accessible to some of the region's ~~projected~~ employment and residential growth~~, as well as making jobs accessible by transit~~.
- 10-12. Comment. These do not seem prescriptive. They seem like a compendium of perceived benefits of TOD. Is there a benefit to spelling all this out? It seems more appropriate, in scaled down version, as part of the introduction. Also, in what way in Fairfax County does TOD preserve green space, as suggested in No. 11?
- The current language is overly vague. This section could be re-worked to incorporate and borrow heavily from the Brookings Institutions' Transit Node Specialization concept. The following is a slight adaptation from Brookings, but is close enough that a citation may be in order - "Transit Oriented Development: Moving From Rhetoric to Reality," (Belzer & Aulter, 2002 - http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/belzertod.pdf, page 32). "Wherever possible, TOD should be planned for at the system-wide scale, instead of assessing each proposal or area individually. Plans should assess opportunities not only at each station site, but should also include a regional approach and consider the interplay between land uses around each station and the way they can affect system-wide ridership, the capacity of other stations along affected transit lines, and other resulting impacts such as traffic, etc.. Although each individual station must balance node and place functions to some extent, the value of the system as a whole can be enhanced if there is some degree of specialization, which can enhance the goals of TOD. Thus, many station areas may be fairly specialized, yet still with the result that the line as a whole will provide a reasonable mix of jobs, housing, retail, and commuter parking. Even when specialization is not carried out to a great extent, any TOD project will be made more effective if it is planned with other station areas in mind."
- Edit: ". . .~~Maximizing~~ Optimizing development around transit can be a benefit regionally by accommodating some of the region's projected employment and residential growth, as well as making more jobs accessible by transit.

12. Environmental benefits

- Environmental benefits of TOD
- Environmental benefits-'open space' should not be used b/c it can include rooftop plazas and indoor and outdoor pools--'green space' is a preferred term
- List as #3 Principle
- 3. Environmental benefits (Arlington R-B car ownership info/air quality)
- Preservation of open space: R-B corridor
- Add caveat to reduction of land consumption: "provided the overall growth rate is not accelerated by the rezoning process"
- The environmental benefits of compact, mixed use development focused around transit stations can include improved air quality, water quality, and the preservation of green space and environmental areas through the reduction of land consumption for development provided the overall growth rate is not accelerated by the rezoning process….
- 10-12. Comment. These do not seem prescriptive. They seem like a compendium of perceived benefits of TOD. Is there a benefit to spelling all this out? It seems more appropriate, in scaled down version, as part of the introduction. Also, in what way in Fairfax County does TOD preserve green space, as suggested in No. 11?
- Edit: "The environmental benefits of compact, mixed use development focused around transit stations can include improved regional air quality, water quality. . ."
- Benefits are not necessarily in the neighborhood of the transit station
- Edit " . . .and the preservation of green space and environmental areas through the reduction of land consumption for development in the region. The utilization of land near transit and existing infrastructure allows the County and public utility providers to accommodate increasing growth pressures in a smaller area served by infrastructure. Improvements in air quality due to reduced vehicle miles traveled and reduced automobile emissions can also be viewed as a regional benefit of TOD . . . ."
- "Environmental impacts" - what "impacts"?
- "sites undergoing redevelopment should demonstrate improved post-development environmental performance." - Is this really possible considering extensive new development? Are we not, instead, wanting to minimize any potential on-site negative impacts, while possibly improving the overall, regional environment?

13. Economic benefits

- List as #4 Principle
- 4. Economic benefits: R-B corridor data
- 13. Economic benefits-existing small businesses within Tysons West metro area; without appropriately zoned alternative locations, they will resist efforts for urban street grid and redevelopment; County needs to be proactive in identifying these businesses and working with them to relocate nearby or if possible within new developments.
- 10-12. Comment. These do not seem prescriptive. They seem like a compendium of perceived benefits of TOD. Is there a benefit to spelling all this out? It seems more appropriate, in scaled down version, as part of the introduction. Also, in what way in Fairfax County does TOD preserve green space, as suggested in No. 11?

14. Open Space

- Outdoor recreational space is often overlooked
- Publicly accessible, usable open space
- Active recreation
- Social gathering space/civic focal points
- Urban parks
- Trails
- Recreation should be within 1 mile of station
- Community recreation, open space, assembly and cultural activity spaces
- Open Space-add 'where appropriate' to the end of the paragraph; open space preservation of any significant land area should ideally be just beyond the boundaries of the TOD, and within the

TOD should be kept in a balanced scale just like the other uses.; wording should recognize that if some open space has already been preserved through officially binding actions it must, except under special circumstances, remain preserved, as distinct from being newly converted to officially preserved open space

- Concern about appropriateness of active recreation within TOD with limited space available (perhaps locate soccer fields, etc 1/4 mile away?)
- **Open Space.** Urban parks and open space contribute to a development's sense of place and are integral amenities offered to residents, workers, and shoppers. Transit oriented development should include ~~efforts to create enhanced opportunities for~~ publicly-accessible, high-quality, usable open space~~, such as~~ that provides opportunities for active and passive recreation, as well as improved connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians~~, trails, public gathering spaces, civic focal points, and urban parks and plazas~~. Open space within new developments should include trails, public gathering spaces, civic focal points, plazas and/or open green space and offer a variety of activities including dining, casual games and recreation, performances, visual arts and special events. These spaces should be accessible to the larger community as well as the immediate transit-oriented development area. Efforts should also incorporate open space preservation where appropriate.
- Open Space. This raises a number of significant issues that broke down at MetroWest. A lot of the open space was quirky, such as on fifth-floor terraces. Is there anything in this policy that truly inhibits others from following that same practice? Much of the green space was tucked into little courtyards, that while technically accessible, were not designed as true open spaces. Finally, the guy who spoke about walkability made clear that a key need is to make services, including rec space, within walking distance. He therefore strongly suggested having active recreation, such as a playing field, within walking distance. Likewise, including true wooded, green park areas should be an achievable goal in the fringe areas of a TOD development. Is there a way of being more forceful about achieving ground level green space as one of the key mixed uses?
- Change open space conservation to "green" space conservation
- Efforts should also incorporate green ~~open~~ space preservation where appropriate.
- How does the clause about space being available to the larger community square with fifth-floor terraces that are open only to building residents?
- **Open space.** Transit-oriented development should include efforts to create enhanced opportunities for publicly-accessible, quality, usable open space, such as active and passive recreation, improved connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians, trails, public gathering spaces, civic focal points, and urban parks and plazas. Where TOD communities are big enough to require new playing fields, sufficient space for organized recreational activity should be included in the TOD project or within walking distance. Open space within new developments should be accessible to the larger community as well as the immediate transit-oriented development area. Efforts should also incorporate green space preservation where appropriate.
- Open space: change to "green" space in description.
- The overall mix should represent a net increase to the County's tax base rather than a liability

15. Infrastructure/Public Utilities

- Add "roads, transit" to list of impacts.
- Opportunities to offset impacts of development in a TOD on public facilities should also be identified and implemented (see Appendix 9 – Residential Development Criteria), such as impacts on roads, transit, schools, parks, libraries, police, fire and rescue, stormwater management and other publicly owned community facilities.
- This misses community concerns on infrastructure. Suggest a somewhat different approach.
- Although TOD improves usage of Metrorail, establishing high-density communities puts significant strains on many elements of the county's infrastructure. Plans for any TOD should closely evaluate what infrastructure adjustments are needed, and funding and strategies for such changes should be identified as part of any TOD proposal. In addition, new development in transit-oriented development areas should look for opportunities to include public facility improvements and services within the transit-oriented development area. Opportunities to offset

impacts of development in a TOD on public facilities should also be identified and implemented (see Appendix 9 – Residential Development Criteria), such as impacts on schools, parks, libraries, police, fire and rescue, stormwater management and other publicly owned community facilities.

- Current language currently reads: "New development in transit-oriented development areas should look for opportunities to include public facility improvements and services within the transit-oriented development area." I fear this again misses the point about the cumulative impacts upon other transit stations. SUGGESTED LANGUAGE: Add - "A TOD project may have transit impacts well outside of its area, notably on transit capacity at other stations, which in turn can impact the utility of the line as a whole. Such impacts must be recognized and measured, and effective steps to mitigate any negative effects should be included in TOD plans."
- Add "Cumulative" to "impacts".
- Cite examples of improved public facilities or services
- Edit: "Opportunities to offset the potentially negative impacts on public facilities of additional new development in a TOD area ~~on public facilities~~ should also be identified . . ."

Phasing of Development

- **Phasing of Development.** Fairfax County recognizes that concurrent development of all uses may not be feasible due to market conditions. In instances where a certain mix of uses is critical to the success of the TOD, the development should include a commitment to phase the project in such a way as to include an appropriate mix of uses in each phase to help ensure the long-term success of the mixed-use development. Where a proposed use is especially critical, TOD plans should assure that subsequent phases of a project are not built until the necessary components are in place. Phasing the development can minimize the potential impacts on the surrounding community and increase amenities for residents, employees, and visitors within the transit-oriented development area.
- Phasing of Development: Phasing of development. The key to phasing is some significant enforcement clause. At MetroWest and Tysons 1, that includes the notion of not building out subsequent phases if key conditions aren't met earlier. Is there anything in this language that encompasses that?
- Phasing of Development: Phasing plans should include pedestrian and bicycle access plans to allow proper non-motorized access throughout the development phases. Our experience at the Reston Town Center and the nearby Market Station residential area highlighted the need for good pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the development process.
- Refer to "adverse" impacts in last sentence.

Introduction

- Introduction: add can reduce traffic and reduce dependency on motor vehicles
- Introduction: The current language seems to expand the scope in an unexplained way, by saying it's for Metrorail, or similar systems that would achieve a similar rate of transit usage." It's hard to know: Are we talking about bus stations, VRE? What's the standard for deciding similar? Unless some clarity is incorporated here, or that phrase is removed, I can't help but fear that this policy will open up TOD applications in all manner of places, which runs counter to a central goal of mine.
- Introduction: I would suggest either omitting the language on other similar systems as being too vague, or, as an alternative, using wording such as "Other transit stations, such as VRE, or similar systems that achieve a similar rate of transit usage, may be considered for planning as Transit Development Areas within Transit Station Areas on a case by case basis"
- Introduction: Add to 3) "improves access to the transit station and"
- Introduction: Add to 3) improves access to the transit station and
- Proposed Intro: "TOD is a development that is able to generate a significantly less amount of vehicular traffic than would otherwise be generated by conventional development. This reduction in vehicular traffic is achieved via the provision of mixed uses within the TOD, and the provision of convenient accessibility to a metro transit station. TOD includes development that is in

immediate proximity to a metro transit station, or that is in general proximity to a metro transit station and is able to demonstrate and provide a high percentage of metro users via safe and convenient alternate mass transit methods (such as shuttle buses, metro buses, water taxi or other mass transit means.)

- Introduction: 3) improves access to the transit station and transportation choice in the area…
- Introduction: Transit-oriented development is a deliberate planning strategy for reducing automobile dependency in Fairfax County by focusing growth around planned and existing Metrorail stations, Well-planned development around these stations, using good design principles 1) leverages major investments in public transit infrastructure, 2) provides an environmentally sound means to accommodate new growth in the County, 3) improves transportation choice in the area, 4) creates opportunities for compact, vibrant neighborhood centers within walking distance of transit; 5) Preserves and enhances neighborhoods located near TOD projects; and 6) Works in harmony with all major county infrastructure systems."
- Intro: I think the use of the word "initially" on the first page is going to prove problematic.
- The purpose of this set of guidelines is to encourage a stronger relationship between all modes of public transit and land use regulations. This relationship will promote higher transit use, lower energy consumption, and viable and sustainable communities, in accordance with Fairfax County's land use, development, and conservation objectives.
- Edit: 3) improves **access to the station and** transportation choice in the area
- Add: "**within a 5-10 minute walking distance of a transit station."**
- Add as first sentence: Transit-oriented development (TOD) has a range of definitions, however, common traits include, development that is compact, contains a mix of housing, employment and retail and the design includes high-quality walking environments.
- Are you saying items 1-4 relate to good design principles? I find items 1-3 are more the outcomes of TOD.

Process:

- Process section should be included, with clarity as to how the specific station area guidelines will be developed and applied
- Implementation-Process/Motion section: add material on funding, protecting stable neighborhoods, mix of uses and services, why single out preservation of single-family neighborhoods and not other neighborhoods (mixed use, etc)
- **Implementation – Process**. Development of transit-oriented development plans and new transit station area planning efforts, as well as major changes to existing planning areas, should be accomplished through a broadly inclusive, collaborative, community process that examines, among other items, proposed changes in use, intensity, and impacts on and opportunities for improvements to public infrastructure. [Put back this section from the September 27 draft.]
- Community Inclusion: This was deleted from the Sept. 27 draft. It is consistent with most significant writing about TOD, as well as a number of the processes described to us during the TOD committee's meetings. Stating the right of the community to share in the planning, from very early stages, is a central issue to making TOD work in Fairfax, and this language should be restored to the final document.
- **16. Implementation – Process**. Development of transit-oriented development plans and new transit station area planning efforts, as well as major changes to existing planning areas, should be accomplished through a broadly inclusive, collaborative, community process that examines, among other items, proposed changes in use, intensity, and impacts on and opportunities for improvements to public infrastructure.
- **PROPOSED DRAFT LANGUAGE FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SECTION IN POLICY PLAN FOR TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT:**

  TOD literature and experience affirm that broad public participation in decision-making directly supports the long-term success of transit-oriented projects. To achieve this, innovative planning techniques should be encouraged that broaden and deepen meaningful public involvement when planning around transit facilities begins. These innovative processes should

emphasize interactive planning shaped by open community dialogue, as distinguished from unilaterally generated proposals that seek support for a preconceived project proposal.

The Planning Commissioners and Magisterial District Supervisors should serve as the focal point for initiating innovative planning of areas surrounding transit facilities. While the particulars of the process should relate to each station, innovative processes should: (1) discourage parcel-based, unilateral developer proposals prior to community outreach and involvement; (2) encourage the collaborative and interactive formulation of a cohesive vision for the transit station area before specific proposals are initiated; (3) foster a TOD vision that is integrated with and complements the surrounding neighborhoods; 4) incorporate a broad range of aspirations and needs of those communities; (5) draw upon county planning officials, supervisors, community groups and developers to identify, and encourage broad-based involvement and participation by, a wide range of stakeholders, including all interested citizens' associations. (6) facilitate continuing stakeholder involvement on a collaborative basis in framing the proposals ultimately advanced for specific parcels.

- Here is some supplemental material that teeters into areas better handled by board policy rather than plan language: Further the Planning Commission should facilitate compilation of best practices for innovative, interactive, holistic and collaborative planning, make it an appendix to the Policy Plan and make it readily accessible on the County's website. In compiling best practices, the county should draw on at least two sources. First, there should be a review of community-inclusion techniques by jurisdictions with successful TOD track records. The county should also review the work of its task forces and other outreach initiatives and compile a lessons learned appendix. Assembling members, chairmen, and stakeholders to review the history of policy planning through task forces and other innovative means may yield more diverse and candid appraisals of these prior efforts. Distillation of the Lessons Learned Should become an appendix to the Policy Plan. The Policy and Procedure Subcommittee of the Planning Commission should consider how to incorporate the Lessons Learned into the planning process.

<u>Proposed Objective/Policy</u>

- Proposed amendment to Land Use Policy Plan as an alternative to an appendix to the Policy Plan: "Objective x: Fairfax County should encourage Transit-Oriented Development near transit stations that contains more intense mixed-use Centers which encourage transit use and provide a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle system.
  - Policy a. The highest use intensity should occur within 1/4 mile of the transit station in the absence of barriers that affect pedestrian access and decrease as distance from the station increases.
  - Policy b. Strive to provide diverse housing stock for a range of incomes.
  - Policy c. Foster a variety of retail establishments and other uses that attract patrons during evening and other non-work hours.
  - Policy d. Use urban design principles that provide public plazas and open spaces, high quality architecture and attractive landscaping that create a sense of community.
  - Policy e. Use green building principles wherever possible and the most effective stormwater runoff mitigation techniques.
  - Policy f. Encourage user-friendly internal transit systems, including accommodation for users' goods such as groceries, dry cleaning and other purchases."
- Objective X: Specifying "rail stations" instead of transit stations limits the language to just rail, rather than allowing for trams, bus rapid transit, or other transit modes that may be developed in the future.
- Objective X: Fairfax County should encourage Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) with focused growth near (***should near be defined here?)*** planned and existing rail stations to create opportunities for pedestrian-friendly, compact vibrant neighborhood centers ***and sustainable communities with accessibility*** to transit.
- Insert more objectives into Policy Plan and question whether or not an appendix is needed. Many Objectives and Polices in the Land Use section of the policy Plan already address principles that

apply to TOD, as do sections of the Countywide Objective related to Land Use Pattern. The following is a recommended Objective and Policies:

Objective 7: Fairfax County should encourage Transit-Oriented Development around, and possibly over rail stations, where appropriate, that contain more intense mixed-use centers which encourage transit use and provide a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle system.

Policy a. The highest density and intensity of uses should occur within 1/4 mile and tapering to 1/2 mile, generally within a 5- to 10-minute walk, of the transit station center.

Policy b. Provide diverse housing stock for a range of incomes.

Policy c. Foster a variety of retail establishments and other uses that meet the consumer needs of residents and employees, that attract patrons during evening hours and weekends and that foster a sense of community.

Policy d. Encourage user-friendly internal and area transit and pedestrian systems to accommodate daily consumer needs for goods and services, such as groceries, dry cleaning, etc.

Policy e. Protect existing neighborhoods adjacent to and near Transit-oriented Development areas by delineating boundaries in the applicable Area Plans and providing for easy pedestrian access to and from neighboring communities.

Policy f. Use urban design principles that provide a street grid, public plazas and meaningful open spaces, high quality architecture and attractive landscaping that create a sense of place.

Policy g. Use green building principles wherever possible and the most effective storm water runoff mitigation techniques.

- Page 1, Policy a. need to correct to read: …including **rail station** areas
- Objective: Is distance from a station ¼ mile to ½ mile from the station platform?
- Intro to Appendix: Use "general" guidance.

Other

- Development around metro is appropriate
- Access Funds to serve major urbanizing clusters in Fairfax County for bicycles/pedestrian/handicap internal circulation
- Tax District/matching general capital budget fund
- Fairfax County needs overall plan for growth in future
- Adequate Public Facilities
- Streamlined review process (perhaps if more affordable housing provided)
- Develop partnerships with community-based and non-profit organizations to access resources to meet development principles (affordable housing, bike facilities, etc.)
- Provide dependent care (child and/or senior) opportunities
- Explore options for air rights development
- 3. Infrastructure: Public facility capacity (roads, transit, schools, parks) analysis should be accomplished as a condition of development; cumulative impact of proposed developments in the surrounding area; analysis should define needs and mitigation
- 7. Enforcement-TDM targets, promised mix of uses, ongoing public vigilance, verifiable data accessible to citizens, Plan and rezoning must specify benchmarks and consequences, performance-based phasing; protect community vision. County adhere to long-term strategic vision and give market time to fulfill goals for TOD site
- 9. Review Broader Impact-interrelationships, synergies and impacts examined over broad area; analysis should occur within framework of enforceable county-wide plan that identifies areas of protection (single-family neighborhoods) and high-intensity development nodes
- Data (metrics)-probably transcends TOD; trustworthy data on costs and benefits before deciding on station sector plans, so that realistic tradeoffs and strategies can be devised
- Get Out in Front-target areas and initiate planning process before a proposal is on the table
- Acknowledgment of Tradeoffs-should be accepted that TOD will cause significant local traffic; will also yield significant local amenities and more efficient use of land than sprawl development;

community visioning process should include a clear cost-benefit assessment of impacts and benefits

- Clear Administrative Procedures-time for informed public comment, following federal model of allowing certain time periods following public hearings
- Systems Approach-Each TOD station should be part of a broader look at countywide needs and capacities. Commercial corridors such as Route 1, get ahead and community process, strive for design-oriented plans
- Broader Impact Assessment-look beyond immediate area at cumulative impact (not necessarily limited to TOD)
- Phasing, TDMs, Mixed Use-County needs to sticks to vision instead of allowing developers to revise plan the moment market shifts
- Tree Zones, Storm Water Management
- Need more explicit principles for structuring the process of planning and approving development around transit stations.
- Form-based zoning--allows citizens to participate directly in shaping how communities should look; zone by form rather than use. Current planning and zoning process is highly technical, and citizens and other stakeholders tend to get bogged down in arcane details; form-based zoning enables all stakeholders to actually see what they are discussing, in the form of detailed visual renderings put together in design charrettes. The county commissioned a study of form-based codes last year, and results of that study should be integrated into the committee's deliberations.
- These guidelines, even after being further refined, represent only the first step in implementing good TOD. Good design requires specific rules and standards. While flexibility is important, developers must be held to clear, measurable standards and these must be vigorously enforced.
- TOD Policy Statement too 'suburban'--should strive for balanced flow in both directions during peak and off-peak periods
- Need material on funding plan for public amenities-public, private and mixed positive examples of good ways of using value capture to achieve funding
- include rules and standards that may be recommended by creative, innovative developers
- Use of the guidelines-are they included in Comp Plan or used in some other form? Perhaps guidebook for TOD would be more appropriate-10-15 pages, with 16 items noted in strawman, filled in with some specifics from Comp Plan about density, parking, TDM, etc and visuals.
- Work should be reviewed by the Tysons Urban Design consultants and the Tysons Task Force prior to adoption by the PC.
- My overall experience of county planning language is that it is loose, even vague, to account for all possibilities. My concern is that this kind of project puts strains on existing communities, and vagueness often translates into developers making demands that continually push the envelope. I'm not sure the customary approach says enough about the goal—a formulation that allows mixed-use development within a designated area that conserves adjoining neighborhoods and the overall infrastructure. I'm not sure this very loose framework would assure anyone that that kind of trade-off would happen. Virtually any of the passages that would protect neighborhoods and infrastructure, and assure the community a role in envisioning a station area's future—be it train, bus or camel station—all seem so soft as to be possibly an illusion.
- The benefits of transit oriented development (TOD) will be maximized if TOD is not treated as an island unto itself, but as a mixed use area that complements the community and at Metrorail stations close-by. All major uses, including recreation, should be available without the need of a car.
- TOD has struggled in Fairfax for three reasons. It hasn't properly integrated the public, it hasn't adequately protected surrounding neighborhoods, and it hasn't properly accounted for the full range of impacts on public infrastructure, beyond maximizing use of Metro.
- Nice job first of all, though I wonder what will this report end up doing? Sitting on a shelf? Is there actual guidance that is more specific to guide city planners, or do they simply look at the report and then have the option not to act upon it?
- I think the draft TOD guidelines are pretty good. I would have preferred that they not be limited to rail, but I like the rephrasing on page 1 of the current draft because it leaves open adaptation to

other transit (BRT would be most likely). It is also better than limiting to Metrorail. I think inclusion of public participation process is good. I've given up on all the back and forth by some of the participants on this point and defer to the committee with the exception of referencing specific tools (see specific comments).