

Board of Supervisors Development Process Committee

October 23, 2018

Government Center Conference Room 11

Board of Supervisors (Board) Members Present:

Sharon Bulova, Chairman
Penelope Gross, Mason District (Vice Chairman)
John Cook, Braddock District
John Foust, Dranesville District
Pat Herrity, Springfield District
Jeff McKay, Lee District
Catherine Hudgins, Hunter Mill District
Kathy Smith, Sully District (Committee Chair)
Linda Smyth, Providence District
Dan Storck, Mount Vernon District

The Development Process Committee (Committee) meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m.

Appendix Q Amendment:

William (Bill) D. Hicks, Director, Land Development Services (LDS), began with a discussion of the Developing News quarterly newsletter published by the development process agencies, including the article on the changes to the Residential Use Permit (RUP) and certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Hicks and Michael Peter, Manager, Financial Management Branch, LDS, presented proposed amendments to Appendix Q in preparation of a transition to electronic plan review. The building plan types that will be part of the initial electronic plan implementation are currently processed in ways similar to the electronic plan review process. Site plans, however, necessitated some process and fee changes. The current site plan review and fee structures are based on a process that employs the use of inserts to replace plan pages that require edits, and this includes a fee for those inserts. However, the electronic plan review software does not accommodate changes to individual sheets. The electronic system is based on review cycles, and requires the entire plan to be uploaded each time, with the system recognizing what was changed from the last upload. The proposed fee structure moves site plans to review cycles without those inserts and focuses on reaching plan approval by the third review (signature plan set submission). A digitization fee is proposed for those plans that are submitted in paper, where the County would digitize the paper plan and enter it into the electronic plan review system. The goal for these fee changes is to be as close to cost and revenue neutral as possible.

In response to a question about why the goal is to be cost neutral, Mr. Hicks described the benefits to the submitting engineers and the cost of producing the plans, as well as the benefit to the County

review in providing concurrent and more efficient reviews. County Executive Bryan Hill also described the added benefit of shortening review times, and the reduction of the queue that will be efficient and cost saving. A Technology Fee Surcharge is proposed to build reserve for future replacement of technology systems. Discussion ensued on the anticipated reduction in time to review, and the lack of the ability of the system to accept inserts.

Mr. Hicks described additional proposed housekeeping changes to Appendix Q, including the calculation of certain site inspection fees and a proposed fee for landscape deferrals. The schedule is for public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board in the winter, to be adopted and effective in the spring of 2019.

LDS Metrics and Time to Market:

Bill Hicks presented on the LDS metrics on time to market. Industry considers all the time from initial concept to completion of the construction and final occupancy as the time to market. LDS, however, has focused on the segments of the process that are under the control of the County, i.e., plan and bond review and approval and permit issuance. Mr. Hicks presented information and examples regarding the amount of calendar days the plans were under review by the county and the time with the customer, and the number of submissions to obtain approval. Discussion ensued regarding the percentage of site plans that are approved with one or two submittals, and the difference between Designated Plans Examiner (DPE) and non-DPE plans. Mr. Hicks indicated he would provide clarification of the graphs in a subsequent e-mail.

Mr. Hicks continued with the presentation on building plan review data regarding tenant fit-out, single family homes, restaurant, and mixed use. Discussion ensued related to goals, deadlines and expectations for plan review times. Mr. Hicks concluded with the next steps to use technology to improve metrics and level of service.

Discussion ensued regarding the scope and extent of the data, other jurisdictions, quality of plans and communication between applicants and engineers.

Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and Related Amendments:

Jerry Stonefield, Site Code Research and Development Branch, LDS, described proposed amendments to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation, Subdivision, and Zoning Ordinances and the Public Facilities Manual to require a delineation of the buildable area on plans of development, in response to the compliance review by the Department of Environmental Quality. In addition, the proposed amendment includes adding running bamboo to the list of noxious weeds, and other editorial corrections.

Discussion ensued regarding the current practices used by submitting engineers to show compliance with the requirements and methods of outreach, and the reasons for the code amendment.

The proposed amendments will be presented at the October 30, 2018 Board meeting for Authorization, with public hearings before the Planning Commission on December 5, 2018 and before the Board on January 22, 2019.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

The next scheduled Development Process Committee meeting is December 11, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.