

Board of Supervisors Development Process Committee

April 3, 2018

Government Center Conference Room 11

Board of Supervisors (Board) Members Present:

Sharon Bulova, Chairman
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 9:30 a.m.

Older Adult Accommodations and Services:

Donna Pesto, Deputy Zoning Administrator, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented an update for the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding older adult accommodations and services and other related changes.

Ms. Pesto presented the information why changes to the Zoning Ordinance may be warranted, the background information for existing provisions, outreach conducted by staff to date, and the proposals for both scope and timing for the amendments.

The amendment was initiated based on the 50+ Plan recommendation and staff experience and challenges with land use applications for uses related to housing, accommodations, and care/services for older adults. The current Zoning Ordinance includes only two categories: Independent Living Facility (ILF) and Medical Care Facility (MCF). Implementation difficulties arise when a single application proposes to blend both of these uses into the same development. Based on outreach and research, Staff has identified four main business models of adult care facilities: Stand-alone Medical Care facility; Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC); Independent Living Facility (with or w/o MCF on-site); and an age-restricted housing development with no enhanced care/services. Staff is proposing a phased approach to the amendment schedule. Phase 1 would create new CCRC District to specifically address developments that provide a continuum of care pursuant to an insurance-style contract. Phase 2 would address developments that include both ILF and MCF components in the same development and would also address adult health care center and senior centers. And lastly, Phase 3 would create a new age-restricted housing use.

Discussion ensued regarding how other jurisdictions are addressing these issues, the proposed timing of the proposed phases and immediate need for changes that are proposed in Phase 2. Staff indicated that outreach for both will occur at the same time, in an effort to expedite Phase 2 to be processed in the same timeframe as Phase 1, with preference to keep them as separate ZOAs in the event that the public process generates a delay in one or the other. Discussion continued regarding affordability, demand for these uses, the nature of the business models seen in today's market, and the need for the county provisions to be flexible to accommodate future trends and business models.

Ms. Pesto continued with the presentation of more detailed information pertaining to CCRCs, and requested specific input from the Committee regarding affordability; the relationship of the new zoning district to the comprehensive plan; secondary and accessory uses; development of the use in other P-Districts; and additional outreach opportunities. After further discussion, the consensus of the Committee was that there should be a baseline contribution to address affordability, including a preference for the construction the affordable units with the development, while recognizing the need to maintain flexibility to encourage the full range of development types and service models.

Discussion continued regarding the relationship of the new zoning Planned Continuing Care (PCC) District to the comprehensive plan, the consensus of the committee was to permit additional secondary uses, where appropriate, and to develop a conversion mechanism addressing density/intensity such that a Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not be required for every PCC District rezoning. Discussion ensued regarding opportunities for public input absent a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and it was noted that each application will require a rezoning, which provides for two public hearings. The Committee concurred that for areas that already zoned to a P-District, the creation of a CCRC Use that mirrors the principal use to be allowed in the new PCC District will appropriately allow these uses in an existing P-District, rather than requiring a rezoning to the new district.

Staff will continue with outreach and development of the proposed amendment text, with the intent to return to the Committee in July. Staff proposes to present the amendments for authorization in the fall, with public hearings conducted in the October-November timeframe.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 10:41 a.m.

The next scheduled Development Process Committee meeting is May 8, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.