Stakeholder Committee Meeting

August 14, 2017 | Loudoun County Comprehensive Plan
Agenda

1. Welcome / Sign-in / Dinner / Administrative Items
2. Housing Primer Presentation
3. Economic Development Primer Presentation
4. Stakeholders Subcommittee Formation
5. Suburban Policy Area Place Types Updates
7. Adjourn
Affordable Housing in Loudoun County
Economic Development in Loudoun County
Subcommittees Formation
# Stakeholders Subcommittees

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Staff Liaisons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Salmon / Kathy Blackburn</td>
<td>Dan Galindo, DPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Baker</td>
<td>James David, DED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Erickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Pearson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Stakeholders Subcommittees

### HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Staff Liaisons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Salmon / Kathy Blackburn</td>
<td>Dan Galindo, DPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>Sarah Coyle Etro, DFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Bingol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Capretti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packie Crown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Henrikson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Yacoub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stakeholders Subcommittees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVISED GENERAL PLAN POLICY CARRYOVER SUBCOMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Salmon / Kathy Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Canonico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Glassmoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Paciulli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ruedisueli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Van Huyck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Subcommittee Alternates

## SUBCOMMITTEE ALTERNATE POOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Gilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mowbray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Approach and Place Types Update
Place Type Updates

1. **Airport** – Removed
2. **Natural Resources Extraction** – Combined with **Heavy Industrial**
3. Use lists consolidated in all Place Types
4. Large-scale Corporate Headquarters use moved from **Institutional Campus** to **Mixed Employment**
Place Type Updates

5. Neighborhood A
   - Uses added: Suburban Multi-family Residential, Office & Neighborhood Serving Retail
   - Land Area Mix: Revised to better display breakdown; Max. % of Nonresidential increased

6. Neighborhood B
   - Uses added: Office & Neighborhood Serving Retail
   - Land Area Mix: Revised to better display breakdown; Max. % of Nonresidential increased
   - Residential Density: Max. increased to 16 du/acre (from 14)
Place Type Updates

7. **Neighborhood C**
   - Previous “C” removed
   - Previous “D” now “C”

8. **Neighborhood Center & Community Commercial Center**
   - Residential Density: Changed to 16-24 du/acre
   - Residential/Nonresidential Mix: Changed to reflect possibility of residential uses

9. **Regional Commercial Center**
   - Residential Density: Changed to 16-24 du/acre
Staff’s Application of Place Types

1. Key Characteristics Considered:
   • Context, Compatibility, Scale & Entitlements

2. Development patterns were generalized into a single place type
   • Existing master planned developments of single-family detached, single-family attached, and multi-family housing = Neighborhood A

3. Alternative Place Types were only proposed on areas of substantial acreage (i.e. not every undeveloped 2 acre parcel)
Community Framework Updates

1. Dulles Airport – Removed as Framework Area
2. Maturing Neighborhoods – Combined with Suburban Neighborhoods
Community Framework Proposal

1. Merge Silver Line TOD into other Suburban Framework Areas

2. Create Urban Framework Areas
   - A more generalized approach that encourages higher density urban development at appropriate locations
   - Would utilize the same Place Types with corresponding policies establishing expectations for urban form and higher intensity of development
Community Framework Proposal

Urban Framework Areas:

- Metro Stations (highest intensity)
- Walkable Places (Non-Metro) (lesser intensity)
## Community Framework Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Place Types</th>
<th>Potential Place Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial Center</td>
<td>Community Commercial Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial Center</td>
<td>Medium Urban Mixed-Use (CPAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center Mixed Use</td>
<td><em>Tall Urban Mixed-Use (CPAM)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remaining Refinements / Updates

1. Desired Form and Character Tables
   • Calibrate Characteristics including Use Mix & Building Heights
     • NOTE: For Place Types with two column tables, multifamily would be allowed in either Use Pattern
   • Add Transportation Characteristics

2. Incorporate (i.e. Merge or Add) Silver Line CPAM Place Typologies in to Place Types

3. Incorporate Stakeholder Feedback on Community Framework Map and Suburban Place Type Map
Suburban Policy Area
Place Types Map
Set Up
Questions for Feedback

1. Do the Suburban Policy Area Place Types Maps appropriately address the location and adjacencies of:
   a) Revitalization and redevelopment areas
   b) Areas previously identified as Keynote Employment with Mixed Employment which allows for a mix of uses
   c) Mixed Employment and Industrial Uses (Along Routes 7 and 50)
   d) Urban areas (Community Framework Handout)

2. What feedback do you have concerning generalizing development patterns into broad place types given the predominant use(s), as shown in the maps?
Discussion Considerations

1. Previous Stakeholders Comments
   a) Mixed use communities, creating ‘place’ rather than developments
   b) Rethinking Keynote Employment
   c) Compatibility of new land use plan with existing development
   d) Older retail / commercial / industrial centers areas great targets for redevelopment
   e) Locating housing near employment
   f) Connectivity throughout the Suburban Policy Area
   g) Route 7 Non-residential development patterns
   h) Route 50 Industrial / Non-residential patterns and characteristics
Discussion Considerations

1. What you do not see, yet.
   a) Land area outside of the Areas of Potential Change have an initial place type assigned based on current zoning / existing development only
   b) More clear definition of the Urban Areas on the Place Types Map
   c) Completion of the desired form and character of each Place Type