



**TYSONS**  
LAND USE TASK FORCE  
[www.fairfaxcounty.gov/tysons](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/tysons)

## DRAFT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARIES DISCUSSING DISTRICT PLAN TEXT

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Districts Discussed</u>	<u>Page Nos.</u>
May 11, 2009	West Side & East Side	2
June 1, 2009	Old Courthouse North Central	4-6 6-7
June 8, 2009	Old Courthouse North Central	8-9 9-10
June 15, 2009	Tysons Central 123 North Central	11-12 13



# **Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary**

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

## **Discussion on Draft Criteria for Demonstration Projects**

Committee members had reviewed the May 6 version of this document, and made the following suggestions. Clark Tyler asked that a sentence be added to Selection Criterion #1 stating, "Circulators must have direct, convenient and visible access to station landing sites."

Committee members asked that criterion #3 be reworded to reflect the possibility that only one demonstration project might be selected. If a second location or project can be evaluated, the committee requests that it be located along a circulator route and that the project be mostly residential in nature.

Wade Smith asked if the Metro stations were being designed to permit second entrances at opposite ends of their platforms. Sterling Wheeler indicated that he would check with Rick Stevens of the Dulles Rail Project staff to find out.

## **Discussion of District Recommendations**

*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.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Irfan Ali  
George Barker  
Jo Hodgkin  
Stella Koch  
Michelle Krockner  
Wade Smith  
Clark Tyler

Members Absent:

Janyce Hedetniemi  
Brenda Krieger  
Bill Lecos  
Keith Turner  
Kohann Williams

# **Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary**

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

## **Updates**

George Barker reported on his presentations to the PC Tysons Corner Committee on May 27, 2009, on Stormwater Management and Urban Design. The committee approved the revisions to the stormwater management text as drafted by the work group.

Brenda Krieger thanked DPZ staff for their cooperation with the Urban Design panel. She stated that the next step will be to decide how much detail on Urban Design should be included in the Areawide and District sections of the Plan text.

Sterling Wheeler asked if Urban Design could be on the PC Committee's agenda for June 18, as their July 1 agenda is already full. The PC Committee's other meeting dates that month are July 16 and July 22.

Mr. Wheeler also reported that the PC Committee approved on May 27 and the Planning Commission accepted on May 28 the Criteria for Demonstration Projects at Tysons. He noted that the final version of these criteria reflected some of the DRC's concerns, including deleting reference to minimum acreage. Staff will email DRC members the approved version of the criteria.

Keith Turner announced that on June 1 the Board of Supervisor approved funding for three major Tysons-related transportation studies: one on the grid of streets, one on the circulator, and one on a station access management program. Wade Smith asked if the TMAG group was related to the latter study, and the consensus was that it will be a group of citizens advising the county on station management access.

Mr. Smith also announced that the Fairfax Connector was currently studying bus routes in and out of Tysons. George Barker explained that FCDOT has about 13 studies now underway. Mr. Barker offered to check with staff on the status of the Tysons-related studies to report back to the DRC. He will also ask FCDOT staff to brief the DRC when study results become available.

Brenda Krieger asked that Mr. Barker suggest to FCDOT staff that they talk with staff in the D.C. government about their successful circulator system that runs in traffic.

Keith Turner announced that FCDOT is holding a briefing for landowners on June 2 from 6 to 8 pm on the plans for extending Greensboro Drive and Boone

Boulevard. This briefing will be held at the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project offices. Wade Smith asked about the study of ramps and interchanges, and Mr. Wheeler explained that the firm of PBS&J is working on that study but has not yet released its report.

### **Discussion of Plan Text for Old Courthouse District**

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 Krockner 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.

### **Discussion of Plan Text for North Central District**

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.

Discussion of the North Central District is expected to continue at the June 8 DRC meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.

Members Present:

Irfan Ali  
George Barker  
Jo Hodgkin  
Stella Koch  
Brenda Krieger  
Michelle Krockner

Members Absent:

Jan Hedetniemi

Bill Lecos  
Wade Smith  
Keith Turner  
Clark Tyler  
Kohann Williams

## **Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary**

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

### **Discussion of Meeting Venues and Times**

The majority of the committee members were in favor of holding future meetings at Wolf Trap rather than at the Government Center. In addition, the suggestion was made that it might be more productive to hold four hour work sessions every other week, rather than two hour meetings every week. Linda Hollis will check with Jo Hodgkin about the use of a meeting room at Wolf Trap and get back to the members with proposed times and dates.

### **Discussion of Intensity Chart for Old Courthouse District**

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.

### **Discussion of Plan Text for North Central District**

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.

Discussion of the North Central District is expected to be concluded at the next DRC meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.

Members Present:

Irfan Ali  
George Barker  
Stella Koch  
Brenda Krieger  
Wade Smith  
Keith Turner  
Kohann Williams

Members Absent:

Jan Hedetniemi  
Jo Hodgkin  
Michelle Krockner  
Bill Lecos  
Clark Tyler

## **Tysons Land Use Task Force Draft Review Committee Meeting Summary**

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

### **Discussion of Meeting Venues and Times**

Tom Fleury suggested that the DRC could use the Library in the Park Crest condominium building at Tysons for its next meeting. The consensus was to have 4 hour meetings every other week. The next meeting will begin at 4 pm on Monday, June 29. When the location is confirmed, it will be entered into the public meeting calendar which is linked to the Tysons and PC websites.

### **Discussion of Tysons Central 123 District**

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 Tower 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.

## **Discussion of North Central District**

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.

The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.

Members Present:

Irfan Ali  
George Barker  
Jan Hedetniemi  
Jo Hodgkin  
Michelle Krockner  
Bill Lecos  
Wade Smith  
Keith Turner  
Clark Tyler

Members Absent:

Stella Koch  
Brenda Krieger  
Kohann Williams