PRELIMINARY STAFF REPORT
2004 AREA PLANS REVIEW

SUPERVISOR DISTRICT(S): SULLY **APR ITEM(S):** 04-III-8DS

NOMINATOR(S): Martin D. Walsh on behalf of TST Westfields LLC

ACREAGE: 50.99 Acres

TAX MAP ID NUMBERS: 44-3((1))15

GENERAL LOCATION: Bounded by Stonecroft Blvd., Route 28, & Westfields Blvd.

PLANNING AREA(S): **III**

District(s): BULL RUN
Sector: FLATLICK (BR3)
Special Area(s): DULLES SUBURBAN CENTER (Rt. 28 Corridor, Land Unit J)

ADOPTED PLAN MAP: Mixed Use, Private Open Space, Public Parks

ADOPTED PLAN TEXT: Base use: Office, conference center/hotel, industrial/flex and industrial use at average of .50 FAR. Two options are available for a Mixed-Use Focal Point near the intersection of Westfield and Stonecroft Boulevards. The focal point would allow a higher intensity with residential possibility. Option A -- Mix of office, retail and hotel up to 1.0 FAR with conditions; Option B -- Higher-density, mixed use, if transit station programmed into area

For complete Plan text: Area III Overview:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/planareas.htm
Dulles Suburban Center, Area III:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area3/dulles.pdf ,
pp. 1- 49 (Overview and Recommendations) & 117- 119 (Land Unit J)

PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT: Modify base use at .50 FAR to add residential and retail uses: mix of office/industrial flex/conference center

CRITICAL ISSUES:

Clarification of proposed development from nominator:

The nomination proposes the addition of residential and retail uses to the existing base plan recommendation for office, conference center, industrial flex at a .50 FAR. In a letter of clarification, the nominator provided the specifications for the proposed percentages of the requested FAR associated with these uses. The percentages include approximately 50% office/flex/conference center, no greater than 20% retail and approximately 30% residential, with the residential component consisting of approximately 350 multi-family units. In further communication via e-mail, the nominator explained that the development would include 400,000 to 600,000 sq. ft. of residential up to four stories, a maximum of 700,000 sq. ft. of office, 150,000 to 200,000 sq. ft. of hotel and 100,000 to 150,000 sq. ft. of retail space. The total would not exceed 1.2 million sq. ft., which is permitted under current zoning.

Extent of Language Proposed:

The extent of the nomination area is at issue. The nomination refers to the development of one particular parcel and notification required only for this parcel was provided by the nominator; however, the nomination does not specify the parcel number in the language of the proposal. As a result, the proposed language would affect all of the parcels in Land Unit J. If this nomination were approved without further clarification to specify Tax Map 44-3 ((1)) 15, the language would then apply to the entire surrounding area to allow residential and retail uses. As a result, this proposal would change the objectives for the entire land unit, which is primarily non-residential development.

Objective for Land Unit J for Mixed Use Focal Point:

The inclusion of multi-family units in Land Unit J at the baseline level would contradict long standing planning objectives for the area. The Comprehensive Plan envisions Land Unit J as a center of activity and employment, consistent with Westfields International Corporate Center. As a result, the current plan text already includes specific language in regards to residential development. The language is explicitly written in effort to create a mixed-use focal point in the area.

The specifications for residential aim to prevent the development of an isolated pocket of residential use within an area that is primarily non-residential. Both options for Land Unit J permit a limited amount of high-density residential development under certain conditions. The options create an opportunity for the incorporation of "mid-rise or high-rise buildings with a sufficient number of units to ensure a high-quality living environment with active recreation and other site amenities…" The Plan intends for a variety of employment and activity, which would generate different traffic circulation patterns and types of use.

The nominator proposes to include multi-family units up to four stories garden apartments within the residential development, instead of utilizing the recommendations for higher density, mid-rise or high-rise buildings. This proposal would decrease the residential density and would defeat the objective for this area. Four-story multi-family units would not support the urban character envisioned in a mixed-use focal point. Mid-rise and high-rise units could integrate other uses within them, such as ground-floor retail or office. This integration would create a more urban and pedestrian-oriented fabric, while the proposal for

multi-family units would create a less dense, auto-reliant community. The proposal would not contribute to the fulfillment of a transit-serviceable, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use focal point.

Impact on Schools:

The proposed Plan potential is approximately 350 multi-family units more than what could be constructed under the current plan. If these units are constructed as four-story garden apartments, the proposed plan would increase the enrollment by a total of eighty students: 48 elementary, 11 middle and 21 high school students. If the Plan proposes high rise multi-family units, the potential enrollment would only increase by 36 students: 22 elementary, four middle school and ten high school students. High rise units, like those specified in the existing Plan options, would generate 43% fewer students enrolled in the schools than garden-style apartments, proposed in the nomination.

The school districts that would be affected by this nomination include Cub Run Elementary School, Stone Middle School and Westfield High School. Both Cub Run and Stone Middle School are projected to be below capacity in year 2008-9. However, Westfield High School as well as neighboring high schools serving the Sully District currently exceed capacity and will continue to grow in the future. Although bond funds have been approved for expansions in these high schools, these additions will not provide sufficient capacity to accommodate students generated by the proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan.

The subject area is not directly connected to any other residential area. As a result, no school bus routes may be serving the area directly. If the nomination is approved, it may be difficult to provide efficient school bus service to potential residential development located on this site.

Environment constraints:

RPA and EQC: A Resource Protection Area and an Environmental Quality Corridor are present on the site. The RPA, an unnamed tributary to Flatlick Branch which is part of the Cub Run watershed, is located in the central and western portion of the subject property. Any area noted as an RPA may also be part of an EQC. The Virginia Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and Fairfax County's Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance recognize these lands as environmentally sensitive and floodplains. The boundaries indicate areas upon which no building should occur, and the areas that have been cleared in the past potentially should be restored.

Hydric Soils: Hydric soils may be also present on this site. These soils may indicate the presence of wetlands on this site and are not limited to the boundary of the RPA or the EQC.

Traffic Noise: The transportation generated by Rt. 28 (Sully Road) may affect the subject property. Noise studies would be required for any noise sensitive uses, such as residential development, to determine the extent of impacts dependent upon where this development occurs.

Airport Noise: According to the latest noise impact contours for Dulles Airport, the subject property is not directly affected by noise levels above 60 dBA DNL. However, the property is adjacent to this noise contour, and it would be necessary to provide notification to future property owners on the subject property as recommended in the Policy Plan.

Transportation

Development Potential and Transportation Imbalance: The Comprehensive Plan describes the imbalance in the Dulles Suburban Center between the zoned development potential of the area and the road capacity of the Countywide Transportation Plan. The Comprehensive Plan describes the adequacy of roads to meet the traffic demand in the area only for the next 10 to 15 years, based upon construction of the planned systems. In order to decrease the imbalance of zoned versus planned land use, the Comprehensive Plan indicates that certain land use strategies should be enacted. These strategies include "planning for uses which generate fewer peak-hour trips than office development, discouraging land use sprawl, and encouraging higher intensity multi-use "nodes of development" that are better served by transit and transit- friendly project planning" (9, *Dulles Suburban Center, Area III, Comprehensive Plan*). The adopted Plan within Land Unit J supports this goal with the mixed-use focal point. It assigns specific land uses to generate fewer trips by automobile and recommends transit and pedestrian-oriented development.

Trip generation: The Plan establishes a performance based strategy for development in this area that provides the opportunity for a broader range of uses if it can be clearly demonstrated that the uses will have lesser peak hour impacts than would be generated if the site were developed at the baseline Plan recommendation. However, the nomination proposes a wide range of land uses, which create too many possible trip generation scenarios to determine a *clear* demonstration that the proposed uses will have lesser peak hour impacts. The nominator should clarify the land uses further in order to provide a more precise scenario.

In order to gain some understanding of what the proposal may generate, several "worse case in" (heavy office square footage) and "worse case out" (heavy residential square footage) scenarios were analyzed. The scenarios estimate different combination of retail, residential, office and hotel uses. The trip generation estimates assume a maximum of 1.2 million square feet, with no more than 600,000 sq. ft. residential, no more than 700,000 sq. ft. office, no more than 200,000 sq. ft. hotel, and no more than 150,000 sq. ft. retail use. Under all of these scenarios, AM Peak Hour Out and PM Peak Hour In are greater than the base plan, while AM Peak Hour In and PM Peak Hour Out are less than the base Plan.

The scenarios also estimate vehicle travel per day (vpd). One scenario incorporates the maximum proposed office, and another scenario estimates the maximum proposed residential, both of which include all possible uses of retail, hotel, residential and office. In these scenarios, the number of vehicles per day would be significantly greater than the base Plan. In two other scenarios, which analyze the maximum office with the remaining space used as residential and vice versa, the vpd trip generation would be slightly less than the base Plan.

In order to prevent misinterpretation of the data for trip generation, it is important to keep in mind the significant difference in the base Plan and the plan options that renders the nomination unsuitable for this comparison. Please note that the plan options permit 1.0 and 1.5 FAR, and the base Plan and the nomination request only 0.50 FAR. The allowed density of the options significantly increases the trip generation in comparison to the 0.50 FAR, and therefore, the comparison of these options with the base Plan and the estimated scenarios is inappropriate with their different standards.

PRELIMINARY STAFF RECOMMENDATION

_____ Approve Nomination as submitted
_____ Approve Staff Alternative
__X__ Retain Adopted Plan

The nomination to add residential and retail uses to the existing base plan for Land Unit J does not provide a better alternative than the adopted Plan. The nomination would have a significant impact on the entire area that would contradict the goals envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Even though the nomination referred to one particular parcel and the nominator notified that specific area, the proposed language would affect the entire Land Unit. The nomination would also contradict the objectives of the areas as a mixed-used focal point with a pedestrian and transit-friendly design, which would decrease the traffic demand of the area. In addition, the nomination would amplify the existing problem of school over capacity and negatively impact the environmental features of the area. With these considerations in mind, staff recommends retention of the adopted Plan.