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SUBJECT PROPERTY
Current Plan: Residential use at 3-4 dwelling units per acre.

Original Proposed Plan: Mix of residential uses, up to approximately 275 dwelling units, and up to 20,000 gross square feet of retail uses. Retail development may be increased up to 70,000 square feet to accommodate a retail anchor, such as a grocery store.

Current Proposal: Mix of residential uses, up to approximately 212 dwelling units, and up to 20,000 gross square feet of retail uses.
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BACKGROUND

On October 20, 2015, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (Board) authorized Plan Amendment (PA) 2015-IV-RH1 for Tax Map Parcels 91-2((1))35A and 35B, (Parcel 35A and Parcel 35B) located northeast of the South Van Dorn Street and Kingstowne Village Parkway intersection within the RH4-Lehigh Community Planning Sector of the Rose Hill Planning District in the Lee District. The subject area is currently developed with Topgolf, a recreational facility with a high-tech golf driving range and an eating establishment. An opportunity exists to plan the site with land uses that would be similar to the established residential communities to the east of the site, provide community amenities, and provide a strengthened connection to the Kingstowne Towne Center.

The Board authorized staff to consider an amendment to the adopted Comprehensive Plan (Plan) guidance for a mix of residential uses consisting of up to approximately 275 residential units and up to 20,000 gross square feet of retail uses. The Board also directed staff to consider that the retail development may be increased up to 70,000 gross square feet to accommodate an appropriate retail anchor, such as a grocery store. In addition, the Board authorization indicates that the Plan amendment should examine transportation, schools, parks, and other impacts while planning for a high-quality design and ensuring compatible transitions for the site. During the review process, the property owner reduced the residential component of the proposal to include a maximum of 212 residential units and limited the retail component to 20,000 square feet of retail uses.

The review of the Plan amendment is concurrent with Rezoning/Final Development Plan application RZ/FDP 2018-LE-009 submitted on Parcel 35A to rezone the property from the PDH-4 District, (planned development housing district at a density up to 4 dwelling units per acre du/ac) and the R-1 District, (residential district at a density up to 1 du/ac) to the PDH-12 District, (planned development housing district at a density up to 12 du/ac), to accommodate 212 dwelling units and 20,000 square feet of commercial use (as of August 2019). The most recent concept plan is included in Attachment I. This is included for illustrative purposes and may change during the review of the application. Any recommendation for this Plan amendment should not be construed as a favorable recommendation by the Board, the Planning Commission, or staff on the proposed zoning applications and does not relieve the applicant from compliance with the provisions of all applicable ordinances, regulations, and adopted standards.

CHARACTER OF THE SITE

The 17.4-acre subject area is located along the east side of South Van Dorn Street near the South Van Dorn Street and Kingstowne Village Parkway intersection and consists of two parcels; Parcel 35A contains 17.1 acres and is developed with a Topgolf golf driving range, miniature golf course, clubhouse, and parking lot; Parcel 35B consists of approximately 0.28 acre and is developed with a Ruby Tuesday restaurant. The parking for the Ruby Tuesday restaurant is accommodated on the Topgolf parcel through private agreements. Nearly half of the subject area is covered by turf and impervious surface, with vegetation around the periphery of the site, as shown in Figure 1. The
site generally slopes down from the north, east, and west to the center of the site. The center and southern portion of the site are relatively flat. No Environmental Quality Corridors (EQC) or Resource Protection Areas (RPA) exist on the site.

The subject area and areas immediately adjacent to the site are planned for residential use at 3-4 du/ac within the Kingstowne area. The subject area is split-zoned R-1 (11.3 acres) and PDH-4 (6.1 acres). The area is located northeast of the Kingstowne Village Center, which is planned for and developed as a mix of uses as part of the town center and village centers.

Figure 1: Aerial View of Subject Area

CHARACTER OF THE AREA

The general Kingstowne area (Figure 2), in which the subject area is located, comprises over 1,000 acres in southeastern Fairfax County to the south of Capital Beltway/Interstate 495 (I-495) and to the east of Interstate 95 (I-95). The general land use recommendations for the Kingstowne area encourage a distinct sense of place through superior design. Residential densities are planned at a maximum overall average of 3-4 du/ac. A mixed-use commercial and community activity center/focal point is encouraged where the Kingstowne Towne Center is located to the southwest of the site. Additional guidance emphasizes the protection of surrounding stable residential neighborhoods through compatible use, type and intensity. Within the Lehigh Community
Planning Sector, the Plan divides the Kingstowne area into the Kingstowne Towne and Village Centers, the Kingstowne South Village, Manchester Lakes and the “Rest of the Sector.” The subject area is located within the “Rest of Sector” section.

A childcare center and funeral home are located to the north of the subject area; a church and townhomes are located to the northeast; and, single-family detached homes are located to the southeast, as shown in Figure 1. Across South Van Dorn Street to the west are single-family attached homes and a pond, and to the southwest is the Kingstowne Towne Center, which contains a mix of office, retail shopping center uses with large format retailers, a movie theater, a post office and approved but unbuilt high-rise multifamily dwelling units.

Figure 2: Lehigh Community Planning Sector: Kingstowne and Manchester Lakes

PLANNING AND ZONING HISTORY

The Kingstowne area Plan language was added to the Rose Hill section of the Plan as a part of the Planning Horizons effort in the early 1990s. There have been no plan amendments for the subject area since that time.

The applicable zoning history for the application property is as follows:
On June 17, 1985, the Board approved zoning applications RZ 84-L-020 and DPA C-448-2, which established the PDH-4 portion of Kingstowne, including a portion of the subject area.

On January 12, 1998, the Board approved zoning applications PCA C-448-16, FDPA C-448-31 and SP 97-L-051 to permit a golf driving range, ancillary miniature golf course and an eating establishment on the subject property.

On December 6, 2004, the Board approved zoning applications PCA C-448-31, FDPA C-448-31-02-01 and SE 2004-LE-015 to permit a change in hours of operation and site modifications.

ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map identifies the site as planned for residential use at a density of 3-4 du/ac within the Kingstowne area. The recommendation is also stated in the RH4 Lehigh Community Planning Sector of the Rose Hill Planning District. General policies for Kingstowne listed in the RH4-Lehigh Community Planning Sector, are cited as follows.


“Land Use

1. Promote a balanced, planned development community that will serve as a showcase community and future focal point of the county.

2. Plan residential densities within Kingstowne to a maximum overall average of 3-4 dwelling units per acre with bonuses, as appropriate. A balanced mix of housing types is encouraged in order to promote diversity and avoid the excessive development of any one dwelling unit type. A broad range of affordable dwelling units that meet the needs of all ages, family sizes and income levels should be provided. At any given time, the level of residential or commercial development should be related to the densities and character of adjoining properties, as well as transportation and environmental constraints, while recognizing the objective of achieving a planned mixed-use commercial/community activity center. Kingstowne should be developed as a unified element with additional parcel consolidation provided where appropriate.

3. Compatible land use and streetscape design should occur throughout the development, especially where Manchester Lakes meets Kingstowne.

4. Encourage a planned development with a mixed-use commercial/community activity center as its focal point. The center should operate much like a downtown area, with the residential, retail and office uses all easily accessible by public transit, by foot or bicycle, as well as by automobile. The center should include residential densities sufficient to support a major core area in conjunction with recreational and leisure activities, commercial retail, office, service uses and compatible high-quality industrial uses, such as high technology. This core, or town center, should be located at the South Van Dorn Street/Kingstowne Boulevard junction.
5. Protect stable adjoining neighborhoods through the use of compatible densities, type, design and/or natural features (e.g., trees, topography) which effectively screen or buffer incompatible or adverse uses.

6. Encourage neighborhood areas that exhibit a distinct character with clearly defined boundaries and setbacks so as to provide a unique sense of identity. Clustering of residential neighborhoods should be planned in order to accomplish this objective, as well as promote usable open spaces within a reasonable walking distance.

7. Promote an identifying theme for the entire planned development center to foster a sense of place including superior urban design features which should be a prerequisite to develop above the low end of the planned density range. Through the application of these design features, the relationship of all land uses within the planned community should exhibit an order, coherent arrangement of uses, identity and aesthetic/sensory appeal.

8. Ensure that the necessary public facilities are in place prior to the completion of residential or commercial development. Public parkland dedication and parkland facilities should be provided in accordance with requirements and standards set by the County Park Authority.

9. Any phased development techniques, if used, should plan the arrangement and relationship of uses, buildings, streets and other permanent elements so as not to preclude future alternative development considerations to achieve an overall coherent design.”

Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2017 Edition, Area IV, Rose Hill Planning District, as amended through 3-20-2018, RH4-Lehigh Community Planning Sector, Rest of Sector, page 62:

“Rest of Sector

Much of the rest of the sector is substantially developed in stable residential neighborhoods. Infill development in these neighborhoods should be of a compatible use, type and intensity and in accordance with the guidance provided by the Policy Plan under Land Use Objectives 8 and 14. The densities planned and approved for Kingstowne and Manchester Lakes are, in many cases, greater than those planned for the residential areas surrounding these developments. These two large developments were approved after extended study and careful consideration of their size and characteristics including the amenities and public improvements provided. Other areas adjacent to or near these developments are planned for lower densities.

Where substantial parcel consolidation is specified, it is intended that such consolidations will provide for projects that function in a well-designed, efficient manner and provide for the development of unconsolidated parcels in conformance with the Area Plan.”

“Objective 8: Fairfax County should encourage a land use pattern that protects, enhances and/or maintains stability in established residential neighborhoods.

Policy a. Protect and enhance existing neighborhoods by ensuring that infill development is of compatible use, and density/intensity, and that adverse impacts on public facility and transportation systems, the environment and the surrounding community will not occur.

Policy b. Discourage commercial development within residential communities unless the commercial uses are of a local serving nature and the intensity and scale is compatible with surrounding residential uses.”


“Objective 14: Fairfax County should seek to achieve a harmonious and attractive development pattern which minimizes undesirable visual, auditory, environmental and other impacts created by potentially incompatible uses.

…

Policy b. Encourage infill development in established areas that is compatible with existing and/or planned land use and that is at a compatible scale with the surrounding area and that can be supported by adequate public facilities and transportation systems.

Policy c. Achieve compatible transitions between adjoining land uses through the control of height and the use of appropriate buffering and screening.

…

Policy e. Stabilize residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial areas through the establishment of transitional land uses, vegetated buffers and/or architectural screens, and the control of vehicular access.

Policy f. Utilize urban design principles to increase compatibility among adjoining uses.

…

Policy i. Minimize the potential adverse impacts of the development of frontage parcels on major arterials through the control of land use, circulation and access.”

PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT

The Board authorized staff to examine an amendment for a mix of residential uses with two retail options in order to evaluate uses that may be more compatible to the surrounding established residential communities and to strengthen the site’s connection to the Kingstowne Towne Center.
The Board authorization directs staff to consider up to 275 residential units and up to 20,000 gross square feet of retail uses, as well as up to 70,000 gross square feet of retail uses to accommodate a retail anchor, such as a grocery store. The Board authorization also directs staff to examine transportation, schools, parks and other impacts while planning for a high-quality design and ensuring compatible transitions for the site.

As mentioned previously, the revised concept submitted by the property owner reduces the residential component to 212 dwelling units and limits the retail component to 20,000 square feet. The Plan amendment analysis includes discussion of the original and revised concept. The following table quantifies the existing development, the current Plan recommendation, and the proposed Plan densities.

Figure 3: Quantification Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Family Attached (DU)</th>
<th>Single-Family Detached (DU)</th>
<th>Retail (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club house, maintenance etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential use @ 3-4 DU/AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS**

This Plan amendment considers the subject area in the context of the larger mix of uses in the Kingstowne area and the extent to which it furthers the Rose Hill Planning District’s goals of creating compatible development in stable residential areas and striving for a mix of housing types and supporting commercial and institutional uses. Other considerations include the potential impact of additional residential uses and retail uses on the transportation network, schools, parks and recreation, affordable housing and environmental issues.

**Land Use**

The Comprehensive Plan’s Concept for Future Development recommends that most of the Rose Hill Planning District, including most of the Lehigh Community Planning Sector in which the subject area is located, to be developed as suburban neighborhoods to include a mix of allowable residential densities and styles; parks and open space; and, where appropriate, neighborhood-serving commercial uses, public facilities and institutional uses that are compatible with the surrounding area. The Policy Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Objective 8 recommends
that infill development is of compatible use and intensity, and that adverse impacts will not occur. Land Use Objective 14 in the Policy Plan elaborates on this notion by recommending compatible scale, transitions and urban design principles for infill development to achieve a harmonious and attractive development pattern.

The Plan for the Kingstowne area similarly recommends that any residential or commercial development within Kingstowne should relate to the densities and character of adjoining properties. Further, any redevelopment should have a logical layout, coherent arrangement of uses, and quality design, and should provide appropriate amenities and open space areas within a reasonable walking distance. This strong emphasis on relationship of uses highlights the need to ensure that any residential and commercial uses on the subject area are compatible with the surrounding area and serve as a transition between the higher density area within the Kingstowne Towne Center and the surrounding suburban area.

Residential Use and Density

The Plan amendment authorization considers up to 275 dwelling units (Scenarios 1 and 2, Figure 3), which would result in a density up to 16 du/ac on the 17.4 acre-subject area. The proposed 16 du/ac would be at least a four-fold increase in density over the adopted Plan recommendation of 3-4 du/ac, which would yield a maximum of 69 dwelling units. The revised concept (Scenario 3, Figure 3) proposes redevelopment of Parcel 35A with a total of 212 dwelling units, which equates to approximately 12 du/ac overall. The concept would be the maximum residential development potential on the subject area. This proposed density would be triple the maximum planned intensity. This level of development would need to be evaluated against other objectives, such as the provision of affordable housing, open space, buffering and screening, access and circulation, during the zoning review. A reduced number of units on the property may be warranted in order to achieve those objectives.

Retail Use and Intensity

Retail and other nonresidential uses comprise the existing uses on the subject area, and the plan amendment considers two scenarios, up to 20,000 square feet and, if an anchor such as a grocery store is to locate on site, up to 70,000 square feet. Suburban neighborhoods may include limited community-serving commercial uses per the Concept for Future Development and Objective 8 of the Land Use Element of the Policy Plan. The inclusion of up to 70,000 square feet of retail use to accommodate a retail anchor, such as a grocery store, would not support the Plan’s guidance to focus commercial uses within the town center. Larger retail uses, such as grocery stores, are located within a short distance in the Kingstowne Towne Center. Further, noise and traffic congestion along South Van Dorn Street would be greater with the 70,000 square feet as compared to the 20,000 square feet of retail.

The more limited amount of retail uses on the subject area of up to 20,000 square feet that is community-serving in nature would remain consistent with the suburban neighborhood area guidance. This guidance recommends community-serving uses, where appropriate, when compatible with the surrounding area. The type of commercial use envisioned for the subject area should accommodate uses that are designed to provide a unique experience for the
surrounding community and contribute to a sense of place per the Kingstowne guidance.

Parcel Consolidation and Design

Any development on the subject site should relate to the character and densities of the surrounding neighborhoods and any transportation constraints, per the Plan guidance. The development should provide a well-designed and efficient layout that reserves sufficient area for community amenities, open space areas and substantial screening to the adjacent residential neighborhoods. In addition, pedestrian and bicycle accessibility (on and offsite), onsite vehicular circulation, and parking along South Van Dorn Street should be addressed.

The subject area comprises two parcels, Parcels 35A (Topgolf facility) and 35B (Ruby Tuesday). Because of the central location of Parcel 35B, consolidation of both parcels would optimize site layout, design, and access, including opportunities to reduce or relocate the surface parking, improve circulation, and create useable open space throughout the subject area. Any proposed redevelopment on Parcel 35A under the proposed option without consolidation of Parcel 35B should ensure that the project functions in a well-designed, integrated manner and does not preclude future alternative development considerations that would achieve an overall coherent design on Parcel 35B.

Appropriate transitions and buffering to adjacent residences should also be provided, especially along the southeastern property line, to contribute to the high-quality design standard envisioned for Kingstowne. The maximum amount of the existing vegetation along the site’s peripheries should be preserved. Further, the retail uses should be oriented away from the existing residential uses to the southeast of the subject area.

Any proposal should provide a site layout and building design that appropriately integrates the mixture of residential and retail uses on the site through a unified site layout, creates a pedestrian friendly environment, provides ample open space and other, appropriate site amenities. The unified site layout should avoid adverse impacts to the residential uses on site, such as locating the rear of the retail use where loading and garbage areas adjacent to residential uses. The integration of the uses would also maximize the open space and site amenity areas and would help foster a sense of place for the site. Further, open space areas and amenities should be planned as integral portions of the site, not on residual pieces of land. Large parking areas for the retail uses should be minimized and, if provided, designed not to discourage pedestrian circulation within the site. A reduced number of units on the property may be warranted in order to achieve those objectives.
Transportation

Trip Generation

The transportation analysis for the Plan amendment analyzed the vehicle trip generation for the existing and planned uses, as well as both proposed retail scenarios (up to 20,000 square feet of retail and up to 70,000 square feet of retail) with the proposed maximum of 275 residential units (Figure 4). The adopted Plan recommendation for residential use at 3-4 du/ac (69 dwelling units) yields 739 daily trips. The dwelling unit type is assumed to be single-family detached dwelling units for the purposes of calculating the trip generation numbers for the adopted Plan.

Figure 4: Trip Generation Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>69 DU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>739</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Scenario 1</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily/Mid-rise (221)</td>
<td>187 DU</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes (220)</td>
<td>88 DU</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (820)</td>
<td>14 KSF</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (932)</td>
<td>6 KSF</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips Generated</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Impact Over Current Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Scenario 2</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily/Mid-rise (221)</td>
<td>187 DU</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes (220)</td>
<td>275 DU</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (820)</td>
<td>14 KSF</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket (850)</td>
<td>45 KSF</td>
<td>4,601</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (932)</td>
<td>6 KSF</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips Generated</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,998</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Impact Over Current Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>9,259</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Scenario 3</th>
<th>Quantities</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes (220)</td>
<td>212 DU</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (820)</td>
<td>14 KSF</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (932)</td>
<td>6 KSF</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips Generated</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Impact Over Current Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Scenario 1 includes 275 dwelling units and up to 20,000 square feet of retail use and generates 3,244 additional daily trips compared to the adopted Plan recommendation. South Van Dorn Street, which is classified as a minor arterial type B street, is already a heavily congested road during peak rush hours. The average daily traffic (ADT) for South Van Dorn Street is 32,000 vehicles per day. If this scenario were constructed, the average daily trips on South Van Dorn would be an approximate four-fold increase over adopted Comprehensive Plan. In addition, there would also be a large increase in peak hour vehicle trips versus the adopted Plan. There would be an increase of 221 AM peak hour trips and an increase of 178 PM peak hour trips.
Proposed Scenario 2 includes 275 dwelling units and 70,000 square feet of retail use, including a retail anchor, and yields the largest increase in trips for the site compared to the adopted Plan recommendation, with an additional 9,259 daily trips. If this scenario were constructed, the average daily trips on South Van Dorn would be an approximate twelve-fold increase over adopted Comprehensive Plan. In addition, there would also be a large increase in peak hour vehicle trips versus the adopted Plan. There would be an increase of 457 AM peak hour trips and an increase of 697 PM peak hour trips. Scenario 2 would increase the average daily trips on South Van Dorn significantly. The increase in the evening peak rush hour is of particular concern with the addition of retail uses, especially with an anchor such as a grocery store.

Scenario 3, with 212 dwelling units, no supermarket anchor, and 20,000 square feet of retail use yields would yield the lowest trips of all three proposed scenarios. The scenario would yield 3,165 daily trips greater than the adopted Comprehensive Plan. In addition, there would also be an increase in peak hour vehicle trips of 213 AM peak hour trips and an increase of 159 PM peak hour trips versus the adopted Plan.

Any scenario that yields over 5,000 daily trips should be accompanied by a Traffic Impact Analysis study (TIA) subject to review by the Virginia Department of Transportation at both the Plan amendment and zoning review phases to provide further insight to the overall traffic issues arising with the increased intensity on the site and develop potential mitigation measures. The revised concept does not include the 70,000 square feet of retail use. Due to the revision, a VDOT Chapter 870 Review was deemed unnecessary.

**Access**

The current access point to the site is the intersection of Kingstowne Village Parkway and South Van Dorn Street, which is located towards the southern portion of the site. The intersection currently operates at a level of service (LOS) B in the morning and C in the evening. The county’s acceptable LOS for the intersection is a LOS D. Although the intersection currently operates above county standards, the potential trip increases to this intersection could cause severe traffic issues for this intersection and the nearby roadways. A second ingress/egress access point should be explored with any redevelopment. However, a new access point may need to function as a right-in, right-out access point as new median breaks on South Van Dorn street are not advisable due to current congestion levels.

**Multimodal Circulation**

Other transportation considerations include transit service, bicycle facilities, pedestrian connections, and onsite circulation. The site is well served by bus routes, which includes bus service to both the Van Dorn Metro station and the Franconia-Springfield Metro station. Any redevelopment should provide enhanced access and connectivity to and from area bus stops in the vicinity of the site and ensure safe bicycle and pedestrian access. The Fairfax County Bicycle Master Plan currently recommends on-road bike lanes on South Van Dorn Street. Any redevelopment of the site should provide adequate right-of-way for future bike lanes, whether on-road, or an alternative, and should facilitate safe bicycle connections to the Kingstowne Towne Center and adjacent residential areas.
The Countywide Trails Plan (Figure 5) shows a major paved trail transitioning to a minor paved trail along the eastern and southeastern portions of the subject area. The minor paved trail is then shown to cross South Van Dorn Street and connect to the Kingstowne Towne Center. A stream valley trail crossing is also shown on the southwestern corner of the site. These trails should be considered as a part of the development design of the site to improve pedestrian accessibility within the area and increase the connectivity of the site to the town center. Pedestrian facilities should be designed to have direct access to nearby trails, sidewalks and bus stops, and to minimize exposure to vehicles. Enhanced pedestrian crossings are essential along South Van Dorn Street and at the intersection of South Van Dorn Street and Kingstown Village Parkway. Safe and convenient pedestrian connections to the Kingstowne Towne Center are especially vital. The onsite circulation of both pedestrians and vehicles should be carefully examined to establish a logical and safe onsite transportation network that also functions to integrate the retail and residential uses.

Schools

The subject area is within the Lane Elementary School (ES), Twain Middle School (MS) and Edison High School (HS) boundaries. The following school capacity chart (Figure 6) shows enrollment and school capacity balances.

The school capacity table shows a snapshot in time (as of January 2019) for student membership and school capacity balances. The five-year student membership projections and individual school capacity evaluations are updated annually by Fairfax County Public Schools. Recommended boundary adjustment options, program changes and potential school expansions and new schools are included in the Capital Improvements Plan for future consideration based on the most recent five-year projections and SY 2018-19 capacity evaluations.

Figure 6: School Capacity, Enrollment and Projected Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Program Capacity SY 2018-19</th>
<th>Membership (9/30/18)</th>
<th>Program Capacity Utilization SY 2018-19</th>
<th>Projected Membership SY 2023-24</th>
<th>Capacity Utilization SY 2023-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edison HS</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twain MS</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane ES</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacities and Projected Enrollments based on the adopted FY 2020-24 Capital Improvement Program (January 2019)
At this time, Edison HS and Lane ES are under capacity, and Twain MS is slightly over capacity. Lane ES is projected to be under capacity, and Edison HS and Twain MS are projected to be over capacity within the next five years. Beyond the five-year projection horizon, enrollment projections are not available.

Impact

The proposed Plan up to 275 residential units would generate 91 additional students compared to the adopted Plan for 69 single-family detached units. At the high school level an additional 38 students would be generated if the proposed Plan were implemented, an additional 18 middle school students and an additional 71 elementary school students. Figures 7 and 8 state the number of anticipated students by school level, for the adopted Plan and the proposed Plan amendment, calculated by using the current countywide student yield ratio.

The high and elementary schools are under capacity and the middle school is being monitored due to having a slight capacity deficit with current enrollments. The high and middle schools are projected to have a moderate capacity deficit and the elementary school is considered to have sufficient capacity for projected programs and growth with future by-right development prior to any plan change or rezoning to a higher residential density. With a plan amendment that proposes increases in residential density, such as that proposed in this Plan amendment, the enrollments at these schools would increase, which may negatively impact the instructional program to the detriment of the students involved if solutions are not identified.

**Figure 7. Student Yield Based on Current Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Proposed Number of Units (Single Family Detached)</th>
<th>Student Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8. Student Yield Based on Proposed Scenario 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Proposed Number of Units (Single Family Attached)</th>
<th>Student Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 countywide student yield ratios (November 2016)

Capital Improvement Program Potential Solutions

The FCPS Capital Improvement Program FY 2020-24 includes potential solutions to consider alleviating current and projected school capacity deficits. For consideration purposes, as many options as possible have been identified for each school, in no significant order, and may be
contingent on other potential solutions listed. Any options chosen for implementation will be discussed and decided through a transparent process with the appropriate stakeholders, in accordance with School Board Policies and Regulations.

*Edison HS:* Increase efficiency by reassigning instructional spaces within a school to accommodate increase in membership, possible program changes, minor interior facility modifications to create additional instructional space and help accommodate capacity deficit, add temporary classrooms to accommodate short-term capacity deficit; and potential boundary adjustment with schools having a capacity surplus.

*Twain MS:* Increase efficiency by reassigning instructional spaces within a school to accommodate increase in membership, possible program changes, add temporary classrooms to accommodate short-term capacity deficit; and capacity enhancement through either a modular addition, potential boundary adjustment with schools having a capacity surplus, or building addition.

*Lane ES:* Monitor student membership.

**Parks and Recreation**

Existing nearby parks (Tara Village, Dogue Creek Stream Valley, Manchester Lakes, Greendale Golf Course) meet only a portion of the demand for parkland generated by existing residential development in the service area of the subject area. In addition to parkland, the recreational facilities in greatest need in the Rose Hill Planning District include basketball and multi-use sports courts, athletic fields, playgrounds and trails. The Plan text for this area specifies that public facilities in Kingstowne, including schools and parks, should be provided. The Plan amendment proposal for 275 units could potentially add up to 594 individuals to the Rose Hill Planning District, generating the need for an additional 2.97 acres of local-serving parkland.

The proposal would also replace a private recreational facility (golf driving range) with the proposed residential and retail uses. Redevelopment could afford the opportunity to re-envision portions of the private recreation and the associated surface parking lot into publicly accessible amenities, such as open spaces or walking trails. Integrating publicly accessible parks and recreation opportunities in the overall development design would be critical to offsetting some of the generated need and enhance the desirability of the project, including through the creation of a sense of place. The inclusion of recreational amenities and useable open space should be part of any redevelopment in order meet the increased demands created by the proposed Plan amendment.

**Environment**

**Vegetation**

The site contains some high-quality upland hardwood forest on the western and eastern sides of the site. Retaining high quality tree areas would be an environmental and aesthetic asset for any redevelopment and would also serve as transitional screening as mentioned in the Land Use section. A majority of the landscaping that exists along the periphery of the site appears to have been provided as transitional screening and is in relatively good condition. This vegetation should
be preserved where possible. Preserving these tree areas would also help to buffer the retail uses from the surrounding residential areas, if the retail use is located along the periphery of the site.

Soils

A geotechnical study is recommended to determine the stability and foundation support for new construction. The geotechnical study should be submitted as a part of any zoning application in order to determine the potential impacts to the overall development concept.

Stormwater Management

The subject area is currently served by existing, nearby stormwater management facilities. However, changes in the county’s Stormwater Management Ordinance have occurred since the development of those facilities. The revised Stormwater Management Ordinance may require additional onsite facilities to address runoff quantity and/or quality control. The Policy guidance of the Comprehensive Plan encourages additional measures even if they are not required by current regulatory standards such as the use of innovative Best Management Practices including stormwater infiltration techniques where appropriate and that meet county requirements.

Green Building Measures

The Policy Plan guidance also recommends that all new development in this area meet the green building guidance. Residential development could include Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification for Homes (LEED-Homes), Earth Craft or National Green Building Standard (NGBS) with the ENERGY STAR path. Those elements which are proposed for various commercial uses should pursue LEED certification for New Construction (LEED-NC) or LEED certification for Core and Shell (LEED-CS) or other similar measures and would be addressed during the development review.

Noise

South Van Dorn Street is a heavily traveled roadway with a mix of vehicle types. As such, transportation-generated noise could affect residential units that are located close to South Van Dorn Street. This potential noise impact should be assessed and possible noise mitigation techniques identified and implemented during the zoning review process.

CONCLUSION

The Plan amendment considers the opportunity for increased residential density with ancillary retail uses and an option to increase the retail square footage to accommodate a retail anchor, such as a grocery store. Replacing the existing recreational use with primarily residential use would result in potential redevelopment more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods than the existing use, if designed appropriately to transition to the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, with the provision of adequate open space and site amenities, and consideration given to
reducing surface parking and relocating parking into structures and/or underground, a limited amount of retail uses could provide convenient access to community-serving uses.

Staff is concerned that the increase in vehicle trips by the proposed redevelopment would create an adverse impact on the South Van Dorn Street and Kingstowne Village Parkway intersection and add heavy traffic volume to the already congested South Van Dorn Street corridor. As shown in the transportation analysis, implementation of either option would likely result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips than the adopted Plan. The option that includes a retail anchor would produce more than twice the amount of trips than a proposal without a retail anchor. Therefore, staff does not support the addition of an anchor on the site. Any development proposal would need to ensure that impacts to roadways are mitigated to an acceptable standard.

A reduced development density from the maximum 275 units authorized (approximately 16 du/ac) to an alternative density up to 12 du/ac inclusive of bonus density for affordable units and a limited amount of retail use would have a lesser impact on vehicle trips, would be more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods, and would less likely compete with commercial development in the Kingstowne Towne Center.

Providing limited retail uses within walking distance to nearby residential areas is in line with the policies for suburban neighborhoods. Plan guidance should recommend the mitigation of negative impacts, encourage the consideration of offsite transportation improvements or a reduction in development. With any option, the redevelopment should consist of a high-quality design with open space and site amenities to integrate the residential and retail uses, and to foster a sense of place. Onsite circulation is key to the success of the development, and pedestrian accessibility within the site and to the Kingstowne Towne Center is a top priority. The development should also be designed to minimize parking impacts and reduce the conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, particularly in any areas where surface parking would remain. The development should preserve as much of the peripheral vegetation as possible to protect the adjacent residential neighborhoods from noise and aesthetic nuisances. Guidance regarding high-quality design, including the provision of useable and attractive open spaces, pedestrian amenities and buffering and screening to adjacent residential uses is recommended, and if this cannot be achieved, a reduced density should be sought.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Comprehensive Plan modification shown below. Text proposed to be added is shown as underlined and text proposed to be deleted is shown with a strikethrough. Text shown to be replaced is noted as such.

ADD: Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, 2017 Edition, Area IV, Rose Hill Planning District, as amended through 3-20-2018, RH4-Lehigh Community Planning Sector, Rest of Sector, new recommendation #58, page 62:

“58. Parcels 91-2((1))35A and 35B are planned for residential use at 3-4 dwelling units per acre. The following option for redevelopment may be appropriate:

Option: Residential use at a density up to 12 dwelling units per acre, inclusive of affordable dwelling units and bonus densities per the county’s affordable dwelling unit program and workforce housing policy, with up to 20,000 square feet of community-serving retail use may be appropriate if the development creates a high-quality, pedestrian-friendly living environment with a distinct sense of place. The development should include pedestrian and bicycle connections to the Kingstowne Towne Center and appropriately transition to the adjacent residential communities, especially to the southeast. Well-designed, usable open spaces and site amenities should be incorporated into the design and function as public places for people to enjoy. The following conditions should be met to implement this option:

- Residential uses are age-restricted units or units that are universally designed so that residents may age in place or can accommodate different ages and abilities.

- Additional retail uses are an integral part of the development and should be constructed as part of the first phase. The uses should be located away from the neighboring residential community to the southeast and designed in a manner to support pedestrian activity with parking integrated into the building. These uses may include restaurants, cafes, food halls, or other dining or entertainment uses. Drive-through uses are not appropriate.

- A variety of useable and attractive open spaces are provided, including a central open space that is well-connected by pedestrian walkways to all parts of the development. The maximum density may not be achievable if useable open space cannot be integrated into the development.

- The site layout and circulation plan enhance access and connectivity to the existing pedestrian network, including through the trail along South Van Dorn Street, and other connections to nearby trails, sidewalks and bus stops.

- Adequate right-of-way for future bicycle lanes, whether on-road, or an alternative, are provided.
• Transportation impacts to South Van Dorn Street and nearby intersections are mitigated. A second ingress/egress access point should be explored, which may need to function as a right-in, right-out access point. If such improvements and proposed mitigations are not possible, a reduced intensity should be considered.

• The existing vegetation along the periphery of the site is preserved to the extent possible, as a critical element of the screening to the adjacent uses. A vegetated buffer of similar size is provided if tree quality does not warrant preservation.

• Tax Map Parcels 91-2 ((1)) 35A and 35B are consolidated. Should consolidation not be achieved, any rezoning application should include an illustrative plan that shows potential integrated development for Parcels 35A and 35B for both interim and long-term conditions that would not preclude redevelopment on Parcel 35B in conformance with objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.”

**COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN MAP:**

The Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map will not change.

**TRANSPORTATION PLAN MAP:**

The Countywide Transportation Plan Map will not change.
ATTACHMENT I

CONCEPT PLAN