envision LOUDOUN
our county • our future
Stakeholder Committee Meeting

September 11, 2017 | Loudoun County Comprehensive Plan
Agenda

1. Welcome / Sign-in / Dinner / Administrative Items
2. Transition Policy Area – Small Work Groups
3. Break
5. Housing and Economic Development Policy Recommendations
6. Adjourn
Subcommittee Meetings

Revised General Plan Policy Carryover Subcommittee
   Tuesday, September 12th – 1-2pm in Purcellville Room

Housing Subcommittee
   Tuesday, September 12th – 5-7pm in Purcellville Room
   Tuesday, September 19th – 7-9pm in Lovettsville Room

Economic Development Subcommittee
   Monday, September 18th – 5-7pm in Purcellville Room
   Thursday, September 21st – 5-7pm in Purcellville Room
Transition Policy Area
Place Types Map
Exercise
Purpose

- Discuss land use concepts
- Provide staff with input
- Identify subjects for evaluation
Board Charter

• Area has experienced significant development pressure
• Suburban policy area is nearing build-out
• Utilities and improved roadways are being built nearby
• Legislative applications in the TPA have been in conflict due to use and density
• Area will continue to see development pressures and Plan conflicts
Public Comments

• Maintain the Transition Policy Area As Is
  • Protect environmental resources and open space
  • Add no more housing
  • Add no more traffic
  • Protect property values
• If strategic development occurs, maintain open space and protect environmental features
• Re-evaluate the TPA/Consider changing the boundary
• Allow limited/more development
Stakeholder Comments

- Relieve development pressure in the rural area
- Utilities should be used more effectively
- Some areas of change identified
- Adjust boundary between TPA, RPA and SPA
- Sycolin Road, Ryan Road and Braddock Road - higher density residential or commercial uses
Considerations

• Existing development character:
  • Open space
  • Cluster pattern
  • Resource protection

• Opportunities and constraints
  • Road location and capacity
  • Existing pattern
  • 30% of area available
  • Central utilities throughout
Scenario 1

- Retain current land use plan
- Density 1 du/1-10 acres
- Residential detached
- Estimate buildout 11,306 units
- Industrial Sycolin
- Retail limited

Scenario 2

- Reflect current land use
- Retain open space
- Targeted density increase
- Expanded employment
- Specified neighborhood centers
Scenario 1
Current Pattern

• **Lower Sycolin:**
  • 1,273 acres available
  • Zoning TR-10
  • Open space: 70%

• **Middle Goose:**
  • 948 acres available
  • Zoning TR-10
  • Open space: 70%
• **Upper Broad Run:**
  - 2,000 acres available
  - Zoning: TR-1 (614 ac)
  - Zoning: TR-3 (1,386)
  - Open space: 50%

• **Upper Foley:**
  - 530 acres available
  - Zoning: TR-3
  - Open space: 50%
• **Lower Foley:**
  - 2,696 acres available
  - Zoning: TR-3
  - Open space: 50%

• **Lower Bull Run:**
  - 445 acres available
  - Zoning: TR-3
  - Open space: 70%
TR-3 50% Open Space
TR-1 50% Open Space
TR-10 70% Open Space
Pros & Cons Scenario 1

**Pros:**
- Retains visual transition
- Respects current development
- Consistent impact on utilities, roads and services
- Environmental protection
- Retains land for public uses

**Cons:**
- Does not address housing diversity
- Does not address housing demand & affordability
- All associated capital and service costs from general funds
Scenario 2
Targeted Change

- Lower Sycolin & Middle Goose Creek
  - Expand Industrial
  - Retain current pattern
  - Proximity to Leesburg
  - Corridor access
  - Existing industrial approvals
Upper Broad Run & Upper Foley

- Current pattern
- Existing development leaves smaller, scattered potential
- Planned roads limited
- Environmental constraints
• **Lower Foley**
  - Higher density
  - Road access
  - Limited existing development

• **Lower Bull Run**
  - Existing development pattern
  - Environmental resources
Pros & Cons Scenario 2

Pros:
• Fiscal balance
• Retains visual transition
• Supports diversity & affordability
• Protects Environment
• Retains open space
• Potential to mitigate public costs through proffers

Cons:
• Greater transportation impacts
• Increases service & facility demands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place Type:</strong> Transition Neighborhood A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Pattern</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Uses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail uses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment uses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View from Perimeter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Street Pattern</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses allowable but not mandated part of mix.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use pattern</th>
<th>Small lot, urban form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential uses</td>
<td>Detached and attached units, 4 du/acre, detached lot sizes &lt;10,000 sf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Minimum 50% of project. May be active and passive recreation, farmland, and conservation areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Internal Street Pattern</td>
<td>Landscaped, significant setbacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place Types: Employment & Commercial

Transition Light Industrial:
• Low impact design
• 0.1-0.6 Floor Area Ratio
• Open space: 50%
• Uses
  • Warehousing
  • Data centers
  • Flex space
  • Office

Neighborhood Center:
Low impact design
0.1-0.6 Floor Area Ratio
Open space: 50%
Uses:
• Neighborhood-serving retail commercial
• Small-format retail and service uses
• Office
• Civic uses & space
Supporting Policy

• Maintain environmental protection
  • Conserve existing forests and habitat
  • Stream buffers
• Maintain visual and spatial transition
• Mitigate capital and fiscal impacts
  • Phase with available transportation and services
  • Utilize proffers
• Design for affordability
• Design open space for accessibility, connectivity, visual
• Preserve historic sites
Questions & Comments
Exercise
Discussion Considerations

1. Public Input from Round 1 *(previously provided)*
2. Public Input from Round 2 *(overview of major topic areas)*
3. Previous background and data provided
4. Previous Stakeholders Comments
Discussion Considerations

4. What you do not see, yet.
   a) Land area in the Transition Policy Area have an initial place type, other place types in the Rural and Suburban Policy Areas are not shown in this iteration
   b) Completion of the desired form and character guidelines of each Place Type for the Transition Policy Area
   c) Accompanying policies and guidance
Work Group Instructions

1. Split up into four groups
2. Review three Place Types Maps
   • Accompanying context maps also provided
3. Hold up to 25 minutes of discussion for each map to ensure all maps are covered
4. Use remaining time to revisit any maps that need additional discussion
5. Break
6. Report out
Questions for Feedback

1. What is your initial reaction to the two scenarios? Any pros or cons?
2. What things would you change (if any)?
3. Why would you make those changes?
4. If new development occurs in the Transition Policy Area, what would you like to see addressed?
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By Right

- TR 3 Zoning
- 1 du / 3 ac
- 50% open space (HOA)
By Right

• TR 10
• 1 du/10 ac
• 70% open space (HOA)
By Right

- TR-1
- 1 du/acre
- 50% Open space