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C. Staff Cover Memo
D. Project Timeline
E. Towns and JLMA Supplemental
F. Responses to Requests for Information
STAKEHOLDERS MEETING
AGENDA

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

6:00 PM Welcome / Administrative Items / Information Updates
  • Introductory Comments from Committee Chair – Jeff Salmon
  • Meeting Objectives – Alaina Ray

6:10 – 6:30 PM Current Project Timeline
  • Staff Briefing
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

6:30 – 6:50 PM Revised Plan Outline
  • Staff Briefing
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

6:50 – 7:20 PM Policy Carryover Subcommittee Feedback
  • Staff Presentation
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

7:20 – 7:30 PM Break

7:30 – 7:50 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Presentation
  • Staff Briefing / Presentation
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

7:50 – 9:00 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Small Work Groups
  • Exercise Setup
  • Small Work Group Session

9:00 – 9:30 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Report Out

Important Documents

A. Agenda 02-20-18
B. Stakeholder Committee 02-05-18 Agenda Packet
C. Staff Cover Memo 02-20-18
D. Project Timeline
E. Towns and JLMA Supplemental
F. Responses to Stakeholders Committee Requests for Information
DATE:    February 15, 2018

TO:      Stakeholders Committee

FROM:    Ricky Barker, Director of Planning & Zoning

SUBJECT: February 20, 2018 Stakeholders Committee Meeting

As intended for the February 5th Stakeholders Committee (Committee) meeting that was canceled due to inclement weather, staff will present an updated Project Timeline and a Revised Plan Outline at the February 20th meeting. These items are important as they lay out the expectations for the Committee’s draft General Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan and provide the proposed time-frame for completion of the Committee’s work. Staff is also providing an updated version of the Towns and Joint Land Management Area (JLMA) Topic Paper based on additional feedback we have received from the Town of Leesburg. Staff has provided these attachments for your review prior to the February 20th meeting.

Staff has produced a revised project work plan to outline the remaining work for the Committee and to achieve a new draft General Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan that staff will deliver to the Board of Supervisors (Board) at the July 19, 2018 Board Business Meeting. In order to achieve this schedule, the delivery of the Fiscal Impact and Travel Demand Model results are now proposed for the Planning Commission (Commission) and Board review stages of the process. Production of the socioeconomic data needed for both models is taking longer than anticipated and will delay the completion of the model results until after May.

As an alternative to a presentation of the model results, this proposed schedule includes an opportunity for the Committee to receive a high-level staff evaluation of the fiscal and transportation impacts of the Committee's land use recommendations.

Preliminary Fiscal Impacts – Staff will provide the Committee with the preliminary fiscal impact information based on their proposed land use recommendations to provide an understanding of whether the Countywide net fiscal impact of the proposed General Plan is fiscally positive, neutral, or negative. This high-level analysis will provide the Committee the expected direction of fiscal results. Additionally, the Stakeholders will be presented with information showing the
relationship between the proposed General Plan and the current Revised General Plan. Outcomes will focus on whether the proposed plan is more or less fiscally positive than the current Revised General Plan.

In order to provide additional context for the Committee, staff will prepare a white paper to explain the role of fiscal impact analysis within the Envision Loudoun process, present assumptions and methodologies that will be used in the full fiscal impact model, and discuss the main “drivers” of fiscal impact results.

Preliminary Transportation Impacts – Staff will provide recommendations on a draft road network to support the new growth and development in the proposed General Plan. Staff will determine where changes to the planned transportation network might be needed as a result of the Committee’s proposed land use recommendations and how this new growth may impact the regional transportation system. Staff will also provide the Committee with a draft pedestrian and bike network plan and, in conjunction with Parks, Recreation, and Community Services staff, will evaluate where new regional trails and connections are needed within the community.

Staff has met with several of the Committee members who have expressed interest in the evaluation of fiscal and transportation impacts to explain staff’s proposal to present a high level evaluation of impacts. Staff is open to meeting with any members of the Committee who wants additional information on this proposed approach, or would like to generally discuss these topics with staff.

As part of the Plan Charter, staff provides updates to the Board of Supervisors about the status of the Envision Loudoun process and the work of the Stakeholders Committee. The next update to the Board is scheduled for February 22nd. This update will provide:

1. Background and Updates on Stakeholder Committee Progress
2. Status of Stakeholder Committee Land Use Recommendations for the TPA and SPA
3. Approach to Evaluating Impacts of Land Use Recommendations
4. Updates to Project Workplan and Schedule

As part of the status report, staff is recommending that a discussion of the Envision project be forwarded to the Transportation and Land Use Committee (TLUC) to allow for an update and to prepare for the subsequent stages of project review. At this stage in the process staff recommends that the Stakeholder Committee continue to wrap up efforts on their recommendations as they currently stand or as modified by the Stakeholders Committee up until completion of their phase of the project. In addition, information on the fiscal impact and travel demand modeling is being recommended to be forwarded to the Finance, Government Operations and Economic Development Committee to provide a more complete update and further discussion. This Envision Loudoun update staff report will be available by Friday, February 16th on the County’s website.
Project Timeline

- **Plan Drafting & Review**: Feb. 1 – Apr. 30
- **Public Outreach Round III**: May 14 – June 1
- **Milestone: Stakeholders Work Complete**: June 16
- **Milestone: BOS Presentation**: July 19
- **PC Deliberation**: Sep. – Nov.
- **BOS Deliberation**: Dec. – Mar.
Meeting Layout

March 5
Quality Development White Paper & Policy Review
New General Plan Chapter Review:
  Introduction
  Rural Policy Area

March 12
New Transportation Plan Chapter Review

March 19
New Transportation Plan Chapter Review

April 2
New General Plan Chapter Review:
  Natural & Heritage Resources
  Housing
  Economic Development

April 9
Constrained Forecast Results
Fiscal Impact Assessment
New General Plan Chapter Review:
  Built Environment/Land Use
  Fiscal Management & Facilities Implementation

April 30
Final Review of Complete New General Plan
Final Review of Complete New Transportation Plan
Public Input Meetings Format Review
Meeting Layout

May 14 – June 1
Public Outreach Round III
Open Houses & Online

June 16
Takeaways from Public Outreach Round III
Stakeholders Recommend Plan Revisions
STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE WORK COMPLETE

July 19
Board of Supervisors Business Meeting Presentation

August - November
Planning Commission Deliberations

December - March
Board of Supervisors Deliberations

March
Board of Supervisors Endorse Plan
VDOT Review Begins
Towns & Joint Land Management Area (JLMA) SUPPLEMENTAL

February 20, 2018
Prepared by the Department of Planning & Zoning
**Introduction**

In January, staff met with the planning staffs from most of the western towns to solicit their comments on the ongoing relevance of existing policies of the Revised General Plan. For the most part, the towns propose to retain and update many policies to ensure the programs that have implemented those policies are not discontinued. For example, the Middleburg staff propose to retain policies that support Town County cooperation on economic development and transportation matters. At this time in-person meetings have not been held with Hillsboro representatives. County staff continues to work with the town staffs to update the existing policies and develop any potential new policies, strategies, and actions. These revisions will be brought forward during review of the new Plan chapters.

**Town Staff Input**

The specific comments from town staff are summarized below.

**Leesburg**

- The Town has limited ‘greenfield’ land available for development within the corporate limits.
- Redevelopment in the Crescent District (area inside bypass/outside historic district) will be key to future economic growth.
- The Leesburg JLMA offers some development opportunity, but areas originally designated for non-residential (such as Tuscarora Crossing and Goose Creek Club) have been rezoned by the BOS for largely residential.
- The construction of Crosstrail Boulevard from Sycolin to Russell Branch Parkway is very important. Particularly with the proposal of the DC United stadium.
- The DC United stadium proposal has Kincaid Forest residents worried about traffic and noise impacts. Residents are also concerned about cut-through traffic using Kincaid Boulevard once it is opened up (this will happen when Crosstrail Boulevard connects to Russell Branch Parkway).
- The Town Council is in a difficult position regarding County facility expansion. On the one hand, the Town wants to retain County government offices and courts in Leesburg and continue to be the County seat. However, purchases of commercial buildings (largely at the Miller Drive/ Airport complex) has taken these buildings off the Town tax roll and further limits economic development opportunities. RGP policy talks about locating public facilities in the Towns. This is generally good but there is a tax implication for the Towns, particularly Leesburg with many County facilities.
- A developer has proposed to buy the Westpark Golf Course and hotel property and develop residential units on a portion of the property. Neighbors and Leesburg residents do not want to lose access to a local golf course. This is a hot issue right now.
- Affordable housing is an issue in the Town as it is everywhere in northern Virginia. Town Staff wants to amend the current ADU MOU with the County to expand the number of town ADU units that the County will administer. County staff are ok with this. However, Council is unsure about “encouraging” more affordable dwelling units.
- The Downtown is always a focus for discussion. Right now staff is working on 3 ZO amendments: food trucks, tents/shade structures, and reduced parking ratios. Re-use of historic buildings is often an issue with people wanting to open restaurants and trying to meet building and fire code requirements. Residential development is increasing which will help with ‘feet on
the street’. But there is competition for parking. Competition from One Loudoun will be a factor. Some small businesses in the downtown are being lured to it because there is plentiful parking.

- Over the past five years there have been multiple proposals from property owners to incorporate, through a corporate boundary line adjustment process, property from the county into the town. Town Council has had mixed opinions on each of these proposals. We continue to receive calls from interested developers and lately this has come from people interested in data centers. However, the Town does not have water capacity to service such uses. The area south of the corporate limits and south of the JLMA is where there is the most interest in this use.

- Growth management policies – the ‘greenbelt’ policies are dated.
- Public Utilities policies – suggest that prior to legislative or administrative approval of development plan by the County that a ‘will serve’ letter be obtained by the County from the Towns stating that utilities will be provided by the town to the proposed development. I believe this is a current administrative practice by the County and I think it would be good to add as a policy in the Plan.
- Transportation policies - #2. This policy should be updated. Yes, roads should be funded and built by the development community but I think we’ve found that public funding is also necessary to ‘close the gap’ to connect gaps in road networks.
- Leesburg JLMA policies:
  - Greenbelt policy seems dated and could be updated by discussing preservation of natural resources through conservation design.
  - Clarify how development to the west of Rt 621 preserve the rural character?
  - Update road construction references.
  - The Leesburg JLMA land use plan emphasizes non-residential development and the Town has viewed it as an opportunity for economic development. As such, there is currently a disproportionate emphasis on housing in these policies.

**Lovettsville:**

- The existing policies should be updated but retained.
- Continue to focus on development inside the Town boundaries.
- The amount of available land is significantly smaller and several large tracts are developer-owned – update policies to reflect Town preference for a hard rural-town edge rather than referring to abundance of town land.
- Strong interest in trail connections to a County system that connects the C&O Canal and W&OD trails.
- Continue cooperation on transportation and public facilities.
- Utilities have been extended outside the Town for health and public facilities, but no desire to expand that policy.
- Town does not envision townhouse or multi-family development.

**Middleburg:**

- Existing RGP policies are still relevant.
- Town is undergoing an update to their comprehensive plan with a Fall 2018 completion target.
- Middleburg has retained extra-territorial subdivision control.
- Middleburg prefers to retain a “hard edge” rather than add a JLMA.
- Pleased with cooperation related to transportation and traffic calming; the Town has been granted CIP funding for road and sidewalk work.
- Potential loss of school and the loss of a non-profit community center are concerns.
- Town utilities are in good shape as a result of commitments by Salamander Inn.
• Town is worried that its brand will be damaged by subdivisions along Route 50 that may eliminate the rural character or make it difficult for people to get to the Town.

Purcellville
• Purcellville is updating their comprehensive plan and expect to be complete in 3 to 6 months.
• Town supported repealing the Purcellville Urban Growth Area Management Plan (PUGAMP) because it specified phasing for annexation that conflicted with a Town proposal.
• Current RGP policies need to reflect updated status of road projects and elimination of PUGAMP.
• New Plan should reference the planned Route 690 interchange and the need for improvements at the Route 7 Bypass/Route 287 intersection.
• The Town is looking at less residential density and discouraging “low-revenue” uses such as parking lots, storage, and warehousing from locating in the town.
• Industrial land is limited to a few lots along Hirst Road and in the Mayfair Industrial Park north of Route 7 Bypass.
• Town seeking an alignment for trail connection between W&OD and Franklin Park.

Round Hill
• Town adopted a comprehensive plan in January 2017.
• Round Hill has extended services throughout the JLMA.
• Proposed annexation will include existing development along Sleeter Lake and Stone Leigh to resolve a use violation; issue for the town is balancing in-town and out-of-town water rates and overarching concern about losing small town character.
• Downtown revitalization constrained by community attitudes and a lack of space, notably for parking.
• Potential at the train station and old school for limited commercial and community center.
• Eastern and western commercial areas have been subject of debate over impact on downtown and desire at the eastern commercial area for “mixed use” [townhouses] and residential development.
• Town examining ordinance changes to accommodate short-term rentals and accessory units.
• Actively pursuing capital projects along Main Street, including the trail connection to Franklin Park and development of the Sleeter Lake park.
• Suggested opportunity to “merge” Sleeter Lake Park to Franklin Park to develop a more significant regional facility.
• Desire for a western community center to be constructed in the Town. Need for daycare, senior center, community center.
• Staff hoping to brand the Town as the part of the Appalachian Trail community by taking advantage of proximity to AP Bear’s Den and Blackburn trail stops.

Hamilton
• Town supports retaining most existing policies.
• Town exercises extra-territorial subdivision review, but has suggested the 1-mile extent be reduced to the JLMA area.
• Town has extended utilities and has water facilities in the JLMA but does not foresee expansion of the JLMA.
• Main Street improvements are focus of Council.

Hillsboro (Awaiting response from Hillsboro; summary provided by County staff)
Hillsboro is the smallest western Town in geography and demographics. It is constrained by utility capacity and topography. Conservation easements create a greenbelt to protect the visual character
of the Town. Like other western towns, the school plays a key social and economic role for the community and the potential closure is an ongoing concern.
STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Below is a list of information that has been requested from staff during recent Stakeholders Committee Meetings. Staff’s responses to these requests are provided in red.

January 22, 2018

Market Analysis

- For the jobs forecast, is there an effort to determine how many of the new jobs are “export” jobs (like data centers and other large companies) and how many are created because of more housing inside the County (like retail jobs, school teachers, etc.)?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: The Market Analysis forecasts the demand for development by first projecting potential employment trends by industry sector. Some of the twenty industry sectors predominantly consist of “export” jobs, whereas others are more tied to serving local demand.

  The Market Analysis then translates the employment forecast into demand for different types of development, such as office, industrial, and retail space. Employment within some types of development – office is an example – include both export and local-serving jobs. Even retail development will serve some people who are not residents of Loudoun County. For that reason, there also is not a clear segregation of export and local-serving development.

  To develop the constrained forecasts, the Market Analysis demand by development type is compared to supply. Thus, for the reasons stated above, the constrained forecasts and the fiscal modeling do not tie directly to assumptions about export and local-serving jobs.

- Is it possible to break down income and wages of the projected job growth?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: The constrained forecasts will provide development by type. These development forecasts will then be used to project employment and to assess fiscal impacts. While employment will be projected, employment by income/wage will not.

- Can you convert the demand to spatial dimensions of the unconstrained forecast? Will there be spatial needs assigned to capital facilities needs? In other words, can you tell how much land would be needed for schools, parks, etc. to fulfill the demand?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: Yes, the land needed for capital facilities will be estimated by the model. Capital facility and land requirements will reflect the needs of future development.

  Constrained forecasts (unconstrained demand adjusted for available supply) of future development will be entered into the fiscal model.
• What if the constrained forecast exceeds demand?
  o Answered by Leigh Anne King (Clarion consultant) during presentation
    The constrained forecast will not exceed the demand shown in the Market Analysis. If available supply exceeds the demand, the demand becomes the constrained forecast.

• Are there any deviation from FIC guidelines in the forecasting of the constrained plan? If so then, the Base Line Scenario will have to be adjusted for those deviations, correct?
  o Answered by staff during presentation:
    The Baseline scenario will be developed using the same process as used for the proposed plan. The Baseline scenario will be based on the Market Analysis medium forecast. This unconstrained demand will be compared to the supply available under the Revised General Plan. (The 2017 Fiscal Impact Committee Guidelines also is based on the supply available under the Revised General Plan.)
    Using the same demand assumptions from the Market Analysis for both the Revised General Plan and the proposed plan – medium scenario, keeps the comparison of results “apples to apples.” With this approach, only the differences in available supply under the two plans lead to differences in results.
    Deviations (based on the timing of development, for example) are expected from the forecast shown in the 2017 Fiscal Impact Committee Guidelines. These deviations will be explained.

• It would be useful to look at the criteria for the allocations of constrained growth; will the Stakeholders have access to the assumptions that went into the forecasting?
  o The Committee will receive a high-level staff evaluation of the fiscal and transportation impacts of the Committee’s land use recommendations. This high-level analysis will provide the Committee the expected direction of fiscal results and whether the Countywide net fiscal impact of the proposed General Plan is fiscally positive, neutral, or negative. Additionally, the Stakeholders will be presented with information showing the relationship between the proposed General Plan and the current Revised General Plan. Outcomes will focus on whether the proposed plan is more or less fiscally positive that the current Revised General Plan. In order to provide additional context for the Committee, staff will prepare a white paper to explain the role of fiscal impact analysis within the Envision Loudoun process, present assumptions and methodologies that will be used in the full fiscal impact model, and discuss the main “drivers” of fiscal impact results.

**Fiscal Impact Analysis**

• In terms of capital forecasting and capital facility needs, are we and/or should we be lumping the Rural Policy Area with the Towns and/or JLMA?
  o Department of Management and Budget Response: Yes, these policy areas will be combined in the fiscal model, since the focus of the plan changes are on development in the Suburban and Transition Policy Areas. Changes in planning for the Suburban and Transition areas could
result in a substantially different level of development (and thus different capital needs and fiscal impacts).

Since plan changes (if any) impacting the Rural Policy Area, Towns, and the Leesburg Joint Land Management Area (JLMA) are expected to be de minimis, the resulting difference between capital facility needs and fiscal impacts between the proposed and the Revised General Plan also are expected to be small.

• Has or how has Staff considered redevelopment in the fiscal modeling?
  o Department of Management and Budget Response: Redevelopment will be included, to capture additional growth in areas that are already developed, such as the redevelopment areas in the Suburban Policy Area. The net increase in development in these areas will be included in the fiscal impact model.

• Can the stakeholders committee be provided with examples of fiscal impact models / results from other communities?
  o Department of Management and Budget Response: Please find below a link to a Fiscal Impact Analysis Report prepared by Tischler-Bise for the City of Germantown, Tennessee. This report analyzes the net fiscal impacts, comparing results based on a plan change to allow for higher densities and redevelopment to results based on existing trends.

  This report provides an overview of how Tischler-Bise conducts fiscal impact analyses. Tischler-Bise tailors each analysis to the specific needs and characteristics of individual jurisdictions. The analysis that will be done for Loudoun County varies in two important ways:

  Loudoun County already has Capital Facility Standards and the Capital Intensity Factor, which can be used to project capital needs and costs. Tischler-Bise will incorporate this information into the fiscal model, rather than use a marginal cost method.

  This report compares scenarios for future growth only alongside scenarios that also incorporate the impact of existing development. The analysis for Loudoun will assess the impact of future growth only.

  It is important to note that a Fiscal Impact Model results will not be presented to the Stakeholder’s Committee due to timing constraints associated with the development of forecasts and the full fiscal model.

  https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/131503

• It the fiscal impact analysis for the Revised General Plan available?
  Departments of Management and Budget / Planning and Zoning Response: Yes. The 2001 Revised General Plan fiscal report and presentation were provided to the Stakeholders Committee in November 2017. They also are included with this packet The documents (G.3 Fiscal Impact Analysis of Planning Commission Alternative 2001 and G.4 Fiscal Impact
Analysis 2001 Comprehensive Plan, PPT 04-24-01) are provided on-line at the following links:
G.4 Fiscal Impact Analysis 2001 Comprehensive Plan, PPT 04-24-01

- Is there a new Capital Intensity Factor being developed for the fiscal analysis?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: No. The capital needs and costs generated by new development will reflect the most recent assumptions incorporated into the Capital Intensity Factor (CIF), going to Board of Supervisors’ Public Hearing in March 2018. These numbers will be adjusted to reflect 2016 costs, to be consistent with the rest of the data in the model.

- What about the difference between the CIF of 2017? How this that being accounted for?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: Please refer to question above.

- Is there a difference or delta of the CIF for the current Revised General Plan versus the new proposed plan?
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: There is not a difference in the capital assumptions per unit (CIF) that will be used. The same capital costs will be applied to the same types of development, regardless of whether that development occurs under the land use pattern allowed by the current Revised General Plan or by the proposed plan.

  The CIF reflects the anticipated capital needs and costs generated by new housing units. Because the CIF is directly linked to the impact of new development, it does not include the costs of any capital needs that currently exist, based on development that has already occurred.

  As described in the answer to question #5, forecasts for future development will be produced for both the Revised General Plan and the proposed plan, using the demand assumptions shown in the Market Analysis. The fiscal results, including resulting capital needs and costs, of the new development under each plan will then be compared. This comparison (looking at the “delta” between the plans) can be used to examine whether the capital needs and costs are significantly greater under one plan versus the other, and whether each overall land use pattern is likely to generate sufficient revenue to offset costs (both capital and operating).

- How are the deficits in current facilities based on the current Revised General Plan being captured in the fiscal analysis? To not do so would be a mistake.
  - Department of Management and Budget Response: The focus of the analysis will be on the impact of future development, comparing the fiscal impacts under the proposed and current plans. As noted above (question 3), the fiscal model will provide an estimate of the land needs, as well as the capital costs, to respond to the demands of future growth.

  Because any current deficits will be present regardless of how development occurs in the future, the costs to address these deficits are the same regardless of changes to the plan.
Existing capital needs are one of several competing priorities that the Board of Supervisors considers during its annual budgeting process.

• Will the County incorporate existing needs or shortfalls into the costs / impacts of the new plan?
  o Please refer to question above.

• When do we get to map the parks and public facilities?
  o Department of Management and Budget Response: Staff will bring recommended public facilities and parks plan chapters/sections which will include maps for the Committee to work on in future Committee Meetings, generally in the April 2018 timeframe.

  o Where are the variety of different proffers received by the County captured in the fiscal impact model?
    o Department of Management and Budget Response: Decisions related to capital and proffer portions of the model are currently under review and have not yet been finalized. At a minimum, the fiscal impact model will include capital facility proffers.
End of Supplemental Packet
STAKEHOLDERS MEETING
AGENDA

MONDAY, February 5, 2018

6:00 PM  Welcome / Administrative Items / Information Updates
  • Introductory Comments from Committee Chair – Jeff Salmon
  • Meeting Objectives – Alaina Ray

6:10 – 6:30 PM Current Project Timeline
  • Staff Briefing
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

6:30 – 6:50 PM Revised Plan Outline
  • Staff Briefing
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

6:50 – 7:20 PM Policy Carryover Subcommittee Feedback
  • Staff Presentation
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

7:20 – 7:30 PM Break

7:30 – 7:50 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Presentation
  • Staff Briefing / Presentation
  • Stakeholders Committee Questions / Comments

7:50 – 9:00 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Small Work Groups
  • Exercise Setup
  • Small Work Group Session

9:00 – 9:30 PM Suburban Policy Area, Towns & JLMA and Housing – Policies, Actions & Strategies Report Out

Important Documents

A. Agenda 02-05-18
B. Staff Cover memorandum for February 5th Stakeholders Committee Meeting
C. Policy Carryover Subcommittee Implementation Report 2.5.18
   C.1 Attachment 1 Jan. Subcommittee Summary Comments Combined
D. Suburban Policy Area Recommended Policies, Strategies, and Actions
E. Towns JLMA Topic Paper_FINAL
F. Housing Policies w/ Strategies & Actions
G. Responses to Stakeholders Committee Requests for Information
DATE: January 29, 2018

TO: Stakeholders Committee

FROM: Ricky Barker, Director of Planning & Zoning

SUBJECT: February 5, 2018 Stakeholders Committee Meeting

As we move forward toward the completion of the Stakeholders Committee draft General Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan, staff will present an updated Project Timeline and a Revised Plan Outline at the February 5th meeting. The updated Project Timeline will set forth the remaining Committee meetings and associated agenda from February until the Stakeholders Committee recommends its draft Plan to the Board of Supervisors.

At the February 5th meeting, staff will present a Revised Plan Outline that is more traditional than previous outlines. Staff will review the outline, explain the reasoning behind it, and gather the Committee’s feedback. Staff expects the plan will still achieve its objective of being user-friendly for staff and all other users.

After an extensive number of meetings and work hours, the Carryover Policy Subcommittee has completed its recommendations to present to the full Committee. The Subcommittee and staff have worked to significantly reduce the 1200 existing policies to a much smaller number and organized them in a more effective and useful manner. The staff and Subcommittee will be seeking your feedback to finalize these recommendations so they can be incorporated into the draft Plan document.

Finally, staff has a number of recommendations for the Committee’s review on three area.

1. Suburban Policy Areas – This topic includes specific policies, actions, and strategies to implement the Stakeholders Committee’s recommendations for the SPA.
2. Towns and Joint Land Management Area (JLMA) – This topic addresses updating the current policies for Towns. Staff will report to the Committee on February 5th regarding its meeting with Town’s staff on these policies.
3. Housing Policies, Actions, and Strategies - In order for the Stakeholders Committee to complete its recommendations related to the Housing Topic, it needs to review staff’s
recommended changes to the Housing Policies, ensure that applicable policies, actions,
and strategies from the current Revised General Plan are carried forward, and
develop/endorse any new strategies and actions.
POLICY CARRYOVER SUBCOMMITTEE (PCS) IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW REPORT

MONDAY, February 5, 2018

Prepared by the Department of Planning & Zoning

Background

Members of the Staff Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) met throughout late Summer and Fall 2017 to develop Staff policy carryover recommendations for consideration by the Stakeholders Committee. The STAC’s recommendations are located here.

The Stakeholder Committee formed the Policy Carryover Subcommittee (Subcommittee), on August 14, 2017, to identify existing policies to retain within Loudoun County’s New Comprehensive Plan. The Subcommittee was also provided the STAC’s policy carryover recommendations for consideration. The Subcommittee met in October to discuss the broad overarching policy for each topic area and requested to review the implementation steps, which took place in January 2018. The Policy Carryover Subcommittee reviewed the following topic areas:

- Rural Policy Area and Villages,
- Towns and Joint Land Management Areas (JLMA),
- Green Infrastructure,
- Growth Management and Fiscal Responsibility, and
- Redevelopment, Revitalization, and Infill.

On November 6, 2017, Staff presented the Subcommittee’s feedback on overarching policies to the Stakeholder Committee. The Subcommittee comments primarily recommended revising policies to remove redundancy, limit wordiness, and delete policies that have been completed or no longer necessary and supported the approach to categorize existing policies (for more detail see Nov. 6th Stakeholder Committee meeting link). The Stakeholder Committee confirmed and recommended progress continue on plan development.

The following information was provided to the Subcommittee for consideration during their review of the implementation measures in January 2018:

- Public comments regarding the topics from two rounds of public input sessions (see Public Input Summaries on Loudoun County and Envision Loudoun websites or links at bottom of document);
- The Board of Supervisor’s (Board) direction to only update and enhance the Rural Policy Area policies per the New Comprehensive Plan Charter;
- No specific changes have been directed to take place with the towns’ respective JLMAs, other than the Leesburg JLMA;
- The Board endorsed vision and goals;
- Stakeholder Committee’s objectives for each goal; and
- Stakeholder Committee comments on the respective topic areas from December 4 and 18, 2017.

Staff captured Subcommittee comments from each meeting in the form of summary notes that the Subcommittee subsequently confirmed (Attachment 1).

The County is currently seeking feedback from the Towns regarding the policy recommendations found in the Towns & JLMA Policy Topic Paper. The paper has been distributed to the Towns and County staff is currently meeting with staff from the Towns to gather input regarding the recommended policies, the status of the Town’s current Comprehensive Plans, and any key objectives and strategies. This feedback will be brought before the Stakeholders Committee for its consideration in the coming weeks.

**SUBCOMMITTEE COMMENT SUMMARY**

Below is a brief summary of the Subcommittee’s comments. Please see Topic Area Discussion Summaries in Attachment 1 for more detail.

*How to Read the Comment Summaries*

The General Comments section reflect Subcommittee comments with all topic areas. The topic area section provides a quick summary and identifies key recommendations, research findings, and pending research for the respective topic area. The research findings subsection, if applicable, presents the research requested in the first bullet with the Staff response in the subsequent indented bullet.

*General Comments*

The Subcommittee concurred with the STAC’s recommendations to retain the concept of many of the implementations measures but with refinement to the language. Several recurring themes emerged with the Subcommittee comments on the various topics, many of which are similar to the comments made on the overarching policies in October:

1. Eliminate redundancy with the existing implementation measures throughout plan;
2. Simplify long or complex language such as removing lists of examples in the text of the implementation measures;
3. Remove completed implementation measures;
4. Rework ongoing implementation measures to recognize the County’s continued efforts (for example, some implementation measures directed County agencies to establish or implement a program or initiative that has been done successfully and should be continued);
5. Define terms in the plan to reduce text and assist understanding (i.e., verify terminology used is up to date);
6. Revised language to be more positive and provide an active voice;
7. Re-evaluate retention of implementation measures that have not been implemented;
8. Rework implementation measures to focus on desired outcomes rather than just specifically stating the measure to take place; and
9. Add headings for the subsets of policies with each topic area to allow reader to identify specific topics quickly, as needed.
Rural Policy Area & Existing Villages

The Subcommittee found the vast majority of the revised and consolidated policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines pertaining to the Rural Policy Area (RPA) and Existing Rural Villages captured the original intent of the Revised General Plan policies. However, the Subcommittee recognized that the existing policies do not necessarily address all the current challenges facing the Rural Policy Area and Existing Villages. The Subcommittee acknowledged that the Existing Villages are a special component of the RPA and the Plan should be more explicit to identify the type of uses and design features necessary to ensure compatibility with the character of the individual villages.

Key Recommendations

- Revise policies to reflect that the RPA is an active area with multiple uses and not a static landscape to address current issues the RPA faces. Emphasize importance of maintaining rural character while accommodating rural uses.
- Reword policy to state that incompatible uses should not locate within the Rural Policy Area rather than directing their location to the Towns or Existing Villages.
- Develop new policies and implementation measures and/or revise existing policies and implementation measures that more explicitly address the uniqueness of the Existing Villages.

Pending Research

- Determine criteria for designating Existing Villages in the current plan as some other smaller “crossroads communities”, such as Willisville and Unison, are not acknowledged within the current plan.
  - The 12 Existing Villages located in the Rural Policy Area were identified in the 1979 Resource Management Plan and carried forward in the 1991 Choices and Changes General Plan and the 2001 Revised General Plan.
  - In order to move forward with the remapping of the County subsequent to the adoption of the Revised General Plan in 2001, the limits of these existing villages needed to be delineated on the planned land use map along with policies so that these areas could either retain their previously existing zoning or be subject to districts that reflected current parcel size, use and relationship to the village, and ultimately not be remapped to the AR-1 or AR-2 district.

Towns & Joint Land Management Areas (JLMA)

The majority of the Subcommittee questioned the necessity and feasibility for JLMAs given the amount of growth that occurred within and around some Towns. The Subcommittee recognized the Towns can be very different from one another and commented that the uniform application of general policies to all Towns and JLMAs does not address the differences e.g. growth versus limited development. Any individual policies should reflect these differences.

Key Recommendations

- Coordinate Town & JLMA policy review with the respective Towns.
- Reevaluate the purpose of the JLMA and its feasibility going forward. Revise existing policies and develop new policies as necessary.
- Consider land availability analysis to verify the amount of land available for development in the JLMA.
Information Requested

- The Subcommittee inquired to the enforceability of the overarching guiding principle that the County would encourage development to occur first within Town limits before locating within the JLMA.
  - The guiding principle is intended to serve as a foundational concept that policies and implementation measures are developed to support and promote. While the County cannot force a use to locate within a Town, the County can choose not to support a use inconsistent with the policies. This will inherently encourage development to locate within the Towns before expanding into the JLMA. The intent of the policy was to provide guidance for the appropriate location for uses inconsistent with the JLMA. The policy will be revised going forward.

Redevelopment & Infill

The Subcommittee and STAC’s concurred that the carryover implementation steps, as well as the carryover policies, need to be strengthened and improved, especially considering that greenfield development in the Suburban Policy Area has largely concluded.

The Subcommittee concurred with Staff that the term ‘revitalization’ is a substantial initiative to improve the quality of life and economic conditions of an area that has significantly declined and the term should be reserved for such circumstances. Redevelopment and Infill development, as well as Adaptive Reuse, are types of development that may support a revitalization effort, but are not necessarily indicative of revitalization.

Key Recommendations

- Clarify the compatibility of Redevelopment and Infill given that both are different and that market conditions that support each most likely may not support the exact type of development that surrounds the redevelopment or infill site.
- Develop policies to address Adaptive Reuse.

Pending Research

- Research of case studies, best practices, and incentives needed to develop new policies and implementation measures.

Growth Management & Fiscal Responsibility

The Subcommittee concurred with the STAC’s recommendation to retain the concepts and ideas of the Growth Management policies and implementation measures. However, the Subcommittee concluded that their review did not have the benefit of understanding the context of the Growth Management policies within the plan; specifically, whether ‘growth management’ is a standalone topic, as reviewed by the Subcommittee, or as part of many chapters of the New Plan as it exists in the current plan.

Key Recommendations

- Strengthen and improve existing carryover policies and implementation measures to better reflect the current legal and land development context. Guidance for proffer review should be included but tailored to the type of development, reflect the ULI report’s recommendations for mixed-use projects, and be up to date with recent proffer legislation.
• Evaluate phasing for urban, mixed-use developments projects be flexible and more in line with market realities while maintaining a balance of desired build out conditions. Current standards appear geared towards suburban, single use development patterns.

• Rephrase policies to reflect current fiscal terminology and practice.

**Information Requested**

- The Subcommittee asked if the plan structure will have Growth Management as a standalone chapter.
  - Staff does not anticipate a standalone chapter for growth management, but the structure of growth management policy discussion in the new plan has not yet been finalized.

**Pending Research**

- Enabling legislation for impact fees.

**Green Infrastructure**

The Subcommittee recognized that Green Infrastructure is worthy of preservation in all areas of the County, not just in areas where they can be effectively buffered; however, the manner in which Green Infrastructure is preserved in the various policy areas should be explored as preservation methods may be different depending on the character of each policy area.

The Subcommittee discussed the wording of several policies and recommended several edits to the policies and implementation measures for clarity and comprehension.

**Key Recommendations**

- Research and evaluate the benefits of buffers and buffer widths provided in the Plan, particularly the stream buffer, floodplain management buffer, and reservoir protection buffer.
- Research and evaluate alternative methods to protect water quality.
- Conduct research on best practices, including incentives to encourage preservation, and evaluate Loudoun’s current practices with the findings.
- Evaluate existing tree policies, natural heritage policies, Green Infrastructure policies to support open space corridors and connections to parks and amenities, and designation of County Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts within the Heritage Preservation Plan and remove any redundancies.

**Information Requested**

- The Subcommittee requested current County practices to protect water quality.
  - The following are current practices that the County implements to protect water quality:
    - Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) Regulations
    - Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations
    - Buffers for River and Stream Corridor resources for legislative applications
    - Riparian Buffer Planting Cost Share Program
    - Zoning Regulations for Resources
      - Floodplain Overlay District (ZO 4-1500)
      - Reservoir Protection Requirements (FSM 5.230.B.4)
      - Scenic Creek Valley Buffer Requirements (ZO 5-1000)
      - Steep Slope Standards (ZO 5-1508)
      - Mountainside Development Overlay District (ZO 4-1600)
• Limestone Overlay District (ZO 4-1900)

Pending Research
• Enabling legislation for a Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program and/or a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

Next Steps
Upon the Stakeholder Committee’s confirmation of the Subcommittee’s recommendations, Staff will begin revisions to the draft plan document. Staff will present research findings and recommendations to the Stakeholder Committee for consideration upon the delivery of plan chapters.
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RURAL POLICY AREA AND EXISTING VILLAGES TOPIC

Meeting Attendees
Subcommittee Members
Jeff Salmon          Joe Paciulli          Al Van Huyck
Kathy Blackburn      Lou Canonico        Chad Campbell
Chris Glassmoyer    Kevin Reudisueli

Supporting Staff
Pat Giglio – Rural Policy Area & Villages Topic Leader
Rodion Iwanczuk – Towns & JLMA Topic Leader
Joseph Carter – Policy Carryover Task Coordinator

General Comments
The Subcommittee found the vast majority of consolidated policies, actions, strategies and guidelines pertaining to the Rural Policy Area (RPA) and Existing Rural Villages captured the original intent of the Revised General Plan policies. However, the subcommittee also acknowledged that new policies and implementation steps (actions, strategies, and guidelines) need to be developed to address current issues the RPA faces today.

The Subcommittee recommended that the language and tone of some of the consolidated policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines could be revised to be more positive and provide an active voice.

The Subcommittee also recommend that any policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines that included phrases with "such as" and associated long lists of uses or examples be amended to reconsider the necessity of the list. Definitions should be amended and/or developed to describe terms used in the policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines. The Subcommittee also recommended that the policies include a header to quickly identify a specific topic (i.e. Rural Residential, Rural Economy) similar to the existing Revised General Plan.

Rural Policy Area
Policy 1 - The Subcommittee recommended the Policy be amended to reflect that the RPA is an active area with multiple uses and not always a static landscape. Emphasize importance of maintaining rural character while accommodating rural uses.

- The associated actions should use an active voice and could be consolidated into one action.
Policy 2 - The language referencing “reduce the need for additional facilities and services” should be reevaluated or reworded to more specifically address the desired outcome. Consider including the concept in the introductory paragraph for the RPA.

- The second action/strategy should be amended to better explain the reference to “rural design service” to describe current joint process with County Departments assisting property owners and prospective rural business owners.
- The third action/strategy pertaining to Rural Clusters should be amend to strike the last sentence referencing a variety of lot size and housing diversity.
- Strike “Incentives will be developed” in the fourth action/strategy for lot consolidation, since the type of incentives are not described.

Policy 3 - Eliminate list of rural economy uses, move list to definition. Add reference to rural tourism in the policy. Rewrite the policy to be more action oriented and general to focus on objectives, outcome, and evaluation of the Rural Economy to be more overarching.

- Actions and strategies should be measureable so that performance criteria can be developed.
- The fifth action/strategy should be amended to include the term repurposing of buildings for rural economy uses.
- The seventh action/strategy pertaining to County parks should be more direct and strike the word “may”.
- The eighth action/strategy is being retained as a placeholder to recognize and further enable the Rural Economic Development Council (REDC).

Policy 4 - The Subcommittee endorsed the policy but recommend the list of rural economy uses in the last sentence be eliminated.

Policy 5 - The Subcommittee endorsed the Right to Farm policy and associated action after a discussion about its necessity given enabling legislation and the benefit of retention for readers unfamiliar with State Code.

Policy 6 - The Subcommittee recommended the policy language of “uses incompatible with the Rural Policy Area will be located in the Towns and JLMAs” be eliminated and the policy be rewritten to emphasize concept that incompatible uses should not be allowed in the Rural Policy Area. Include language to better define compatibility of uses between the Rural Policy Area, Towns and JLMAs instead of stating that the uses must locate within the Towns.

Existing Villages
The Subcommittee agreed that the villages are a special component of the County and Rural Policy Area and the Subcommittee voiced some general comments that the policies, actions, strategies and guidelines for the Existing Villages should be more explicit to specifically direct design in these areas. The Subcommittee also raised the question if other crossroads communities such as Unison, Willisville, etc., which are smaller in size and not referenced explicitly in the existing Revised General Plan, should be considered. The Subcommittee also questioned how do we define village character or
evaluate appropriate scale and size as referenced in the proposed strategies and actions when the character of the individual villages are so different.

**Policy 1** - The Subcommittee endorsed the policy but recommended that Action 1 consider a different term other than “management plans” to reference the County providing assistance to the individual Existing Villages.

**Policy 2** - A Subcommittee member questioned why “rural tourism” was being specifically identified in a policy pertaining to commercial uses in the Existing Villages. After some discussion, the majority of Subcommittee members supported retention of the term “rural tourism” as Existing Villages function as focal points for goods and services for visitors to the RPA.

• The Subcommittee recommended that action two be rewritten to eliminate reference to village residents and commercial landowners.

**Policy 3** - Either amend or delete Guideline as the current language is not directly related to the Policy which only speaks to rezonings to higher residential densities and general compatibility with the Existing Village character.
General Comments
The Subcommittee had several comments that reflected the following overarching themes for the Towns & JLMAs policies:

1. Applying the policies uniformly to all Towns/JLMAs does not address the differences in growth that has occurred or desired with some Towns versus those that have had limited development.

2. The towns are different from another; any individual policies should reflect these differences. Towns with JLMAs are very different from the Towns without JLMAs.

3. The majority of the Subcommittee questioned the necessity and feasibility for JLMAs given the amount of growth that occurred within them around some Towns.

4. The Subcommittee inquired about the County’s ability to direct growth to occur within Towns when the Towns govern land development within their corporate boundaries.

5. A Subcommittee member suggested Staff inventory available land within the JLMAs to help determine the necessity of JLMAs policies.

6. The Subcommittee inquired as to the level of coordination between the County and the Towns and recommended coordination take place.

Guiding Principle
Subcommittee commented that this seems to apply to other towns not Leesburg.

Growth Management Policies
Policy 1, Strategy c – Clarification is needed about the meaning or use of the word “preferred” indicating support for locating commercial uses within the Towns.

- Subcommittee questioned whether this means commercial development should be located within the Towns instead of locations within the Suburban or Transition Policy Areas, or in other locations other than within the Rural Policy Area and
JLMAs.

Policy 2 – Clarify wording that the Towns are the provider of utilities in the JLMA and remove other language as it confuses the statement. Consider deleting reference to Purcellville JLMA.

Policy 3,
  • Actions C and D - The Subcommittee recommended transportation related policies be located within the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).
  • Action E – Cooperating with towns with land surrounding Towns seems vague. Explicitly note ½ mile from jurisdictional boundary statutory provision or delete.

Land Use & Design
Policy 1 & 2 – Re-evaluate the need for these policies. Subcommittee commented that these should be understood.

Policy 4 a. – Re-evaluate the need for the Design Guidelines.
  • Remove term urban as not all Towns are urban.
  • Consider deleting references about interconnected streets.

Individual Towns Policies
Consider deletion of these policies and reconsider need for separate policies for each town.
REDEVELOPMENT, REVITALIZATION, AND INFILL TOPIC

Meeting Attendees
Subcommittee Members
Kathy Blackburn            Joe Paciulli            Al Van Huyck
Chris Glassmoyer          Kevin Reudisueli         Chad Campbell
Lou Canonico

Supporting Staff
Kate McConnell – Redevelopment, Revitalization, and Infill Topic Leader
Joseph Carter – Policy Carryover Task Coordinator

General Comments
In general, the Stakeholder Subcommittee (Subcommittee) identified the need for the new comprehensive plan to increase the emphasis on redevelopment, revitalization, and infill (RRI) over the current RRI implementation steps (actions, strategies, and guidelines), as well as policies. When considering new plan policies, the Subcommittee recommended defining redevelopment, revitalization, and infill and recognizing the differences between these terms by developing applicable policies and implementation steps.

The Subcommittee recommended the language and tone of the RRI policies and implementation steps be more positive and encouraging of RRI. However, the Subcommittee acknowledged they were simply reviewing carryover implementation steps, so their recommendations and observations are limited.

Lastly, the Subcommittee recommended avoiding any policy repetition as the subcommittee identified the policy encouraging consolidation was also located in the growth management section.

Policy 1 Implementation Guideline
The Subcommittee recommended ensuring the intent of the policy and guidelines is to encourage compatible RRI projects, rather than projects with similar uses, densities, etc. The guidelines should be flexible enough to encourage and support new and innovative uses. The guideline criteria should also be evaluated for relevance and importance to achieving a compatible RRI project and recommended consideration of weighting the criteria.
**Policy 2 Implementation Action**
The Subcommittee recommended separating action steps based on private investment and public incentives. They also suggested identifying in the Plan which public incentives the County would support.

**Policy 3**
The Subcommittee recommended including parameters for “interim uses,” such as a definition and time limitations.
General Comments
The Subcommittee agreed that Growth Management carry-over policies are overall disjointed; Staff attributed this to the fact that the policies were consolidated from various chapters of the Revised General Plan. The Subcommittee questioned whether policies that pertain primarily to fiscal and budgetary concerns should be included in this topic area. The Subcommittee further questioned whether growth management would have a standalone section in the new comprehensive plan. If so, the subcommittee recommended more overarching themes, and suggested that they may be distinguished among Rural, Transition, and Suburban Policy Areas with broad policy goals identified for each policy area.

Policy Discussion
Policy 1 - Locate development in areas served by adequate public facilities, transportation networks, utilities, and other infrastructure in conformance with policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The Subcommittee generally agreed that this policy should be carried forward, but recommended removing circular references to the need to “conform to the policies of the Comprehensive Plan.” This applies to other policies with similar language as well.
- The Subcommittee recommended that policies that pertain to Towns and JLMAs would be better included in those respective sections of the new comprehensive plan.

Policy 2 - Facilitate efficient provision of infrastructure, public facilities, and services.
- The Subcommittee generally agreed that this policy should be carried forward. However, subcommittee members noted the vagueness of this policy and recommended that actions/strategies/guidelines be developed to clarify. The
Subcommittee also noted that the strategy pertaining to parcel consolidation should be revised to specify the subject (i.e. “who is doing the consolidating”). If it’s the developers’ responsibility, it was recommended that the county incentivize this strategy.

Policy 3 - Development proposals will mitigate impacts to transportation, infrastructure, public facilities, and services.
- The Subcommittee commented that, if adopted, impact fees should be implemented throughout the County rather than solely in the Rural Policy Area.
- The Subcommittee questioned the status of state enabling authority for county-imposed impact fees.
  - Is state legislation adequate for the county to adopt impact fees that meet growth management goals? The Subcommittee acknowledged Staff’s comment that this will require additional research, but noted that the findings be included in any discussion of impact fees included in the new comprehensive plan.

Policy 4 - The County will seek to maintain an affordable real-property tax rate by balancing, on a timely basis, residential and non-residential development in conformance with the overall policies of the Revised General Plan.
- The Subcommittee recommended that current phasing strategies and guidelines be reviewed for practicality and effectiveness and revised accordingly. Similarly, where appropriate, ULI’s phasing recommendations for mixed-use/urban development should be integrated into the new comprehensive plan. Generally, the Subcommittee agreed that phasing for provision of public facilities is important for growth management; however, Subcommittee members questioned the practicability of use linkages/buildout relationships between residential and commercial (i.e., phasing requirements to provide commercial uses prior to residential buildout).

Policy 5 - Public facilities will be located in areas with sufficient service capacity, proximate to the populations to be served, and in accordance with the County’s land use plans and fiscal policies.
- The Subcommittee generally agreed that this policy should be carried over.
- The Subcommittee questioned whether “Adopted Service Plans and Levels” is the appropriate terminology. Staff will research and update carry-over policies as necessary.

Policy 6 - The County will seek to meet the goals of an effective fiscal policy as stipulated in the Board of Supervisors’ Fiscal Policy originally adopted December 17, 1984, and as subsequently amended.
- Subcommittee members suggested that this policy may not be best categorized under Growth Management.
- The Subcommittee questioned whether the 1984 BOS’ Fiscal Policy is still operative. Staff will research and update carry-over policies as necessary.
Policy 7 - Central water and wastewater utilities will not be extended into the Rural Policy Area, except to serve public use sites.

- The Subcommittee agreed with the general concept of this policy but questioned the appropriateness of this being treated as an overarching policy.
- Subcommittee members recommended that this be treated as a Rural Policy Area-specific strategy rather than an overall Growth Management policy.
Meeting Attendees

Subcommittee Members – January 9, 2018
Kathy Blackburn  Lou Canonico  Chad Campbell
Chris Glassmoyer  Kevin Reudisueli
Joe Paciulli  Al Van Huyck

Subcommittee Members – January 11, 2018
Kathy Blackburn  Lou Canonico
Chris Glassmoyer  Kevin Reudisueli
Joe Paciulli  Chad Campbell

Supporting Staff
Marie Genovese – Green Infrastructure Topic Leader
Joseph Carter – Policy Carryover Task Coordinator
Bill Cain – Natural Resources Program Manager
Ryan Reed – Natural Resources Team Leader
Todd Taylor – Natural Resources Team

General Comments
The Subcommittee discussed the wording of several policies. The Subcommittee recommended several edits to the policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines that both the Subcommittee and Staff agreed were worthwhile to clarify and make policies, actions, and strategies more understandable. The Subcommittee also recommended several actions and strategies be combined to remove redundancies and remove those that are completed, not likely to be achieved, or the intent is captured elsewhere. The Subcommittee also discussed looking at the tree and natural heritage policies and the designation of County Historic and Cultural Conservation Districts in the Heritage Preservation Plan and reconciling any redundancies within the New Plan or the Heritage Preservation Plan.

The Subcommittee recognized that Green Infrastructure is worthy of preservation in all areas of the County; however, the manner in which Green Infrastructure is preserved in the various policy areas should be explored as preservation may be different depending on the character of each policy area. The Subcommittee recommended conducting research on best management practices, including incentives to encourage preservation, and evaluating Loudoun’s current practices with the findings.
The Subcommittee discussed the value of the Conservation Design concept and recognized that most legislative applications conform to this concept in practice.

The Subcommittee recommended revising the wording from all actions and strategies that have been implemented, not just those that pertain to the Green Infrastructure, to recognize the continued implementation of the action or strategy. Discussion also recommended rewording actions and strategies to identify desired outcomes.

**Buffers**

River and stream corridor buffers were deliberated in both meetings and discussion involved a.) whether specific widths for buffers should be listed in the Plan, b.) whether buffers widths were still relevant and should be retained, c.) whether the specific widths should be revised, d.) the need for specific criteria, e.) whether stormwater management regulations supersede this practice, and f.) whether alternative approaches would provide more benefit than buffers. The Subcommittee discussed proactive actions and strategies to protect water quality, including incentives, and clearly defining the objective. Subcommittee and Staff agreed that additional research should be conducted and buffer widths evaluated while exploring alternative measures to protect water quality. Staff’s evaluation and recommendations will be presented to the Stakeholders Committee.

The Subcommittee also discussed the 1,000 foot voluntary buffer adjacent to the Beaverdam and Goose Creek reservoirs. The Subcommittee questioned whether water quality benefits are still being achieved at 1,000 feet from the resource as land at this distance may not be draining to the reservoir. The Subcommittee recommended clarifying the difference between the 100-foot minimum stream buffer and the 50-foot management buffer.

**Policy Specific Recommendations**

The Subcommittee provided the following recommendations for actions and strategies:

**Policy 1 Actions & Strategies**

The Subcommittee recommended rewording policy 1, and associated actions and strategies, to recognize the purpose of preserving and protecting Green Infrastructure elements for the public health, safety, and welfare rather than stating that the purpose is because these resources are fragile and irreplaceable. Further, the existing wording does not take into account new Green Infrastructure elements.

- **Action** - The Subcommittee inquired to whether the County currently identifies sensitive environmental, cultural, and historic resources that are not conducive to development. If the County is not doing this, the Subcommittee stated that the action should capture the County’s current actions in regards to these types of resources.

**Policy 2**

Explore including public access within conservation easements as part of subdivisions.
Policy 4 Actions & Strategies
- Remove guideline calling for only 50% of the open space requirement to be satisfied by the area of the river and stream corridor resources.
- Revise strategy regarding reforestation for degraded forested areas close to stream corridors to clarify this is for upper stream reaches that do not involve the Major Floodplain and to promote natural regeneration within the limits of the Major Floodplain.
- Strategy - Remove list of examples of low impact development (LID) from the strategy promoting the use of LID measures.
- Action - Revise the action stating, “The County will establish appropriate standards including the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulations to protect natural streams from the harmful effects of increased stormwater volume, velocity, and pollutant loads resulting from development” to ‘will consider’ or ‘may establish’. Remove phrase “including the Virginia Stormwater Management Program regulations” since this is a State requirement.
- Action/Strategy - Reword and reduce the length of text for the action/strategy pertaining to the Virginia General Permit for stormwater discharges.

Policy 7 Guideline
- Remove “large lot or clusters” from limestone guideline.

Policy 9 and Guideline
- Add “naturally occurring” and “adopted regulations” to steep slope policy and guidelines.

Policy 10 Action
- Verify terminology being used within the actions and strategies of this policy, such as Forest Management Plan.
- Revise the action stating “The County will develop and adopt a Tree Preservation Ordinance” to “The County will explore”.

Policy 12
- Better define terms ‘exemplary natural communities’ and ‘natural features’.
- Evaluate wording requiring a species assessment for those developments that have a likely presence of one or more natural heritage resources.

Policy 13
- Add qualifiers to “geological features” and “archaeological sites” to policy so that it is clear what features the policy intends to address.
- Action – reference NOVA parks coordination for Potomac Heritage Trail action.

Policy 15
- Revise “The County shall establish green building standards” to “The County will promote”.
- Evaluate the County construction to LEED Silver or equivalent standards policy.
Policy 18

- Clarify that Noise is referencing Airport Noise.
- Include updates to the airport noise contours based on the most current information.

Definitions

As with previous topics, the Subcommittee recommended the Plan make better use of definitions within policies, actions, strategies, and guidelines to eliminate long lists of text within the Plan document.

The Subcommittee recommended defining the following terms within the new Plan:

- Major and minor floodplain;
- Streams;
- Viewshed (Clarify whether the viewsheds for Scenic Rivers is from the bank of the river or from within the river itself);
- Wellhead protection program; and
- Exemplary natural communities (or remove from Policy 12).

The Subcommittee requested that the following definitions be clarified within the new Plan:

- Conservation (Policy 2) — clarify
- Mountainside — reflect rating system as established in the Zoning Ordinance and
- Sustainable Site Design — clarify and elaborate purpose.
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Background

The Suburban Policy Area (SPA) is located in the easternmost portion of the County, which is in close proximity to the job centers and activity areas located east of Loudoun. The SPA currently consists of a mix of commercial areas and neighborhoods which provide a broad range of quality environments. The commercial areas of the SPA are focused areas for employment uses provided within a variety of commercial and workplace environments, including traditional office and industrial parks, mixed use employment centers, and commercial centers. Neighborhoods in the eastern corner of the County were built between 1960 and 1990, while neighborhoods built in the western area of the SPA were built in the early 1990s or later. These neighborhoods commonly reflect the housing styles and neighborhood designs that were prominent in the era they were developed.

The master planned developments in the western portion of the SPA include a variety of housing types within large developments organized around neighborhood centers designed as the focal point of the community which serve surrounding neighborhoods with easy access to daily needs. The earlier neighborhoods developed in the east provide a more limited mix of housing types, are primarily single-family, and rely on neighborhood commercial developments located on major roads like Route 7 for easy access to amenities. Parks, greenways, and open space frame developments and link neighborhood residents to nature, neighborhood destinations, and beyond in both the western and eastern neighborhoods.

The SPA is currently designated as the growth area of the County and has accommodated most of the residential and commercial growth over the past decades due to the presence of central water and sewer utilities and an expanded road network. The County’s vision for the Suburban Policy Area has been and continues to be that it will contain self-sustaining communities that offer a mix of residential, commercial, and employment uses; a full complement of public services and facilities; amenities that support a high quality of life; and a design that incorporates a holistic approach to preserving and improving community character through compatible development. The results of that vision can be found in the SPA’s current commercial areas and neighborhoods; however, the development of these areas has generally occurred on previously undeveloped properties. Today there is little undeveloped land remaining as most land within the SPA has already been developed or is approved for development, and only 2% of the Area (approximately 1,200 acres) remained to be developed as of June 2016. This means that redevelopment will soon begin to play an increasing role in development decisions within the SPA which will mark a significant shift in the county’s planning and development activities.

Evaluation and Expectations

Because much of the SPA is already developed, the New Comprehensive Plan must be developed with an expectation that most new projects will be modest in scope and therefore will need to be evaluated based on their compatibility with the larger community of which they will be a part. As the primary location for suburban-scale residential and nonresidential development, the manner of growth and redevelopment in the SPA is of vital importance. However, the New Plan must also consider the demographic, market and land use trends of the past decades which have led to greater demand for mixed-use and urban environments. While the County’s Revised General Plan (RGP) established an
overall land-development strategy that encouraged compact, mixed-use developments providing people with the opportunity to live, work, recreate, and shop in a pedestrian-friendly environment, the development that has occurred in Loudoun has largely remained single-use and automobile oriented.

The New Plan must simultaneously ensure development is compatible with the existing development pattern of the SPA while supporting the necessary flexibility in form and use that will be needed to create vibrant urban and mixed-use environments that can be supported by surrounding suburban-style development and attract a variety of lifestyles. As each new development is absorbed into the SPA’s built environment, it will be important that it is viewed in the context of its larger community with an emphasis placed on consideration of the character of the development and how it contributes to the needs and overall identity of the SPA and Loudoun County. The RGP recognized that the SPA is not and should not be one homogenous area. It anticipated that there would be four distinct communities within the Suburban Policy Area: Ashburn, Dulles, Potomac, and Sterling. The RGP’s vision for these four large communities is that they would increase in quality and become more distinct places. The RGP introduced the concept of Community Plans for the four communities that would address the particular needs and guide the remaining build-out of each. While these Community Plans never came to fruition to the extent described in the RGP, the concept of creating Community Plans and other similar plans to accompany the New Comprehensive Plan is one which offers tremendous potential to ensure that the vision of the SPA is fully achieved.

Policies, Strategies & Actions

The Stakeholders Committee’s policy review to date has been organized topically, and the policies of previously reviewed topics such as Redevelopment and Infill, Growth Management, Housing, Economic Development and Green Infrastructure will all apply to the SPA. There are also a range of other topics and issues that will affect the SPA which staff continues to work through, such as:

- Place Types and specifically associated policies,
- Quality Design policies, and
- The degree to which the content of a number of existing plans (Route 28, Route 50, Retail, etc.) should be superseded by, maintained separately, and/or incorporated in to the New Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, staff has attempted to create the list of policies, actions and strategies below which address the SPA broadly and at a high level while minimizing overlap with these other topics.

Staff is requesting the Stakeholders Committee’s feedback on these policy statements at the February 5th meeting. Following the meeting, staff will use the Committee’s feedback on this document to produce a draft plan chapter on the Suburban Policy Area with all the other related recommendations. This draft chapter will be provided to the Stakeholders at a future meeting for its review. Please note that it is possible that some of these policy statements may be shifted to other locations as the New Plan’s chapters are drafted.
Policy 1: **Ensure the compatibility of new development within the Suburban Policy Area with the existing development pattern which surrounds it.**

**Actions & Strategies**

1.1. The following characteristics should be considered when evaluating the compatibility of a proposed development with surrounding uses:

- Consistency with the desired form, character and land uses of the underlying Place Type;
- Differences between the height, scale, bulk, setback from the street, or other physical features of the proposed development and existing development in the immediate area;
- Presence and quality of a spatial or physical transition between uses;
- Availability of adequate roads, services and infrastructure; and
- Relationship to existing cultural and environmental resources.

Policy 2: **Promote the design and development of Suburban Policy Area communities as walkable and interconnected places.**

**Actions & Strategies**

2.1. The County, in collaboration with other governmental agencies and the private sector, will ensure through a variety of measures that all public spaces in residential and commercial areas are accessible by pedestrians.

2.2. Residential, office, institutional, civic, and retail areas in the Suburban Policy Area will have convenient access by foot and bicycle.

2.3. Retail and office proposals will combine open and civic space in features such as pedestrian promenades and plazas, public art, entrance features, linear parks and trails, outdoor seating, lawns and greens and similar design features that invite pedestrian activity.

2.4. The Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) provides additional transportation policy direction for the transportation network (walkability, multimodal, connectivity) in the Suburban Policy Area.

Policy 3: **New development should be designed to build upon and foster the sense of place in the Suburban Policy Area and its communities.**

**Actions & Strategies**

3.1. Create new Community Plans and other appropriate plans which address the particular needs and guide the remaining build-out of specific areas within the Suburban Policy Area.
3.2. Update the County’s adopted Small Area Plans encompassing the Suburban Policy Area’s communities to provide for the development of the Suburban Policy Area in accordance with the recommendations of [the New Comprehensive Plan].

3.3. Create Design Guidelines for specific areas within the Suburban Policy Area which ensure a high quality of development is achieved.

3.4. Ensure development proposals conform to the applicable Development Guidelines of this plan.

**Policy 4: Encourage developments to include a mix of uses and create environments where individuals can work, live, and have convenient access to services, shops, and recreation.**

**Actions & Strategies**

4.1. Mixed-use developments will include active, passive, and natural open space areas where appropriate with particular emphasis on preserving mature vegetation and features such as floodplains.

4.2. Within mixed-use developments, construction of new residential uses should occur concurrent with construction of employment and commercial uses to best balance the fiscal costs and benefits of the project.

4.3. Encourage new multi-family residential units to be located within existing commercial centers, both retail and employment, to bring housing to employment areas and allow suburban development patterns to change over time.

4.4. Retail buildings offering residential or office uses on upper floors are encouraged.

4.5. Allow flexibility in the development phasing for mixed-use projects while still establishing a build-out relationship between the residential and non-residential components of the project in order to ensure that a mix of uses is achieved and accomplish the intent of the applicable Place Type(s) for the project.
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Introduction

The seven incorporated Towns in Loudoun County offer a window to the County’s past and are a key component of its unique character today. All have existed as independent incorporated entities for more than a century, first as agricultural business centers, providing markets for farm products and the necessary goods and services for rural residents. Over the years, the Towns have developed as the population centers as well as the location for employment and public facilities.

Today, the Towns, while still influenced by their agricultural tradition, play a more varied role that includes retail and service-based businesses, home-based businesses, educational opportunities, and telecommuting as well as serving as bedroom communities for many who commute to jobs in the region. Yet, they have largely managed to retain their charm and distinct sense of community.

Revised General Plan Intent

The County’s 2001 Revised General Plan established policies that recognized the character of each of the seven incorporated Towns and that would allow the County to be proactive in working with the Towns to assure a vibrant future for them. The County recognizes that the health of each Town contributes to the County’s overall strength and attractiveness as a place to live and therefore provides resources to assist the Towns with facilities planning, economic development, and land use planning and supports an open and thorough process of working with the Towns.

The Board of Supervisors endorsed the Plan Charter for the new Comprehensive Plan and recognized the relevance and effectiveness of many of the existing policies, specifically within the Rural Policy Area. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors recommended no major changes to the County’s policies and strategies for the Rural Policy Area except to update, strengthen and enhance the existing policies of the Revised General Plan. The Plan Charter can be viewed at https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/120052.

Part 1: What We’ve Heard

Reflecting the County’s intent to focus primarily on the Suburban Policy Area presently, public comments received during the Round1 and 2 Community Outreach and Engagement effort during the Envision Loudoun process primarily addressed areas to the east of Route 15 and the Towns. Comments that did reference the Towns supported the following improvements specifically within the Towns: grocery stores, gas stations, entertainment and performance arts venues, affordable housing, recreational facilities (like Ida Lee or Claude Moore Parks), teen centers, senior centers, libraries, parks, and playgrounds. There was also strong public support for preserving farmland in western Loudoun County for farming, livestock, and equine industries, which would indicate additional support for providing amenities and satisfying the daily and weekly shopping and business needs of rural residents in the existing Towns.

Part 2: Background

Towns Urban Growth Areas

The strategy of the Plan to date encourages compatible development within the Towns and the adjoining areas. First through the 1991 General Plan that established Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) for the Towns of Leesburg, Hamilton, Purcellville, Round Hill, and Lovettsville as expansion areas around Towns to concentrate development to maintain viable communities, limit development sprawl, and ensure that public facilities
adequately and efficiently served Towns and surrounding areas, the UGA boundaries set the limits of municipal water and sewer extension that the Towns control and mark the edge of future town limits.

The 1990s saw tremendous residential growth in areas around the Towns and reassessment in Town abilities to serve UGAs with central utilities. There was additional reassessment about whether “Urban Growth Area” accurately reflected the intent for continued development in UGAs. Therefore, areas generally encompassed by the UGAs was changed to “Joint Land Management Area” (JLMA). The boundary of the JLMA, with an exception for the Town of Purcellville, sets the limits of municipal water and sewer extension and in that respect, it continues to serve as an urban growth boundary. It defines a significant change in land use between the areas within the JLMA and that which is outside of the boundary.

The County works closely with each Town on development proposals within the JLMAs to promote a logical, cohesive extension of the existing Town fabric. While Towns are responsible for planning and zoning within their boundaries, the County’s Zoning Ordinance applies to these areas.

**ANNEXATION**

Annexation guidelines are key implementation tools. Annexation is a logical extension of the increased role played by Towns in the provision of public facilities, services, utilities and commercial products and services. Annexation allows system providers a larger role in managing the services and facilities in each Town. Potentially annexation could result in the enhancement of the towns’ tax revenues. Although there are no current annexation agreements with Towns, all Towns can work with the County on possible annexations. The County has provided support to the Towns for needed public utility, public facility, and transportation planning and made facility provision in and around the towns a priority. In the past, lack of funding for needed public utility improvements has put the Towns in the position of having to rely on private development proposals for financial support. As such, the need for improved water and sewer service places environmental protection, community design and other matters in a secondary position when development applications are reviewed.

**PUBLIC UTILITIES AND FACILITIES**

All the Towns with the exception of Leesburg rely on groundwater sources for drinking water. Each town needs a reliable water source. In recent years, some of the Towns have had to take action to clean up municipal wells that were temporarily polluted. The County places a high priority on protecting groundwater supplies for the Towns and rural residents. The County also recognizes that communal and on-site wastewater systems have improved significantly in recent years. The County must consider the need for providing various public facilities to serve a growing population and the use of communal facilities in the JLMAs should be considered as one means of serving these facilities. The County in cooperation with the School Board and Towns will concentrate new school facilities in and around the Towns, balanced with the importance of maintaining existing rural community-based schools. The County works cooperatively with, and assists the Towns on issues and concerns.

**LAND USE**

The Towns represent have historically been good examples of traditional development patterns. Each is a distinct community with a variety of business and residential opportunities to maintain a human scale where people can walk from home to the store, church, and school. Towns also are the focal point for the large rural communities that surround them. The Central Business Districts (CBDs) for each of the Towns have been built in traditional patterns. The business areas represent efficient land use patterns as buildings are located compactly, a variety of businesses are located close to the street, with an emphasis on pedestrian movement.

The Towns will continue to play an important role in providing for a wide range of housing needs. The existing housing stock in each Town represents a variety of housing types and price ranges. The County, in collaboration with each Town, strives to encourage this housing pattern in the JLMAs, and particularly the inclusion of
affordable housing in new developments to meet local demand. Growth poses challenges to the historic design features and character of the Towns. Conventional suburban style development is frequently adjoined to Towns with little sensitivity to the traditional design, transportation constraints, and unique architectural qualities of the existing community. Careful consideration must be given to both scale and design of new developments and roadway design to preserve and enhance the traditional community character.

Part 3: Challenges and Opportunities

Challenges

- Annexation is a logical extension of the increased role played by Towns in the provision of public facilities, services, utilities and commercial products and services. Annexation allows system providers a larger role in managing the services and facilities in each Town, however careful consideration for annexation will need to be given by both the County and the Town(s).

- Most of the Towns are largely residential with commercial activity and land use limited to small retail and service uses to meet residents’ needs. Larger employment uses are located to the east, which limits the ability for the Towns to undertake needed public utility, public facility, and transportation planning and facility provision.

- Growth poses challenges to the historic design features and character of the Towns. Conventional suburban style development is frequently adjoined to Towns with little sensitivity to the traditional design, transportation constraints, and unique architectural qualities of the existing community.

Part 4: Carryover Policy Recommendations

Background

The existing policies of Loudoun County’s current Revised General Plan have been refined to reduce redundancy and categorized as policies, actions, or strategies. References to actions and initiatives that the County and/or Towns have completed have been removed. In some cases, the text of the current Towns chapter (Chapter 9) was used to help further refine an existing policy. Policies were revised without changing the intent. Refined individual Town policies were retained within the individual Town policy section. No revisions have been made to the County/Town Annexation Agreement/Corporate Boundary Adjustment Guidelines in Chapter 11, attached verbatim at the end of this section. Additional coordination between the County and Towns will occur in the planning process.

The location of existing policies within the chapter is notated within parenthesis using the following abbreviations for the chapter section and the corresponding number of the policy (e.g. Land Use policy #1 = LU 1):

- Chapter Introduction Text = Intro Text
- Growth Management = GM
- Land Use = LU
- Public Facilities = PF
- Public Utilities = PU
- Transportation = T
Joint Land Management Areas Definition

Joint Land Management Areas (JLMAs) exist around the Towns that have coordinated with the County to establish a JLMA. The purpose of JLMAs is to establish distinct boundaries between the Towns and the adjacent policy area and accommodate growth coming from the Towns.

Guiding Principle

Recognizing that the health and stability of each Town contributes to the County’s overall strength and attractiveness as a place to live, the County will provide resources to assist the Towns with facilities planning, economic development, and land use planning and supports an open and thorough process of working with the Towns. (Intro Text)

a. The County will encourage the Towns to continue efforts to maintain commercially viable downtowns. (LU 14)

b. Recognizing the Towns’ intent to create distinct “gateways” into each community, the County will consult with each Town to ensure that planning and development of these gateways will be coordinated where land in both the Town and the County is part of the gateway. (LU 15)

c. The County will work with the Towns to help ensure the protection of unique environmental resources in the vicinity of the Town and in the Town. (LU 16)

d. The County will work with the Towns to identify tourism opportunities in and around the Towns and to coordinate action on these opportunities with the countywide tourism objectives. (LU 11)

e. The County will support the Towns in assessing the historical and cultural resources in the Town and will work with the Town on historic preservation efforts both in and around town. (LU 12)

f. The County encourages the protection of the Towns’ historic and archaeological resources. (LU 13)

Towns Urban Growth Management Policies

1. Development should occur within the Towns where existing infrastructure is available to serve the use prior to locating within the JLMA. (GM 2, several others)

   Strategies

   a. The County supports the continued use and enhancement of existing public facilities located in the Towns and JLMAs. (PF 2)

   b. Existing Towns will be the principal location of new public facilities. If land is not available for new facilities within the Towns, the facilities will be located within or adjoining the JLMAs. (text, GM2, PF 1, several others)

   c. The County will support the strengthening of the commercial areas within the Towns as the preferred, principal location of retail and service businesses, office development, and major civic uses. (LU 9, 10)

2. All development within the JLMAs is planned to be served by public sewer and water provided by the Towns, with the exception of areas within the Purcellville JLMA, in accordance with the Towns water and sewer service plans. (PU 1, 7)
Guideline

a. Town and County owned and/or operated public facilities and cluster residential developments with densities no greater than one unit per three acres within JLMAs may be served by communal facilities. (PU 7)

3. The County and the Towns will collaborate planning efforts regarding land use, transportation, natural and cultural resources, economic development, annexation and other matters affecting the JLMAs. (GM 1)

Actions

a. The Towns will coordinate with the County to revise, create, or remove a JLMA. (Text, current practice)

b. Specific land use plans will be adopted jointly by the County and Towns to cooperatively plan JLMAs or to plan areas around Towns without JLMAs. (GM 2, 3 and text)

c. The County and the Towns will coordinate on road network planning in and near Towns to ensure that traffic generated from development within the County does not adversely affect the Town. (T3, text, several others)

d. The County will assist the Towns with traffic calming measures. (T1)

e. The County will coordinate with the Towns on rezonings and subdivision development in JLMAs and within the areas surrounding the Towns regarding the provision of utilities, public facilities, and compliance with community design, growth management, and other goals and policies. (GM 4, 9; LU)

f. The County will establish joint Town and County committees to oversee planning efforts in the JLMAs, assign staff as required to provide technical support, and encourage participation of Town and County residents. (GM 5)

g. The County will coordinate with the Towns on development issues in order to promote fiscally balanced growth that will not unduly strain County or Town resources. (GM 10)

h. The County encourages the adaptive re-use, redevelopment, maintenance, conservation, and improvement of existing housing stock in a manner supporting social and economic diversity within the Towns. (LU 5)

Land Use & Design Policies

1. Land use within the Towns will be governed by the Towns zoning standards and their comprehensive plans.

2. Land uses in the JLMAs are identified within the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

3. Mixed-use development is encouraged within the existing Towns and some JLMAs in accordance with approved growth management strategies. (LU 3)

4. Development within the Towns and JLMAs will apply traditional neighborhood design that complement and enhance the existing development patterns of the respective Town. (LU 6)

   a. Development Guidelines (LU 7)

   • JLMAs will develop in an urban pattern of compact neighborhoods extending in a contiguous, rational and convenient manner from the existing Town. (LU 4)

   • Residential communities will be encouraged to exhibit traditional design and neighborhood connectivity for streets, and to incorporate a variety of lot sizes.
• Numerous connections to existing streets where an existing rectilinear street pattern is evident and connection is possible;

• An interconnected street network without cul-de-sacs and P-loop streets except where required for environmental reasons;

• A rectilinear block pattern (modified only where needed to address environmental constraints) with compact lots, shallow front and side-yard setbacks and block sizes of 300 to 600 feet;

• Sidewalks along all streets, providing pedestrian access to the town or neighborhood center, public buildings, parks, and other destinations;

• A compatible mix of residential and non-residential uses such as home-occupation businesses, churches, and schools;

• A hierarchy of parks, squares, or greens, and natural open spaces throughout the development; and;

• A central public focal point consisting of any, all, or a combination of a park (village green); a public facility such as a church or community center; natural features; or neighborhood commercial uses.

Leesburg Joint Land Management Area Policies

1. Development within the JLMA will comply with the Leesburg Town Plan.

2. A greenbelt extends into the Rural Policy Area for 2,600 feet to the west and north of the Town, where the corporate limits represent the JLMA, and adjacent to the JLMA along Route 15, north of Leesburg, the greenbelt extends 2,600 feet into the Rural Policy Area.

3. Power generation plants are not allowed in the Leesburg JLMA due to incompatibility with existing residential areas within or near the Town JLMA.

Lovettsville Area Policies

1. Reflecting the fact that a percentage of the land within the Town’s boundaries remains available for both open space conservation and development, the Town wishes to consolidate development within its boundaries; therefore, there will be no JLMA around Lovettsville.

   a. The County will work with the Town, when requested, on boundary-line adjustments for properties that are positioned both in the County and in the Town, in order to resolve jurisdictional questions for affected property owners and to support the Town’s goals and priorities.

2. The County will continue to plan the location and design of County facilities within Lovettsville, in consultation with the Town.

Hamilton Joint Land Management Area Policies

1. Development within the Hamilton JLMA will comply with the comprehensive plan for the Town of Hamilton and the Joint Land Management Area.
Purcellville Joint Land Management Area Policies

1. The County encourages a mix of residential and business uses in and around the Town that are compatible in scale with the small-town character of Purcellville.

    **Strategy**
    a. Developments along Route 7 and Route 287 and the Route 7 Bypass will include setbacks, height limitations, and landscaping to preserve town character.

Round Hill Joint Land Management Area Policies

1. The County supports planning efforts to retain the small-town character of Round Hill and will assist the Town in efforts to preserve the historic character and resources in and around the town.

    **Strategy**
    a. To enhance the identity of the Town, the County supports the development of gateway features into the town.

2. County support will be extended to the Town to plan for enhancing the economic base of Round Hill through such things as tourism, vitalizing the Town’s commercial center, and attraction of new business.

    **Strategy**
    a. The Town should develop a “main street” concept for the town core.

Middleburg Area Policies

1. The County supports the Town’s establishment of a “hard edge” for development that clearly distinguishes where the Town stops and where the rural, undeveloped countryside begins.

Hillsboro Area Policies

1. Identifying long-term solutions for improving the safety of Route 9 in western Loudoun and through Hillsboro that do not compromise the rural character of Hillsboro will be a joint effort by the County, the Town of Hillsboro, and VDOT.

    **Strategy**
    a. Continue to implement safety measures for pedestrian movement along and/or across Route 9.

Green Infrastructure

The following Actions and Strategies (highlighted) reference the Towns but are to be located within a separate Green Infrastructure section of the New Plan. The policy supported by the actions/strategies and definitions are provided for reference:

**Green Infrastructure**: A County-specified classification of the environment in a related, predominately natural system of environmental, natural and heritage resources, open space assets and complementary elements that serves as the underlying structure for general land use, planning, development and redevelopment in the County. It includes major rivers, stream corridors, floodplains, wetlands, steep slopes, ridges and...
mountainsides, forested and vegetative landscapes, wildlife and endangered species habitats, heritage resources, parks, greenways, trails, and recreational facilities. It provides the context in which the built environment relates to the natural environment and guides where and how development and redevelopment is to occur.

**Policy**

2. **Protect and enhance the Green Infrastructure elements by considering the following:**
   - **Conservation** – Creating a stronger relationship between natural and built environments.
   - **Preservation** – Retaining and protecting existing environmental, natural and heritage resources.
   - **Restoration / Recapture** – Adding to the Green Infrastructure wherever possible.

**Action**

*The County will collaborate with the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Conservation Management Institute, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, the incorporated Towns and other public and private entities to define and recommend areas for open-space preservation and develop a trail system that links the County’s natural, historic, and recreational resources. (Combined Scenic Corridor policy 5 and Greenways/Trails policy 2)*

4. Establish and maintain a healthy river and stream corridor ecosystem to ensure that water is clean and safe, protected from the damages of soil erosion and flooding, and promotes biological diversity.

**Strategy**

*The County will work with the incorporated Towns, in conjunction with the Clean Water Act, to establish overall water quality goals and specific standards for individual streams and river and stream corridors, consistent with county river and stream corridor objectives and policies. (Chapter 5 Surface Water policy 13)*

**Policy**

7. **Preserve and protect groundwater quality.**

**Action**

*The County will develop, implement, and maintain a wellhead protection program to protect groundwater from contamination of drinking water quality for the residents of rural Loudoun. The County will support the development and implementation of wellhead protection programs for western Loudoun Towns. In addition, the County will refine and strengthen surface and groundwater protection policies and regulations. (Chapter 5, Ground Water policy 2)*

**County/Town Annexation Agreement/Corporate Boundary Adjustment Guidelines (Verbatim)**

The County and the incorporated Towns will explore alternatives for entering into annexation agreements to facilitate the annexations of properties that are receiving Town sewer and water services. Agreements might include language based on the following recommendations:

1. It should be the intent of the County and of the Town that any property located within the Joint Land Management Area (as defined in the policies of this Plan) which is presently or would be served by Town sewer and/or water in accordance with the utility policies included in this Plan, should, in the future, be annexed by the Town.
2. The Town and the County should only honor requests for the extension of sewer and/or water services outside the Town’s corporate limits, within the designated Joint Land Management Area provided that the beneficiaries of such service prepare written acknowledgement of the right of the Town Council to annex the subject properties. If the Town should desire, this written acknowledgement shall include the beneficiaries’ written agreement to join with the Town in a joint annexation petition.

3. Parcels located within the designated Joint Land Management Area and contiguous to the corporate boundaries of the Town which have agreed to annexation in exchange for Town sewer and/or water service should be immediately annexed by the Town upon County approval of the rezoning and/or development proposal that requires water and/or sewer service.

4. Parcels located within the designated Joint Land Management Area which have agreed to annexation in exchange for Town sewer and/or water but which are not contiguous to the corporate boundaries of the Town should enter into an agreement with the Town as follows: that annexation of these parcels should take place at such time as the subject parcels become contiguous with the corporate limits of the Town or five years from the date of County approval of the rezoning and/or land development proposal which requires Town water and/or sewer service, whichever comes first. In the latter case, where parcels receiving central sewer and water remain noncontiguous to the corporate limits of the Town, any parcels lying between the corporate limits of the Town and the noncontiguous parcel which is receiving Town sewer and water should be annexed at the end of the five year period. However, these intervening parcels should not be required to hook into the Town sewer and/or water service unless desired by the property owner or necessary in order to maintain public health standards.

5. At such time as the County approves the rezoning and/or development proposal of a property in the Joint Land Management Area, which would require Town sewer and/or water service, such approval should constitute the County’s approval of such annexation. At the time of such approval, the County should also provide the Town with written consent of annexation.

6. All Towns may proceed with annexations or with corporate boundary line adjustments irrespective of whether the Town has a Joint Land Management Area. In cases where there is a need to make a minor adjustment to a corporate boundary, the Town and the County may process a corporate boundary line adjustment pursuant to the State Code provisions. For incorporation of property which is more expansive in size or which will have broader jurisdictional and land use implications for the Town as well as the County, an annexation proceeding is appropriate. The State Code provisions apply to annexations and the County will work with each Town on an annexation pursuant to state requirements.
Appendix A: General Town Information

Leesburg
Since the mid-1700s, Leesburg has been the social, judicial, business and political hub of Loudoun County. The Town was founded in 1758 and, as the County seat, is a key part of the County’s heritage. Preservation of the Town’s heritage is a priority in Leesburg, and much of the core area of the Town is on the National Register and has been designated as a historic district. Leesburg has been and will continue to be attractive as an employment center, and it is a major retail and service center for Loudoun County.

The Town expects to continue to meet the projected central utility service demands of Leesburg and the JLMA. The estimated population of the Town is about 46,000, making it the largest town in the County and one of the largest in the Commonwealth. Leesburg has always been a destination point for tourists and a business center as the seat of County government. Most recently, however, economic development associated with good road connections to the east, utility capacity and a growing residential population has elevated Leesburg’s position as an activity center and strengthened Leesburg’s interest in attracting emerging technology industries within the corporate limits and the JLMA.

Lovettsville
The Town of Lovettsville, known as “The German Settlement”, is the northern-most incorporated Town in Loudoun County and in the Commonwealth. Records date back to the early 1700’s, when German families came from Pennsylvania to settle in the area. The General Assembly officially established Lovettsville as a Town in 1836 and the Town was incorporated in 1876. Farming was very much a part of the Lovettsville community, as was sustainable economic development that offered retail sales, lodging, professional services and entertainment.

Town officials today, encourage business development that is consistent with the existing character of the Town and that serves Town residents and they envision the reestablishment of some of the services, both professional and commercial, that were provided within the Town in the past. Town officials support efforts to encourage a strong town economy that, in turn, will contribute to a strong rural economy. Lovettsville’s vision for its central business district is to create a traditional main street by positioning new businesses close to the street and diminishing the prominence of parking lots. The Town has expanded central utility capacity and has expressed interest in establishing a JLMA.

Hamilton
Like several Towns, Hamilton has faced residential development pressure in its JLMA. The planning strategy for the Hamilton area is to encourage predominately residential development at a relatively low density in and around the Town. Residential development should be compatible with the visual character and scale of the Town and reinforce the Town as the center of community. The focus of commercial development will be the center of Town.

The Town wants to increasingly provide some of the convenience retail and service uses needed by residents. To that end, the Town plans to strengthen its core downtown area and work to achieve a well-defined central business district. In the coming years, the County will assist the Town in planning and economic development efforts to help the Town develop its town center.

Purcellville
Historically, Purcellville has been the business hub of the Rural Policy Area. It has been the central location for agriculturally related business. Today, retail in the Town satisfies much of the consumer demand in the rural area. The Purcellville area has become an increasingly attractive location for development because of utility and transportation improvements in recent years. Completion of the Route 7 Bypass improved linkages to the east. The Town’s population has increased to 8,356, more than double the population when the Revised General Plan was adopted. Purcellville’s geographic position at the crossroads of major thoroughfares in western Loudoun will continue to be an incentive to development and bolster the Town’s regional role in the western part of the County.

**Round Hill**

Round Hill is Loudoun’s most western town and is positioned both as a gateway to the County and as the gateway to the Blue Ridge Mountains. The Town began to develop in the mid-1880s. When the W&OD Railroad was extended to the area, business began to develop in the town and the train brought summer visitors from Washington, D.C. to the Town to enjoy the rural countryside and to escape the heat.

Round Hill has retained much of the original character of its early years. The axis roads through town are lined with gracious old homes and the population within the corporate limits is stable at about 500. It is primarily a residential town where residents commute to work. To this day the center of town remains the commercial core and provides for basic business and service needs. Round Hill has continued to be a residential community preserving its historic and environmental heritage and fostering a strong sense of community while expanding its economic base that primarily serves the Round Hill area. The town recently updated its Comprehensive Plan, welcoming participation by Town residents as well as those residents living in the JLMA.

**Middleburg**

The Town of Middleburg was established in 1787. It is the southernmost town in the County and it has a rich historical past, from colonial times through the Civil War to more recent times, that is treasured by the citizens of Loudoun and especially by the citizens of Middleburg. A significant portion of the Town has been placed on the National Register for Historic Places and the Town administers a local Historic District to provide architectural review over development. The Town of Middleburg has had a stable population for several years, and this trend is expected to continue.

The Town of Middleburg attracts tourists from around the world. The commercial core of Middleburg contains upscale shops that are marketed for the tourist industry. Visitor dollars at restaurants, shops, and inns within the Central Business District generate 60 percent of annual town revenues. The equestrian farms and estates located around Middleburg and the associated equestrian businesses are central to Middleburg’s social fabric and way of life. Many citizens of Middleburg have connections to the equestrian industry either through direct work on the farms or work in equestrian related businesses. This equestrian industry is a major contributor to Loudoun’s economy.

**Hillsboro**

The Town of Hillsboro is a village of 18th-century homes and small businesses in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Although a recent Boundary Line Adjustment increased the area of the Town by approximately 108 acres, Hillsboro remains the second-smallest incorporated town in the Commonwealth. The Town contains lovely historic residential properties and a small commercial area. The Town is currently working with the County on economic development strategies for the core business area.

While the predominantly historic stone residences and businesses give the Town a distinct character, the quality of life there has been affected by heavy traffic on Route 9. The two-lane roadway through the middle of Hillsboro has become a busy commuter thoroughfare connecting West Virginia to Northern Virginia’s
growing employment centers. Traffic congestion and vehicle and pedestrian safety have become serious concerns for local residents. The Town has been working with the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation to mitigate the increased traffic volume with traffic calming techniques including planning for a roundabout at the intersection of Routes 9 and 690.
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Background:
With the endorsement of the Comprehensive Plan Charter in April 2016, the Board of Supervisors identified Residential Housing and Diversity as one of the nine (9) major topic areas that needed to be addressed through the comprehensive planning process. In May of 2017, the Board endorsed a draft Vision and Goals for Envision Loudoun. The Vision expresses the desire for Loudoun to be an inclusive community and the goal related to housing calls for the provision of a full spectrum of housing to support our community.

Vision:
Loudoun County continues to flourish as a prosperous and inclusive community with a well-deserved reputation for great places, natural and built, as well as historic and new, in a variety of settings. The County will foster economic innovation, fiscal strength, and sustainability.

Goal:
Well-designed places providing a full spectrum of housing and employment options linked to supporting commercial, entertainment, educational, agricultural, and recreation activity.

An adequate supply of housing—varied in type and price, both rental and for-sale, in convenient locations is a fundamental component of a complete, inclusive, and enduring community. The creation and demand of affordable and attainable housing requires that the pattern of residential development—its design, density, location, cost, and performance—benefit the user and community now and over time. Housing affordability and attainability is a complex quality of life issue that has impacted Loudoun economically, including the transportation system. Currently, 48% of Loudoun’s workforce earn less than 40% of the area median income (AMI) and 44% commute into the County daily (“Primer on Housing in Loudoun County”).

The lack of attainable housing undercuts the ability of employers to attract workforce and causes workforce instability especially in lower paying industries. This challenge also leads to long commutes from jobs to more affordable housing outside of Loudoun which causes increased congestions on our roadways.

Housing White Paper
In September 2017, the Envision Loudoun Stakeholders Committee and the Housing Subcommittee reviewed “Housing White Paper: Issues & Recommended Policies for Consideration” developed by the consultants and staff. The study showed a disparity in the County’s estimated population growth and housing opportunities—particularly affordable housing opportunities. The white paper, through public input and community groups, proposed
policies that could increase Loudoun’s ability to provide a range of housing choices for a diverse population. The Subcommittee recommended ten (10) policies which were subsequently recommended by the entire Stakeholders Committee on September 25, 2017.

The ten (10) policies are as follows:

1. Provide housing options throughout Loudoun County that can accommodate a variety of lifestyles, households, ages, cultures, market preferences, incomes, and special needs.
2. Encourage housing to be located near existing or planned employment opportunities, schools, communities, utilities, multi-modal transportation options and other amenities.
3. Increase the diversity of housing unit types, sizes, and innovative designs throughout Loudoun County.
4. Support mixed-use development projects that provide a continuum of housing types and prices as well as commercial uses such as retail, entertainment and offices in a walkable environment.
5. Support residential development on infill and redevelopment sites that is designed to acknowledge the surrounding context.
6. Increase the quantity of affordable housing units and create a continuum of affordable housing options for all people (workforce levels, ages, incomes and abilities) who want to live and/or work in Loudoun County.
7. Create a dedicated revenue stream for affordable housing programs in the County.
8. Provide a variety of housing types that are attainable and desirable to all levels of the workforce to maintain the County’s economic competitiveness.
9. Leverage public and private resources to address housing needs in Loudoun County.
10. Preserve the existing affordable housing stock in Loudoun County.

The recommended policies reflect a combination of existing polices included in the County’s Revised General Plan (RGP), as well as, new policies that promote diverse, mixed-income housing projects through infill and redevelopment opportunities. The Subcommittee separately reviewed policies from the RGP related to Housing and recommended which statements should be carried forward to the New Comprehensive Plan in some fashion.

Housing Summit

On October 16, 2017, the Board of Supervisors held a Housing Summit to seek feedback from stakeholders and advisory board/commission on topics related to housing affordability in Loudoun County. In addition, County Staff from the Departments of Family Services, Economic Development, Mental Health, and Planning and Zoning provided an overview on the needs, programmatic, policy and regulatory framework that exists across the spectrum of operational departments that are involved in housing issues and business development issues. Staff also provided a Housing Primer that contained a wealth of information on these subject areas.
An opening presentation was made by Jeff Salmon on behalf of the Stakeholders Committee on its work on the Housing topic and to share the ten recommended policies. At the Summit, the Board discussed additional policy development related to affordable housing, considered recommendations brought forward by staff, and requested additional information on this topic for future Board consideration.

The following recommendations were approved by the Board at the Summit:

- Direct staff to develop a resolution of intent to amend the Zoning Ordinance to establish necessary revisions and newly created amendments to incentivize affordable housing and for that information to go to the Transportation and Land Use Committee before coming to the full Board;

- Direct staff to develop a public land inventory and for that information to go to the Transportation and Land Use Committee before coming to the full Board;

- Direct staff to develop a formal revolving loan program for the Loudoun County Housing Trust Fund and report back to the Finance/Government Operations and Economic Development Committee with additional program details and a schedule for implementation.

At the January 9, 2018 Finance/Government Operations and Economic Development Committee meeting, the Committee considered draft guidelines and scoring criteria for the Housing Revolving Loan Fund program. The Committee directed the staff to have the guidelines reviewed by a professional underwriter and gain input from advisory boards and affordable housing developers. On February 5, 2018, a workshop will be convened with the Housing Summit speakers and others to discuss the draft guidelines. The two additional items will be presented to the Transportation and Land Use Committee later this year.

On December 5, 2017, the Board of Supervisors designated by resolution, the Suburban Policy Area as a “revitalization area” (consistent with Code of Virginia Section 36-55.30:2) in need of affordable housing to support industry and jobs in this part of the County. The designation will help support applications for financing through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program administered by the Virginia Housing Development Authority.

Latest Housing Policies, Actions and Strategies:

Following a review of the Stakeholders Committee’s ten policies from September, Staff in multiple departments provided recommendations on new Housing policies, strategies, and actions, and Staff’s recommended changes are located in Section 1. Staff has recommended to keep four (4) of them as housing policies, transfer one of the policies to the Revitalization, Redevelopment, and Infill topic, and convert the remaining policies to actions/strategies as shown in Section 2. The policies, actions, and strategies in Section 1 have been color coded to assist with determining the items that are new, previous Stakeholders Committee recommendations, or carry-over items from the RGP.

Through its review of the RGP, the Adult/Retirement Housing policies from Chapter 2 that prescribe the location, scale, density, use mix, and unit mix are anticipated to be addressed by the place types and are not included within the text below. Adult/Retirement Housing policies
related to design are expected to be addressed by the Quality Development sections of the comprehensive plan and are also not included within the text below.

Two additional sections have also been provided to aid the Stakeholders Committee’s review of the policy statements in Section 1:

- Section 2 consists of a tracking table displaying the original language of the ten recommended policies and a redlined version showing how these policies have since been modified.
- Section 3 consists of the current RGP glossary definitions for any terms included in the policy statements found in Section 1.

Over the past several months, staff has:
1. Reviewed the Stakeholders Committee’s recommended policies and (where appropriate) converted them to Actions/Strategies;
2. Merged the carry-over Revised General Plan (RGP) policies into actions and strategies; and
3. Developed a list of recommended actions and strategies.

The final step for the Stakeholders Committee relative to the Housing Topic, is to review staff’s recommended changes to the ten (10) Housing Policies reviewed by the Committee in September 2017 to ensure that applicable policies, actions, and strategies from the current Revised General Plan are carried forward and develop/endorse any new strategies and actions. At its February 5th meeting, the Stakeholders Committee will be asked to provide feedback on the policies, actions and strategies in this document. Staff will then further develop the Committee’s recommendations and share them with the public during the next round of public meetings.

SECTION 1: Policies, Actions & Strategies

The basis of the policy statements in this section is noted by color:

- **Yellow** = Stakeholders’ Recommended Housing Policies, Actions & Strategies
- **Green** = Revised General Plan Housing Policies, Actions & Strategies
- **Brown** = New Staff Recommended Policies, Actions & Strategies

**Policy 1: Provide housing options throughout Loudoun County that can accommodate a variety of lifestyles, households, ages, cultures, market preferences, incomes, and special needs.**

**Actions & Strategies**

1.1. **Encourage the integration of housing for special needs populations (as defined in the Glossary) within existing and planned communities, particularly in areas within ¼ mile walking distance of convenience shopping and employment opportunities, transit, and other amenities.**
1.2. Provide diverse housing options for older adults to meet the continuing needs of the aging population and support the option of aging in place or within the community.

1.3. Encourage the design of residential units and neighborhoods to physically meet the needs of aging adults and persons with disabilities (e.g. universal design and accessible units).

1.4. Maintain the County’s economic competitiveness by increasing the diversity of housing unit types, sizes, prices, and innovative designs throughout Loudoun County which are attainable and desirable to all income levels of the workforce.

1.5. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand the number of districts where manufactured housing, accessory units, and other alternative housing types are allowed.

1.6. Review and revise regulatory documents, as appropriate, to enable people to age in their own homes such as allowing second kitchens within single-family homes for caregivers.

1.7. Support mixed-use development projects that provide a continuum of housing types and prices as well as commercial uses such as retail, entertainment and offices in a walkable environment.

1.8. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to establish necessary revisions to incentivize affordable housing.

Policy 2: Increase the quantity and diversity of affordable housing for all people who want to work and live in Loudoun County.

Actions & Strategies

2.1. Focus County programs on the unmet housing needs of households earning up to 100% of the Washington Metropolitan Area Median Income (AMI).

2.2. Examine and estimate unmet housing needs, and evaluate housing programs for their effectiveness in addressing those needs every five years.
2.3. Encourage development proposals that include a residential component to include housing for households with incomes at or below 50% AMI.

2.4. Provide incentives for residential development that includes housing for households with incomes at or below 30% AMI, which include older adults on fixed incomes, persons with disabilities, and workers in low-wage jobs.

2.5. Develop an affordable housing strategic plan that identifies the County’s affordable housing policy and strategy for addressing current and future unmet housing needs.

2.6. Ensure affordable units are provided on land development applications proposing development of 20 or more dwelling units with a density greater than one dwelling unit per acre.

2.7. Strengthen affordable housing zoning standards to the greatest extent that state code allows to maximize diversity in affordable housing provision.

2.8. Encourage housing that is developed to fulfill unmet housing needs to be served by public utilities and located near existing or planned employment opportunities, public facilities and services, transit, and other amenities.

2.9. Support the use of planned and/or zoned non-residential land to address unmet housing needs if the proposed use provides a mix of residential, commercial and employment uses and addresses the full range of unmet housing needs.

Policy 3: Preserve the existing affordable housing stock in Loudoun County.

Actions & Strategies

3.1. Provide programs that bring existing affordable housing in need of indoor plumbing, operational septic and water systems, and major system repair (new roofs, heating and cooling systems) up to safe and livable conditions.

3.2. Implement housing programs that address the maintenance, preservation and improvement of existing affordable housing stock.
Policy 4: Leverage public and private resources to address housing needs in Loudoun County.

**Actions & Strategies**

4.1. Create a dedicated revenue stream for affordable housing development.

4.2. Develop a rent subsidy program to address the housing needs of extremely low-income or vulnerable households including older adults on fixed incomes and persons with disabilities.

4.3. Support the use of public and private partnerships, programs, tools and incentives to address unmet housing needs and increase the County’s capacity to compete for federal and state assistance.

4.4. Provide technical assistance to the Towns to assist them in establishing and maintaining programs that provide affordable housing.

4.5. Work in partnership with nonprofit, public and private entities committed to the provision of a wide range of housing opportunities by offering technical and financial assistance.

4.6. Evaluate whether to pursue the creation of a Housing Authority that would develop new affordable housing, rehabilitate housing, and revitalize community infrastructure.

4.7. Encourages the Economic Development Authority to exercise its authority to assist with tax exempt bond financing, leverage gap financing and stimulate cooperative partnerships toward the preservation and production of housing to address unmet needs.

4.8. Consider the use of County-owned property to offset the costs to nonprofit, public and private sector entities to fulfill unmet housing needs and primarily target 1) special needs populations and/or 2) households having less than 50% of Area Median Income (AMI).
4.9. When purchasing real property, consider buying properties that can be developed to fulfill unmet housing needs in addition to the primary public use.

4.10. Expand the employer-assisted housing program to help meet the private sector's workforce housing needs.

**Housing-related Strategies Shifted to Other Topic Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Statement</th>
<th>Moved to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8.</strong> Support residential development on infill and redevelopment sites that is designed to fit into the surrounding context.</td>
<td>Redevelopment, Revitalization, and Infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.9.</strong> Adaptive re-use of existing unused or underutilized structures for housing is supported when in conformance with other Plan policies.</td>
<td>Redevelopment, Revitalization, and Infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11.</strong> Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions in the region to address the provision of a healthy balance of jobs and housing in each jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Growth Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2: Stakeholders Committee’s Recommended Policies Tracking Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Policy Language</th>
<th>Current Policy or Action/Strategy Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide housing options throughout Loudoun County that can accommodate a variety of lifestyles, households, ages, cultures, market preferences, incomes, and special needs.</td>
<td>1. Provide housing options throughout Loudoun County that can accommodate a variety of lifestyles, households, ages, cultures, market preferences, incomes, and special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage housing to be located near existing or planned employment opportunities, schools, communities, utilities, multi-modal transportation options and other amenities.*</td>
<td>2.8. (Converted to an Action/Strategy) Encourage housing that is developed to fulfill unmet housing needs to be served by public utilities and located near existing or planned employment opportunities, public facilities and services, transit, and other amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase the diversity of housing unit types, sizes, and innovative designs throughout Loudoun County.</td>
<td>1.4. (Converted to an Action/Strategy) Maintain the County’s economic competitiveness by increasing the diversity of housing unit types, sizes, prices, and innovative designs throughout Loudoun County which are attainable and desirable to all income levels of the workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support mixed-use development projects that provide a continuum of housing types and prices as well as commercial uses such as retail, entertainment and offices in a walkable environment.</td>
<td>1.7. (Converted to an Action/Strategy) Support mixed-use development projects that provide a continuum of housing types and prices as well as commercial uses such as retail, entertainment and offices in a walkable environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support residential development on infill and redevelopment</td>
<td>(Shifted to Redevelopment, Revitalization, and Infill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites that is designed to acknowledge the surrounding context</td>
<td>Policies) Support residential development on infill and redevelopment sites that is designed to fit into the surrounding context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase the quantity of affordable housing units and create a continuum of affordable housing options for all people (workforce levels, ages, incomes and abilities) who want to live and/or work in Loudoun County.</td>
<td>2. Increase the quantity and diversity of affordable housing for all people who want to work and live in Loudoun County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Create a dedicated revenue stream for affordable housing programs in the County.</td>
<td>4. (Converted to an Action/Strategy) Create a dedicated revenue stream for affordable housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide a variety of housing types that are attainable and desirable to all levels of the workforce to maintain the County’s economic competitiveness.</td>
<td>1.4. (Converted to an Action/Strategy) Maintain the County’s economic competitiveness by increasing the diversity of housing unit types, sizes, prices, and innovative designs throughout Loudoun County which are attainable and desirable to all income levels of the workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Leverage public and private resources to address housing needs in Loudoun County.</td>
<td>4. Leverage public and private resources to address housing needs in Loudoun County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Preserve the existing affordable housing stock in Loudoun County.</td>
<td>3. Preserve the existing affordable housing stock in Loudoun County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: RGP Definitions*

*Note: Current RGP glossary definitions are provided for reference, but these definitions are subject to change.

**Affordable Housing:** Non-subsidized housing (sale or rental) for those people whose income is 30–70 percent of the median household income for the area. Such housing should require no more than 30 percent of household income.

**Manufactured Housing:** Manufactured housing are homes built entirely in the factory, transported to the site, and installed under a federal building code administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

**Special Needs Population:** Special needs populations include low income residents (incomes below the 30 percent Area Median Income (AMI)), elderly residents requiring congregate care, disabled residents, and the homeless.

**Universal Design:** The simple design of both products and the built environment to be useable by people of all ages and abilities, and which promotes the ability for people to age in place.

**Unmet Housing Needs:** The lack of housing options for households earning up to 100% of the Washington Metropolitan Area Median Income (AMI).
STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTEE
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Below is a list of information that has been requested from staff during recent Stakeholders Committee Meetings. Staff’s responses to these requests are provided in red.

November 6, 2017

Parks Needs Assessment

- Questions for information regarding public facility planning, especially as it pertains to parks, specifically:
  - Is there a facility deficit for parks?
    - Yes, due to land availability for certain park sizes and cost / fiscal priorities.
  - What land needs to be acquired to meet demand?
    - The PRCS Service Plan, Standards and Facilities Information is available [here](#).

Forecasting / Market Assessment / Fiscal Impact

- Transition Policy Area fiscal impact analysis used for current plan.
  - Provided at Nov. 20th meeting. Click [here](#) to view meeting documents and webcast.

Land Preservation

- Provide consultant’s research on PDR and TDR programs to Stakeholder Committee.
  - While some information was received from consultant, the product only included definitions of PDR and TDR and links to localities using the programs. No analysis of the program(s) viability for Loudoun was included in the research.

Process Question

- Calculate the amount of time that staff, Stakeholders Committee and its subcommittees have contributed to Envision Loudoun to develop buy-in to the plan among the public, Stakeholders Committee, Planning Commission, and the public.
  - This information, particularly staff time spent on the Envision Loudoun process, is not tracked on an hourly basis.

November 20, 2017

Needs Assessment

- Can Stakeholders Committee get a copy of the Stantec Silver Line report?
  - The Silver Line Land Use Scenario Planning Study is available at: [https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/117873](https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/117873)
  - The accompanying Market Analysis and Best Practices Study is available at: [https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/116094](https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/116094)
December 4, 2017

Land Use Related Requests Questions

• Request for a clear picture of current By-Right Development, Pipeline Development above the Revised General Plan
  
  o This information will be provided when the Constrained Forecast that is based on the Stakeholders Committee recommended land use plan is completed.

Transportation Related Requests

• Is the FY 2018 Budget of $114 Million allocated to construction only or is it a combination of construction or bond coverage?
  
  o Per DTCI: The FY 2018 Budget includes funding for design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of roads. The County does require contractors to provide performance and payment bonds on County projects. Further, they are also typically required to post a bond with VDOT for any work that occurs within the public right-of-way.

• General request for bike-pedestrian funding allocations.
  
  o Per DTCI: As discussed on December 4th, the TLUC on November 17th recommended budget direction (5-0) that the Board incorporate 3-5 miles of standalone (i.e. above and beyond those belong incorporated into a road project) bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects each year in the CIP. The Board is anticipated to consider this recommendation during budget discussions this Spring.

• How many lane miles are built by proffers and how many through public funds?
  
  o Per DTCI: This question is complex and does not have a simple answer. As the County has approved legislative applications, proffers for various aspects of planned roadway improvements are incorporated. These improvements may include but are not limited to: dedication of right-of-way, provision of easements, relocation of utilities, provision of roadway lanes, provision of turn lanes, provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and installation of traffic control devices. Further, many proffer statements include cash-in-lieu contributions towards the partial or full cost of an improvement, if constructed by others. Whatever form these improvements take, it is important to note that the need for certain improvements are fully site-generated, meaning that an owner/Applicant provided these improvements based solely or primarily on traffic impacts generated by the proposed development program. Meanwhile, others improvements are regional, meaning that the need for the improvement is only partially generated by the site. In these cases, the County negotiates a regional transportation contribution for a portion of the costs of these improvements. Therefore, most lane miles are built with some combination of public and private investment, and it would be extremely onerous and complex to try to break down those amounts into exact numbers.
• Are there projects with unbuilt facilities due to triggers not being met?
  
  o Per DTCl: Yes. Some triggers have not been met due to continuing/ongoing development of the site, while others will likely never be met due to a site building out at a lower density than approved without ever reaching the proffered triggers. There are also sites that are permitted to develop a land use pattern that has not been economically-viable in recent years, such as suburban office parks. Therefore, there are also proffers outstanding for sites that are neither under construction nor built out.

• Request for general statistics of vehicle accidents and severity in Western Loudoun County.
  
  o Please click here (BOS Item - Primary Rural Roads - 06-29-17) for information on rural primary roads that DTCl staff presented to the Board of Supervisors at the 2017 Transportation Summit on June 29, 2017. The item contains crash data and maps for primary roadways in the Rural Policy Area (i.e. Routes 7, 9, 15, 50 and 287) for the five-year period from 2012 through 2016.

**Forecasting / Market Assessment / Fiscal Impact**

• When are we getting the Market Assessment?
  
  o The Market Assessment was presented at the Stakeholders Committee Meeting on January 22, 2018

**December 18, 2017**

**Rural Policy Area**

• One Stakeholder asked how many lots under 10 acres currently exist in the RPA?
  
  o There are 12,772 lots under 10 acres in the RPA. Of that number, approximately 15 of those parcels are split by the boundary and have half either in the TPA or a Town.

**Existing Villages**

• One Stakeholder asked how the Existing Villages where originally selected for inclusion in the current Revised General Plan?
  
  o The identification of the villages in Loudoun County is estimated to have begun with the County’s Resources Management Plan, circa 1979. Villages continued to be identified and accounted for during comprehensive plan writing efforts in the following decades.
**January 22, 2018**

**Market Analysis**

- For the jobs forecast, is there an effort to determine how many of the new jobs are “export” jobs (like data centers and other large companies) and how many are created because of more housing inside the County (like retail jobs, school teachers, etc.)?
  - Response to this question / request for information will be answered by the Department of Economic Development and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- Is it possible to break down income and wages of the projected job growth? Can you convert the demand to spatial dimensions of the unconstrained forecast? Will there be spatial needs assigned to capital facilities needs? In other words, can you tell how much land would be needed for schools, parks, etc. to fulfill the demand?
  - Response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Economic Development and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- What if the constrained forecast exceeds demand?
  - Response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Economic Development and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- Are there any deviation from FIC guidelines in the forecasting of the constrained plan? If so then, the Base Line Scenario will have to be adjusted for those deviations, correct?
  - Response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Economic Development and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- It would be useful to look at the criteria for the allocations of constrained growth; will the Stakeholders have access to the assumptions that went into the forecasting?
  - The criteria for allocations will be provided during presentation of forecasting results at a future Stakeholders Committee Meeting, likely in late Spring 2018.

**Fiscal Impact Analysis**

- In terms of capital forecasting and capital facility needs, are we and/or should be lumping the Rural Policy Area with the Towns and/or JLMA?
  - Response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- Will the County incorporate existing needs or shortfalls into the costs / impacts of the new plan?
  - Response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

- Has or how has Staff considered redevelopment in the fiscal modeling?
  - Yes, redevelopment has been considered. A full response to this question / request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget.
• Can the stakeholders committee be provided with examples of fiscal impact models/results from other communities?
  ○ The Department of Management and Budget is working with the consultant to obtain this information.

• Is the fiscal impact analysis for the Revised General Plan available?
  ○ Yes; these documents, Fiscal Impact Analysis of Planning Commission Alternative 2001 and Fiscal Impact Analysis 2001 Comprehensive Plan, are provided at the following links:
    https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/131261
    https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/131262

• Is there a new Capital Intensity Factor being developed for the fiscal analysis?
  ○ Response to this question/request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

• What about the difference between the CIF of 2017? How this that being accounted for?
  ○ Response to this question/request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

• Is there a difference or delta of the CIF for the current Revised General Plan versus the new proposed plan?
  ○ Response to this question/request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

• How are the deficits in current facilities based on the current Revised General Plan being captured in the fiscal analysis? To not do so would be a mistake.
  ○ Response to this question/request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.

• When do we get to map the parks and public facilities?
  ○ Staff will bring recommended public facilities and parks plan chapters/sections which will include maps for the Committee to work on in future Committee Meetings, generally in the April 2018 timeframe.

• Where are the variety of different proffers received by the County captured in the fiscal impact model?
  ○ Response to this question/request for information is being answered by the Department of Management and Budget and will be provided to the Stakeholders Committee.