TYSONS
LAND USE TASK FORCE
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/tysons

DRAFT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARIES DISCUSSING DISTRICT PLAN TEXT

Meeting Date	Districts Discussed	Page Nos.
May 11, 2009	West Side & East Side	1-2
June 1, 2009	Old Courthouse	2-4
	North Central	4
June 8, 2009	Old Courthouse	5
	North Central	5-7
June 15, 2009	Tysons Central 123	7-8
	North Central	8-9
June 29, 2009	North Central	9
	Tysons Central 7	9-10
	Tysons West	11
July 13, 2009	Tysons Central 123	11-13
July 15, 2009	Tysons East	13-14

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee
Meeting Summaries Discussing District Plan Text

Monday, May 11, 6:00 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center

Introduction, page 105

Committee members suggested that some language be added to the introduction to this section addressing the following concepts:

Redevelopment projects should not block public access to existing parks or open space.

There should be a system of trails linking parks and open space throughout Tysons.

Redevelopment projects should provide for connections among the grid of streets and stormwater and other public facilities within their subdistricts.

Redevelopment projects should respect others' views of existing parks and open space by not "showing their backs" to green space. This will preclude the location of rear alleys, dumpsters and other garbage facilities in view of parks and open space.

West Side, pages 147-150

Page 147, second paragraph, change the verb in the third sentence to "should," not "could." At the end of the sentence after "passive recreational facilities," add "such as trails."

Page 148, add a paragraph about trails in the Old Courthouse Spring Branch Subdistrict. These should include a trail along the Old Courthouse Spring Branch stream valley park from Gosnell Road on the south to Old Ashgrove Lane on the north.

In addition, two or three short trails should cross the stream valley and link the abutting residential community to Tysons. These include Old Ashgrove Lane, where the existing bridge should be used for pedestrian and bicycle access and remain closed to automobiles; the Dominion Virginia Power line easement, which could be connected to Vesper Street on the west; and a possible trail through Raglan Road Park.

Page 149, sixth bullet, change verb from "should be" to "was."

Page 149, seventh bullet, change the phrase from "are sufficient" to "have been provided."

Regarding page 150, the Gosnell Subdistrict, Wade Smith asked about the treatment of parcels along Route 123. Mr. Wheeler said that those parcels may be addressed through the Urban Design section of the Plan text.

East Side, pages 169-175

Mr. Smith stated that The Colonies of McLean is now a gated community. He asked what would happen if that property were to redevelop, and was told that the streets would then be public.

Mr. Smith further asked about properties facing Scotts Run. These properties are addressed in the Tysons East district beginning on page 139.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary

June 1, 2009, 6 p.m.
Wolf Trap Center for Education

Old Courthouse, pages 151-160

Mr. Wheeler gave an overview of the draft Plan text for this district. He explained that the first four paragraphs on page 151 were taken directly from the Task Force recommendations. The fifth paragraph explains the logic of dividing the district into three subdistricts. As shown in the map on page 152, the South Old Courthouse Subdistrict includes a nonresidential edge subarea and a residential edge subarea. The land use character of both of these subdistricts is expected to remain the same.

The Northwest Old Courthouse Subdistrict is divided into three subareas. Each of these subareas has redevelopment options for residential mixed use, which have 50% higher intensity than the current Plan. In addition, parts of these subareas within ½ mile walking distance of Metro stations or in proximity to the future circulator have higher planned intensity as indicated in the Areawide Land Use chapter. Mr. Wheeler explained that the Plan text was drafted to provide flexibility for phasing development.

Bill Lecos expressed his concern that including such flexibility in the Plan will encourage continued project by project development at Tysons and will not conform to the Task Force vision. Mr. Wheeler explained that the Plan will be able to include greater certainty once the location of proposed circulator routes has been determined, and the funding for the circulator study was just approved today. He further emphasized that the Areawide Plan text addresses intensity near the Metro stations and the circulator routes.

Mr. Lecos stated that the Plan should include the preferred alternatives for the circulator routes. Mr. Wheeler pointed out that the last bullet on page 159, under “Additional Guidance for Northwest and Northeast Subdistricts,” describes the circulator alignment and states that redevelopment should be designed to accommodate the additional intensity. He asked that DRC members suggest revisions to this language regarding the proposed circulator.

Irfan Ali understood that staff could not assign FARs to locations that have not yet been identified (i.e., land adjacent to future circulator routes), but agreed with Mr. Lecos that the circulator needs to be mentioned in both the Areawide and District text. The suggestion was add to references in the District text to the FAR table on page 33 in the Areawide text. Mr. Wheeler noted that the first bullet on page 158 under “Additional Guidance” did provide that reference.

Wade Smith stated that the District plan text needs to expand the discussion of the circulator. George Barker directed DRC members to draft alternative Plan language and otherwise forward their suggestions on text revisions to DPZ staff.

Stella Koch suggested that the Plan needs a systems approach. Mr. Lecos agreed that the approach should be on an Areawide basis so that the resulting development is not planned on a parcel by parcel basis. Ms. Koch stated that the circulator study may help with revising the Plan text so that the approach is more integrated.

Brenda Krieger noted that she believes that a form-giving circulator can be made up of bus routes, although Irfan Ali stated that he does not agree. Ms. Krieger also noted that she objects to the use of the verb "may" and would like the Plan text to clearly state the conditions under which higher intensities will be granted. She would like to see the "Additional Guidance" from pages 158-9 moved to earlier in the District text. Mr. Wheeler stated that the "Additional Guidance" may apply to all Districts at Tysons, and could possibly be moved to page 105 of the Plan text.

Ms. Krieger asked about the meaning of the third paragraph under "Redevelopment Options" on page 158, and in particular the phrase, "Redevelopment should be designed to accommodate this additional intensity." Mr. Wheeler explained that the intent was to encourage redevelopment plans to provide for phasing in intensity, with some interim land uses possibly included. An example of a redevelopment proposal that addresses the phasing of intensity is JBG's concept for the Moore Cadillac site.

Ms. Krieger also asked about the source of the second paragraph on page 158, regarding office and hotel uses up to 1.27 FAR. Mr. Wheeler explained that that referenced a Plan amendment approved after adoption of the 1994 Plan for Tysons, and that the Planning Commission had instructed staff to include approved amendments.

Kohann Williams noted that the Dulles Task Force had language calling for "trigger mechanisms." She noted that the DRC would like staff to provide more specific language on trigger mechanisms than the current references to phasing. Ms. Williams also observed that the systems approach discussed earlier might be provided through detailed management plans developed later by the Implementation entity for Tysons. She stated that she did not think it was possible to provide that level of detail in the Comprehensive Plan.

Clark Tyler emphasized the need for a clear statement in the Plan text about the need for a circulator system at Tysons. George Barker assured the DRC that the Board of Supervisors and FCDOT are committed to the creation of a circulator, and that the purpose of the forthcoming study was to determine routes and types of equipment.

Irfan Ali explained that the results of the circulator study are needed to determine where to allocate additional intensity. He agreed with Ms. Williams that the future District plans developed by the Implementation entity will be able to provide a granular level of detail.

Wade Smith suggested that the text make a clear differentiation of the Plan recommendations with the circulator and without the circulator. Michelle Krocker disagreed, stating that the Plan text needs to assume the circulator is a given. Sterling Wheeler suggested that DRC members review the "Additional Guidance" section and provide staff with suggestions to strengthen the discussion of the circulator.

George Barker asked for comments on specific pages of the Plan text for the Old Courthouse District. Wade Smith asked if language could be added to Subarea 2, Residential Edge, on page 153, regarding the treatment of the rear of buildings to buffer adjacent residential

neighborhoods. Mr. Smith also requested additional text about streetscaping along Route 7, coordination of land uses with the opposite side of Route 7 in the Tysons Central 123 District, and the potential for this section of Boone Boulevard to serve as a "main street." Brenda Krieger cautioned against being too prescriptive about Boone Boulevard, given the realities of the real estate market.

There was discussion about the designation of "Nonresidential" and "Residential" edges in the South Old Courthouse Subdistrict. Bill Lecos and Sterling Wheeler explained that these land uses were agreed upon when Task Force member Jim Scott was on the Board of Supervisors, and that they should remain as designated.

Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci asked about the second sentence in the second paragraph under "Subarea 2 – Residential Edge" on page 153, "The portion north of Science Applications Court is planned for office use up to .50 FAR." She suggested that this area could be developed as residential in the future, and Mr. Wheeler agreed.

Keith Turner suggested that staff add a chart linking showing intensity by district or subdistrict. There was some discussion as to whether such a chart would be helpful for each of Tysons' eight districts. Mr. Wheeler suggested that DPZ staff draft a sample chart and bring it to a future DRC meeting.

<u>North Central, pages 161-168</u>

Mr. Wheeler gave an overview of the draft Plan text for this district. Referencing the map on page 162, he pointed out the Office Subdistrict on the north side of this district. Subarea 1, the Dulles Airport Access Road Office Area, maintains existing building heights. Subarea 2, the Capital Beltway Office Area, calls for increased intensities and heights.

The southern portion of this district, the Urban Neighborhood Subdistrict, was divided into two subareas. Subarea 1 includes the Rotonda and Post neighborhoods, grouped together because they were both developed at 30 units per acre. Subarea 2 includes the Park Crest development, which has been approved for residential and retail uses up to 3.0 FAR. Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci provided the DRC with proposed revisions to this section of the Plan text, creating a separate Subarea 3 for Park Crest.

Ms. Baker explained that Park Crest did not necessarily have to become a separate subarea, but that the Plan text should reflect its approved intensity and allow for office development as a potential future use of part of the site. Brenda Krieger asked if the draft Plan's current land use categories would not permit office in a residential area. Mr. Wheeler explained that the text on page 166 indicates that this property is planned and approved for residential use; this text would limit retail and office uses to the ground level of a residential and not allow free-standing retail and office buildings.

Ms. Baker also provided revised wording for the first paragraph under Subarea 1, DAAR Office Area, on page 163. The suggestion was made that the bullets on pages 166-168 of the North Central District might be moved to earlier in the discussion of this district. Also, these bullets should be compared to the "Additional Guidance" bullets on pages 158-160, to avoid redundancy.

Wade Smith observed that he thought the Lillian Court residential development was included in two Districts, and Mr. Wheeler so noted.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee
Meeting Summary

June 8, 2009, 6 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center

Old Courthouse, pages 151-160 (Continued)

As requested at the June 1 meeting, staff prepared an intensity chart for the seven subareas of the Old Courthouse District. Members approved the chart with the addition of a note that the FARs do not include bonuses for LEED certification or the provision of affordable/workforce housing.

Looking at the land use categories shown in the Redevelopment Options on the chart, Brenda Krieger suggested that the Plan provide flexibility in the Residential Mixed-Use category so that some areas could be residential only.

Regarding the column labeled "Base Plan," there was some discussion as to whether Tysons' new zoning ordinance will change existing zoning. If that happened, committee members wondered if the option to develop under what is now called the "Base Plan" would continue to exist. Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci pointed out that the Plan text needs to include this type of language so that current landowners can obtain Special Exceptions to make minor changes to their properties. Sterling Wheeler
also noted that guidance on Existing Uses in the Areawide Land Use section of the Plan could address the Special Exception issue.

An outcome of the discussion was to recommend that the paragraphs now entitled "Base Plan" be collapsed into the descriptions of existing development at the beginning of each geographic area in the Plan text.

George Barker reported that he had checked with Jim Scott and Kate Hanley regarding the land uses in Subareas 1 and 2 of the South Old Courthouse Subdistrict. The consensus was that residential development should be permitted in both of these subareas. Sterling Wheeler suggested that new residential development in Subarea 1 be required to provide a screening wall similar to that provided by existing office uses. In Subarea 2, Mr. Wheeler suggested that residential development have a street edge. Irfan Ali noted that Arlington County requires screening in residential areas, and stated that he agreed with Mr. Wheeler's suggestions. Elizabeth Baker offered to draft language regarding residential development in Subarea 2.

North Central, pages 161-168 (Continued)

Mr. Wheeler and Ms. Baker stated that they are still working on Plan language for the Park Crest development. The issue here is that the Planning Commission has approved this site for multifamily development at an FAR of 3.0, which resulted from use of the current Plan's housing bonus provision. This intensity is higher than the Task Force recommendations for this area, even locations near the Circulator.

The committee then turned to Subarea 1, the DAAR Office Area, of the Office Subdistrict. Regarding the second paragraph under "Redevelopment Option" on page 163, Keith Turner

agreed that the Fairfax Building site will need to be redeveloped to accommodate a proposed ramp from the Dulles Airport Access Road to Jones Branch Drive. He disagreed with limiting a new building's height to 75 feet and suggested a height limit of 100 feet for this site.

The last sentence on the bottom of page 163 generated discussion on how intensity will be transferred among sites at Tysons. The sentence now reads, "Some increase in intensity may be available once the circulator is operational; if so, some or all of this additional intensity may be transferred to redevelopment south of Jones Branch Drive, if the intensity cannot be accommodated due to the area's height limit."

The suggestion was made to change the second half of this sentence to read, "additional intensity may be transferred *either* to redevelopment south of Jones Branch Drive, *or the intensity may be transferred elsewhere at Tysons*."

Regarding Subarea 2, the Capital Beltway Office Area, in the paragraph entitled "Redevelopment Option" on page 164, at the end of the third sentence regarding transfer of intensity, the suggestion was made to delete the phrase "to redevelopment west of Jones Branch Drive."

Mr. Wheeler noted that the southernmost part of this subarea is located within ½ mile of the Tysons Central 123 Metro station and therefore could have additional transit-related intensity. The issue of building height for this site was put on hold until the DRC addresses this issue. Stella Koch asked if consideration had been given to building height given Tysons' topography, and Mr. Wheeler responded that the 3D modeling shown at the February 2008 public workshops was based on existing topography.

The committee then turned to Subarea 1, Rotonda/Post Neighborhoods, of the Urban Neighborhood Subdistrict. The suggestion was made to delete the last sentence on page 165, as it refers to building heights. Irfan Ali noted that aerial photos indicate that there are 45 acres of undeveloped land on the Rotonda site. He asked Task Force member and Rotonda representative Sally Liff if that land will be developed. She responded that some of the land had been taken for road improvements, but that the rest was either recreation facilities for Rotonda residents or a forested hillside buffering the complex from traffic on Spring Hill Road.

Regarding Subarea 2, West Park Urban Neighborhood, Keith Turner asked if FARs will be site specific, and Mr. Wheeler explained that FARs will apply to the gross land area and allow for density to be transferred from new open space and streets to building sites created by the new urban blocks.

Wade Smith asked if the Plan should permit the transfer of intensity between districts at Tysons, rather than restricting transfers to the same districts. Mr. Wheeler agreed and said he will include a paragraph to that effect in the Areawide Land Use section. There was additional discussion about density transfers, with the conclusion that a formal Transfer of Development Rights program is not appropriate for inclusion in the Plan but might be established by the Implementation entity.

Mr. Smith said that the Dulles Toll Road serves as a buffer between Tysons and residential neighborhoods to its north. Therefore he thought that new buildings could be higher than existing buildings, as long as they did not exceed 75 feet in height.

Regarding the map of the North Central District on page 162 of the text, Keith Turner asked if it is still in the conceptual stage? One of his concerns is that the map shows the site of the Dickenson building as a civic use, when it should be Mixed-Use.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary

June 15, 2009, 6 p.m.
Wolf Trap Center for Education

Tysons Central 123, pages 125-138

Regarding the vision for this district, Wade Smith asked if the language in the last paragraph on page 125 was realistic. The decision was made to delete the second half of the first sentence, describing Route 123 as "a boulevard with street trees and traffic calming treatments."

Bill Lecos announced that Visit Fairfax is issuing an RFP for the construction of a conference center in Fairfax County. He noted that conference facilities are mentioned in the vision for this district but suggested that they could also be located in one of the other three TOD districts. The suggestion was made to mention conference facilities in the Areawide Land Use guidance, noting that it would be desirable to have them located within walking distance of Metro.

Regarding the Redevelopment Option for Subarea 1 of the North Tysons Central 123 Subdistrict, Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci would like to provide some more positive language on a vision for the future of Tysons II (the Galleria), assuming the addition of residential development and other changes. Sterling Wheeler noted that in order for this subarea to redevelop with more intensity, improvements such as those listed on pages 128-9 of the Plan text will need to be made. Wade Smith suggested that pedestrian access through Tysons II needs to be improved. He also noted that buildings could be wrapped around the parking decks at both Tysons I and II.

Regarding Subarea 2, South West Park, Keith Turner called the committee's attention to his memo dated March 9, 2009, and asked Linda Hollis to circulate it to DRC members prior to the next meeting. Mr. Turner noted that in the previous Plan for Tysons, this subarea was included in the Tysons core area, where the highest intensity was envisioned. Since this area will be within ¼ to ½ mile of the Metro and will be served by Circulators, Mr. Turner stated that the new Plan should emphasize that this area should have high intensity and that building heights should be between 200 and 360 feet.

Bill Lecos asked whether intensity could be transferred away from areas to the north to this subarea. Mr. Turner stated that because the North Central District is expected to be the location of both a park and elementary school site, the West Park subarea will need to be granted a fairly high intensity as well. The committee noted that intensity transfer to South West Park should be addressed in the next version of the Plan text.

Mr. Turner pointed out that, after redevelopment of South West Park, building entrances will be oriented towards Tysons Boulevard. With the addition of future parks and structured parking, walking up Tysons Boulevard will be a pleasant experience. Mr. Turner stated that the distance

tiers on the Intensity map on page 31 are not correct, and confirmed with Mr. Wheeler that distance is measured from Metro station entrances, not the station platform.

Regarding the South Tysons Central 123 Subdistrict, Subarea 1, Jill Parks of Cooley Godward will suggest more positive language for the future vision for Tysons Corner Center (the Mall or Tysons I). Wade Smith noted that the malls need to improve accessibility between each other. He also stated that there should be bicycle access from north to south along the Beltway, bike lanes along Route 7, and bike lanes along the internal streets.

On the subject of Subarea 2, Northeast International/Route 7, Irfan Ali stated that this is a very hazardous intersection for pedestrians to try to cross. There was discussion of the need for a pedestrian bridge, although Tom Fleury noted that the Freddie Mac bridge over Jones Branch Drive was very expensive to construct and involved prolonged negotiations with VDOT. Keith Turner stated that in January 2008 the Board of Supervisors approved a study of Route 7 from 123 to 495, and suggested that staff check with FCDOT to see if this issue can be addressed during this study.

Regarding Subarea 3, Towers Crescent North, Wade Smith noted that there need to be more and better connections between this subarea and the Mall. It was pointed out that redevelopment of the Mall will include improvements such as a pedestrian bridge connecting Towers Crescent North to the Mall.

No changes were suggested for Subarea 4, Towers Crescent South. For Subarea 5, Watson Street, Wade Smith pointed out that this area has the potential to include broad sidewalks and outdoor cafes. There was discussion of this subarea's closeness to two Metro stations and the Circulator, its potential for a grid of streets, and the possibility of increasing intensity here.

<u>North Central, pages 161-168 (Continued)</u>

Elizabeth Baker and Sterling Wheeler shared with the committee their suggested revisions to the language for this district. In the Office Subdistrict, Subarea 1, DAAR Office Area, page 163, Wade Smith objected to deletion of the phrase "provides a transition in building height to the single family neighborhoods to the north" in the first sentence. The committee agreed to leave that phrase as is.

In the Urban Neighborhood Subdistrict, Subarea 1, page 165, under Redevelopment Option, Ms. Baker added a new first paragraph regarding the vision for this subarea. She changed the reference to intensity in the second sentence of the second paragraph from "between 1.0 and 1.5" to "up to 1.5," to be consistent with language for the Crescent development. She also changed the maximum building height in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph from "105 feet" (the Rotonda condominiums) to "between 75 and 125 feet."

Ms. Baker added a new Subarea 2 to include the Park Crest development north of Westpark Drive, and the Crescent development south of Westpark Drive. Within this subarea, there is a new first paragraph introducing the potential for office development in Park Crest. This paragraph states: "The vision for Subarea 2 is for residential mixed-use development with residential uses predominating. Office uses may also be appropriate for the area north of West Park Drive given its close proximity to the Dulles Toll Road and the existing office focus there. Office uses would complement the existing residential and retail uses in this area. Conversion of one of the approved residential buildings to office use should be considered if the resultant

traffic impact is comparable or less than the currently approved high rise, high density residential and retail uses."

Tom Fleury explained that of the five residential buildings approved at Park Crest, two have been built – the high rise condominium building and the Lofts building which includes the Harris Teeter grocery store. Of the three remaining buildings, the proposal is to convert one to office. In order to meet the traffic impact test, this building will be smaller than the approved residential building.

The West Park Urban Neighborhood, now on page 166 of the draft Plan text, will become Subarea 3. Discussion of this subarea will take place at the next meeting on June 29.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary

June 29, 2009, 4 p.m.
Hilton Garden Inn Conference Center

North Central, pages 161-168 (Continued)

Mr. Wheeler reminded the committee that, at the June 15 meeting, Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci requested that a new Subarea 3 be added to the Urban Neighborhood Subdistrict, to include the Park Crest development. Keith Turner noted that Park Crest is proposing to convert a residential building to an office building, assuming no increase in traffic impact. He asked if such conversions should not also apply to other subareas at Tysons. Mr. Barker noted that Park Crest is requesting to convert one of five buildings from residential to office, and requested that Elizabeth Baker report back to the group on what percentage of total square feet that conversion represented. Mr. Wheeler noted that that percentage could help to shape the Plan recommendations on the Residential Mix land use category.

Regarding Subarea 2, West Park Urban Neighborhood, Mr. Turner asked that the comments in his March 9 memo be included in revisions to the Plan text.

Tysons Central 7, pages 116-124

The group discussed the designation of this district as the "Civic Center" on page 116. The suggestion was made that civic uses should be provided at all four TOD Districts, and that the Plan text describe a range of such uses. Mr. Wheeler explained that the concept for Tysons Central 7 was for a civic building such as a library, possibly colocated with an arts center. Ms. Krocker noted that in the future library services may all be provided electronically rather than through a building. Ms. Hedetniemi suggested that the phrase be changed to "civic center," removing the initial capital letters.

Brenda Krieger provided the committee with copies of her comments and those of Elizabeth Baker on the North Subdistrict of Tysons Central 7. She noted that several of the bullets under "Redevelopment Option" on pages 122 and 123 contain information that is repeated through the Plan text. She suggested that information which applies to all redevelopment be stated at the beginning of the District recommendations (page 105) and referred to later, rather than having the detailed text repeated. Mr. Wheeler indicated that staff will look at this issue. However,

there is a concern that if this text is not repeated in the subdistricts, the reader of the Plan may not view these issues as applicable to a specific area.

Regarding the use of the term “Base Plan,” such as on page 121, Mr. Wheeler recommended that it be left in the text as it applies to existing landowners who may wish to make minor modifications to their properties in the near term. Rather than “Redevelopment Option,” Ms. Baker suggests the use of “Vision Plan” for those portions of the text describing how the Task Force vision might be implemented.

Ms. Krieger noted that some of the text under the second paragraph of “Redevelopment Option” on page 121 would be more relevant in the revised Urban Design section of the Plan text. She suggests deleting the four paragraphs on specific consolidations from page 122. She also recommends deleting the names of specific building owners or tenants as these may change at any time. Ms. Krieger would like to see the Plan distinguish between those improvements that individual landowners will provide, and those improvements that will be the responsibility of multiple landowners within a subarea.

Ms. Krieger also cautioned against requiring one “iconic” building at each Metro station, and the committee agreed that the topic of building heights needs to be discussed at an upcoming meeting.

There was some discussion of the need to ensure that the North Subdistrict will include at least a one acre park. Ms. Krocker noted that one purpose of the Implementation entity was to monitor the provision of improvements, such as parks and open space. She also observed that the Plan needs to provide sufficient incentives for landowners to provide these improvements.

Regarding the South Subdistrict, Elizabeth Baker noted that the consultant’s concept map showed 7 green spaces there versus only three in the North Subdistrict. The committee agreed that, while a Civic Commons in the Tysons Central 7 District is desirable, the Plan should not require that it be 3.5 acres in size (page 118). Ms. Baker noted Farragut Square is 2 acres and the Reston Town Center plaza is 1 acre. Irfan Ali suggested that the Plan text provide greater flexibility on the Civic Commons, allowing for it size and exact location to emerge during the development review process. Bill Lecos recommended that the Plan text be consistent with the Park Authority’s new Urban Park Framework in terms of descriptions and sizes of future parks at Tysons.

In the second sentence of the first paragraph on page 116, under the Vision for Tysons Central 7, Mr. Lecos requested that the word “largely” be deleted.

Ms. Baker suggested that the first two paragraphs on the top of page 119 regarding specific consolidations be deleted.

Regarding the third bullet on page 120, the question was raised about the need for that much specific detail on building height.

Janet Caldow, a landowner in the South Subdistrict, referred to her June 25 letter regarding the history of Tysons and in particular the country store purchased by her family in 1902. She said that she expects the Park Authority to take possession of her collection of artifacts, but asked that the committee consider mentioning historic markers in the Plan text. Committee members stated that they would prefer plaques inside of buildings.

Tysons West, pages 107-115

Elizabeth Baker provided the committee with suggested revisions to the Plan text for this district. The committee suggested that the adjective “quasi” be deleted before the word “industrial” in Ms. Baker’s proposed second sentence under “Vision” on page 107.

On page 107, Ms. Baker deleted the last two paragraphs that limit arts and entertainment uses to the south side of Route 7. Instead, she added text to the second paragraph on that page, describing similar land uses on both sides of Route 7.

Michelle Krocker noted that Ms. Baker deleted the sentence on page 107 that mentioned “live/work and loft housing,” and requested that similar language be added to the third bullet on page 110. Ms. Krocker noted that this concept was suggested by Jo Hodgin and that the intent was that affordable housing for artists be provided near their places of work. She added that the housing does not have to be in “live/work” or loft-type spaces.

Regarding the South Subdistrict, Ms. Baker explained that she deleted much of the paragraph on building heights from page 111. The committee agreed that a revised building height map could substitute for much of this detail.

In the North Subdistrict, Ms. Baker raised the issue of the minimum sized park in the second paragraph on page 114. The group agreed to be consistent with the Park Authority’s Urban Park framework.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary

July 13, 2009, 4 p.m.
Hilton Garden Inn Conference Center

Tysons Central 123, pages 125-138

Ms. Krieger asked about staff’s response to the committee’s proposal that language regarding consolidation and coordinated development plans be included only in the introduction to the District Plan text and not be repeated within each district and subdistrict. Mr. Wheeler stated that the introduction to the District Plan text should be expanded to include some of the key issues that are common across the districts. The repetitive language within the individual geographic areas should remain to provide a context for any more specific guidance. Mr. Wheeler also pointed out that it is useful for the text to include names of significant places, such as Tysons I and Tysons II. He would also like to leave references to existing and approved square feet and intensities at the malls in the text (pages 127 and 132).

North Subdistrict

On page 125 at the end of the third paragraph, the committee recommended deleting reference to “parking structures” and rewording the sentence regarding providing connectivity by taking advantage of the changes in topography between Tysons Boulevard and Westpark Drive.

In the fourth paragraph on page 125, both Routes 123 and 7 should be described as future "tree-lined boulevards," and the words "traffic calming" should be deleted.

The language in the bottom paragraph on page 126 is repeated throughout the district text. The phrase "is predicated upon" should be replaced with "will depend on."

On page 127, under Subarea 1, Tysons I (and elsewhere in the district text), Mr. Wheeler recommended that the subtitle "Redevelopment Option," be retained and not be replaced with "Vision Plan."

The committee asked that mention of the amphitheater in the next to the last paragraph on page 127 be retained, and that the phrase "before a lunchtime audience" be deleted.

The committee recommended distinguishing between three levels of development in this subarea: 1) existing or Base Plan; 2) approved; and 3) future redevelopment.

On page 128, the first bullet should be divided into two bullets, one referencing traffic impacts and the other referencing amenities that should be included with residential development.

On page 128 in the fourth bullet, delete reference to "parking structures" as discussed above under page 125.

Under Subarea 2, South West Park, in the third bullet on page 130, delete reference to "parking structures" as discussed above under page 125.

On page 131, the third bullet references a maximum building height of 200 feet. Mr. Turner's March 9 memo requested a maximum height of closer to 300 feet. A decision on this point was deferred until the committee conducts a discussion of recommended building heights throughout Tysons.

South Subdistrict

Regarding Subarea 1, Tysons Corner Center, the first bullet on page 133 should be divided into two bullets, as discussed above under page 128.

The bullet on building heights on pages 133-134 will be revised after the committee reaches consensus on this issue. Reference to an "iconic building" should be deleted from the top of page 134 (and elsewhere in the Plan text). The phrase "architecturally significant" would be preferable.

In the next bullet on page 134, there was significant discussion of the concept of "gateway buildings." The consensus seemed to be that this concept applies more to an auto-oriented suburban place than a transit-oriented urban place like the transformed Tysons.

In both Subareas 1 and 3 (Towers Crescent South), the committee was not in favor of limiting heights to be less than the Tycon Tower.

In Subarea 5, Watson Street, the committee recommended retaining the final sentence at the bottom of page 137, "The ability to realize planned intensities will depend ... ".

The bullet on building heights on page 138 will also be retained, pending the committee's decisions on this issue.

Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary

July 15, 2009, 6 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center

Tysons East District, pages 139-146

Brenda Krieger provided a three-page handout with her comments on this District. These comments supplement the markup provided previously by Elizabeth Baker of Walsh Colucci and Jill Parks of Cooley Godward. Ms. Krieger's first four comments reference page 139:

First sentence in the first paragraph, reword due to the changed meaning of "gateways" discussed at the July 13 DRC meeting.

First sentence in the second paragraph and elsewhere in this District, delete the adjective "active" in reference to Scotts Run park.

Third paragraph, delete reference to specific professions (architects, professors and computer programmers); retain reference to creative class households. Put "creative class" in quotation marks.

Last sentence now reads, "Achieving the planned intensity is predicated upon the degree to which necessary public infrastructure is in place ...". Ms. Krieger suggests that the DRC agree on language regarding attaining a balance between infrastructure and development, and use that consistently throughout the Plan text.

Scotts Run Crossing and Colshire Subdistricts

Page 141, second bullet, Sterling Wheeler requested that the phrase "consolidation should include about 15 acres" be retained; however, at previous meetings the committee had recommended the deletion of specific acreage requirements.

Ms. Krieger stated that the DRC also needs to agree on language regarding consolidation and coordinated development plans and use that throughout the Plan text. Irfan Ali noted that the location of the grid of streets will help determine the appropriate size of consolidations and coordinated development plans, and that the Implementation entity will work with landowners on this issue as well.

Page 142, second paragraph, Ms. Krieger noted that Ms. Parks added a sentence, "The location and configuration of Scotts Run Road may be adjusted at the time of development approval so as to preserve and make use of the existing right-of-way."
Ms. Krieger stated that she would like to see flexibility in both type of street and location of right-of-way. After some discussion, Mr. Wheeler suggested that this language might be included in the Areawide recommendations, rather than being repeated in each district.

Page 143, second paragraph, Keith Turner and Cooley Godward submitted revised text which reads as follows:

"The Scotts Run Crossing Subdistrict is separated from suburban neighborhoods by the extensive right-of-way of the DAAR and Route 123. It is positioned above the Capital Beltway, and has an average grade 25 to 35 below the improved Beltway, the planned extension of Scotts Run Road over the Beltway, and the elevated Metro station. As a result, this subdistrict's building heights are between 150 and 360 feet. Building heights should be highest closest to the Metro station *or* (DRC agreed to replace "and" here) along the Capital Beltway." (DRC agreed to end the paragraph here.)

Page 143, graphic at bottom, Ms. Krieger requested that this be deleted as it shows Old Meadow Road widened to six lanes with a median in the middle. Mr. Wheeler suggested that the graphic be retained but cropped so that the median is not shown. The committee also suggested that the caption could be changed to something like, "View of circulator from Tysons East Metro station."

Old Meadow and Anderson Subdistricts

Pages 144-5, bullet regarding consolidation, Ms. Krieger suggested using future agreed upon language regarding consolidation and coordinated development plans, and not including a minimum acreage figure.

Page 145, third paragraph, new road improvement adjacent to Scotts Run should be called a "street," not a "road," given the nature of this subdistrict.

Page 145, third paragraph, Baker and Parks raised the issue of whether or not right-of-way is public. The group agreed that the subject of public access easements is more properly discussed in the Areawide Plan text, along with street cross-sections.

Page 145, seventh paragraph (second bullet), Ms. Krieger proposes new standard language regarding urban design and open space amenities that does not include this amount of detail; i.e., delete "streetscapes, plazas, courtyards, landscaping, lighting and seating" and reference the Urban Design and Environmental Stewardship guidelines.

Page 146, second paragraph, Ms. Krieger expressed her concern that individual developers not be expected to pay for all amenities at Tysons. The suggestion was made to insert "Commitments for" at the beginning of the last sentence. It would now read, "Commitments for needed improvements should be provided consistent with guidance in the Public Facilities, Transportation and Environmental Stewardship chapters."

Wade Smith suggested that the Plan identify which facilities are expected to be paid for by the general public, which will be paid for on a pro-rata basis among developers at Tysons, and which might be provided by individual developers. Mr. Wheeler suggested that this language could be included in the Public Facilities, Transportation and Environmental Stewardship chapters.

Page 146, second bullet, Ms. Krieger recommended greater flexibility in the discussion of building heights.