BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUSINESS MEETING
ACTION ITEM

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE COMMITTEE REPORT: Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update

ELECTION DISTRICT: Broad Run and Dulles

CRITICAL ACTION DATE: At the pleasure of the Board

STAFF CONTACTS: Richard Klusek AICP, Project Manager, Planning and Zoning
                  Chris Garcia, AICP, Program Manager, Planning and Zoning
                  Ricky Barker, AICP, Director, Planning and Zoning

PURPOSE: This item is to summarize the results of the October 14, 2016 Transportation and Land Use Committee (TLUC) meeting on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM); to obtain the Board of Supervisors’ (Board) direction on specific amendments to the draft Silver Line Area Transportation Plan; to direct staff to postpone the upcoming Planning Commission public hearing; and to refer the CPAM to the November TLUC meeting for additional evaluation and refinement.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board provide direction on the changes to the proposed Transportation Plan; direct staff to postpone the Planning Commission October public hearing on the CPAM; and forward the item to the November TLUC meeting.

BACKGROUND: At its October 14, 2016 meeting, TLUC had a comprehensive discussion on the draft Silver Line CPAM. Specifically, TLUC was asked to provide staff direction on seven (7) specific items (Attachment 1, October 14, 2016, TLUC staff report). There were certain aspects of the Silver Line CPAM that staff needed Board direction on so these items can be discussed and evaluated during the review and approval process. During the meeting, TLUC provided additional recommendation on a number of other items that are included in this report. Staff has summarized the key results of the TLUC meeting below.

DIRECTION ON SPECIFIC ITEMS FROM TLUC STAFF REPORT:

1. Land Use Plan Alternative A – Mixed Use on the East Side of Loudoun County Parkway Within One Mile of the Metro Stations

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC approved on a vote of 3-2 (Higgins and Umstattd opposed) to change the Compact Walkable Employment and Compact Walkable Non-Residential designation
on specific properties on the east side of Loudoun County Parkway to Urban Mixed Use, Medium Buildings (See Map 1). Some members felt that the properties within one-mile of a metro station should be designated for mixed use to provide for greater flexibility.

2. Land Use Alternative B – Urban Multifamily Residential on the East Side of Loudoun Gateway Station

TLUC Recommendation:
TLUC approved on a vote of 4-1 (Randall opposed) to change the designation of these properties to Compact, Walkable Non-Residential to provide the greatest amount of flexibility and density for non-residential development (see Map 2). There was discussion about the need for multifamily residential near the Loudoun Gateway Station outside of the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay District Noise Contour; however, a majority supported non-residential due to anticipated revenues from this type of development. In addition, TLUC members supported a change to increase the Floor Area Ratio maximum from 4.0 to 6.0.

3. Land Use Alternative C – Single Family Residential at the Regency Subdivision and Vantage Pointe Subdivision

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC unanimously supported (5-0) retaining the Single Family Detached designation to recognize these two existing residential developments. Some TLUC members supported revising this issue in future years when there is more interest and opportunity to consider redevelopment of these existing developments.

4. Land Use Plan Alternative D – Mixed Use along Ashburn Village Boulevard

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC unanimously supported (5-0) changing the designation of this property from Urban Residential to Mixed Use Medium Buildings (See Map 3). This property is within ½ mile of the future Ashburn Metro Station and the designation will provide more flexibility for the property’s future use.

5. Urban Residential Designation

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC approved on a vote of 3-2 (Randall and Volpe Opposed) to amend the Urban Residential designation to include primary uses for active adult residential, mixed uses (more non-residential opportunities), and to remove the urban-style townhome as a desirable use. TLUC also directed staff to research questions regarding various residential types and densities and report back to TLUC in November. The biggest concern with the allowance for townhomes was the generation of school-age children and the need to build more schools. Several members felt that some types of townhomes may not have a significant impact on schools. One member recommended to add “Live/Work” units within the preferred land use.

6. Identification of Possible Areas for Parks and Schools

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC approved on a vote of 5-0 to direct staff to develop policies to reduce the footprint/size of schools and parks within the CPAM area; to begin work on new
standards for schools within this area; and to encourage more use of private parks instead of public parks. Several members expressed concerns about potentially using 300 acres of land for public uses and the impact this would have on generating revenue for the tax district. Several members recommended the use of urban-type schools especially for elementary schools.

7. Residential Development in the LDN 65 noise contours of the Airport Impact Overlay District

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC approved on a vote of 5-0 to reaffirm the County’s Policy and Zoning Ordinance requirements of not allowing residential uses inside the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay District. Both the Revised General Plan and the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance do not support/allow residential uses within the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay District. In addition the Revised General Plan requires public notification of airport impacts on a residential community for areas within one mile of the LDN 60 noise contour. In addition to the notification provision, properties within the 60 to 65 LDN range must disclose the location of the property in the LDN 60 to 65 to perspective buyers, and provide acoustical treatment for structures within this area, and to provide avigation easements indicating the right for flights to pass over the property.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED SILVER LINE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

TLUC recommended two significant changes to the proposed Silver Line Transportation Plan. The TLUC chair recommended that these proposed changes go to the full Board to receive direction so staff could begin studying the impact of these proposed changes.

A. Removal of Several Proposed Urban Two-Lane Roadways

TLUC Recommendation: TLUC recommended to the Board on a vote of 3-2 (Randall and Umstattd opposed) to remove proposed road segments between Prentice Drive and Shellhorn Road (See Map 4). Several members felt that smaller two-lane road segments should not be on the plan since they were not shown throughout the plan. TLUC members also stated that the developer of the properties would provide their own network which should provide adequate circulation. Staff had expressed that removing the roads would not allow the County to require that these roads be provided.

B. Extension of Barrister Road to Commerce Court (Third Crossing of Broad Run)

TLUC recommended to the Board on a vote of 5-0 to add a new crossing of the Broad Run from the existing Barrister Road to Commerce Court as another Greenway alternative to the proposed Silver Line Transportation Plan (See Map 4). Several members understood that this was a significant change; however, felt that the road should be added now so it could be evaluated and studied during the process.
OTHER RECOMMENDED CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS FROM TLUC:

The following is a list of other items discussed and recommended during the October 14, 2016 TLUC meeting. TLUC recommended that these changes and the above changes be forwarded to its November meeting.

Changes in Text to Support Economic Development Goals

TLUC members suggested that Planning and Zoning staff work with Economic Development staff to modify wording throughout the Plan to ensure that economic development goals continue to be supported. These changes include addressing existing entitlement and supporting data centers and other economic opportunities within the study area.

Evaluation of the Student Generation Figure

TLUC members requested that staff further evaluate the student generation figures from residential uses near metro stations. Specifically, residential development around other newer metro stations should be evaluated rather than older stations in Arlington.

Identification of Mixed Use Neighborhood Areas

Staff received feedback at the TLUC meeting that more work is needed for the four neighborhood areas described in the plan. Specifically, there were concerns about the impact on properties that were split between neighborhoods and the implementation of the proposed development guidelines.

Townhomes within Mixed Use Designation

TLUC members recommended that Townhomes be designated an undesirable within the Mixed Use – Medium Designation. Members were concerned about the impact on schools of additional Townhome developments.

General Changes to the Plan Text

Staff received feedback regarding some specific changes to the text of the plan to clarify and improve the document.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE OCTOBER PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

Due to the significant number of recommended changes and the need to obtain further direction from the full Board, TLUC recommended postponing the Planning Commission’s October public hearing on the CPAM until after the Board’s December 6, 2016, Business Meeting. Several members felt it was better to have a cleaner version of the plan and more direction from the Board prior to holding a Planning Commission public hearing. This action would significantly delay the original schedule to have the Planning Commission’s recommended CPAM to the Board by December. A potential new schedule would be as follows:
Revised Silver Line CPAM Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>TLUC Briefing/Discussion and Board Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016</td>
<td>TLUC Meeting on Revised Draft Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>Board Discussion and Direction of TLUC’s Revised Draft Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>Planning Commission Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>Planning Commission Work Session and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Board Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April 2017</td>
<td>Board Endorsement of Draft Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July 2017</td>
<td>VDOT Completes Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Adopts CPAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALTERNATIVES: The Board may delay action on changing the revised Transportation Plan alternatives until staff has an opportunity to study them and provide its recommendation. The Board may also choose to continue to hold the Planning Commission public hearing and allow for the Commission to provide its recommendations on these items before the Board makes any recommended changes.

FISCAL IMPACT: The draft fiscal impact of the CPAM was included in the October 14, 2016, TLUC report. Due to the significant number of recommended changes, a new draft will be developed that will evaluate the fiscal impacts of the CPAM.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

1. I move that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to make the changes to the Silver Line Area Transportation Plan as recommended by TLUC so they can be evaluated during the CPAM process.

   AND

   I further move that the October 2016 Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Silver Line CPAM be postponed until after the December 6, 2016, Board of Supervisor’s Business Meeting.

   AND

   I further move that the draft Silver Line Area CPAM be forwarded to the November TLUC meeting for further study and evaluation.

   OR

2. I move an alternate motion.
ATTACHMENTS:

1. October 14, 2016, TLUC Silver Line Area CPAM Staff Report
2. Map 1 (Land Use Recommendation For New Mixed Use Areas East of Loudoun County Parkway)
3. Map 2 (Land Use Recommendation for New Mixed Use Areas Near Ashburn Boulevard)
4. Map 3 (Land Use Recommendations for Area Near Loudoun Gateway Station)
5. Map 4 (Proposed Transportation Plan Changes)
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**SUBJECT:** Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update
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**STAFF CONTACTS:**
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**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this item is to: 1) provide information to address questions from the July 15, 2016 Transportation and Land Use Committee (TLUC) Meeting regarding the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM); 2) provide an update for the project; and 3) request Board direction on specific items related to the CPAM Land Use Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the TLUC make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors (Board) regarding specific items included within this report.

**BACKGROUND:** Staff has been actively engaged in activities for the Silver Line CPAM since October 16, 2013, when the 2012-2015 Board initiated a Silver Line/Metrorail Tax District CPAM to evaluate the development potential of the Dulles Metrorail Service Districts. Once initiated, the beginning steps of the effort included studies of market conditions and conceptual planning scenarios.

In 2014, Loudoun County sought the assistance of a Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel (TAP) to determine if the County’s Revised General Plan provides a planned land use that strikes a desired and beneficial balance between the following four criteria:

- Prompt realization of tax revenues to support future Metrorail operations;
- Maximizing future employment generation;
- Achieving the desired land use pattern; and
- Minimizing demands on the County’s transportation infrastructure.

More specifically, the County requested that the Panel examine several topics and questions throughout the one and one-half day TAP, such as market realities, transit oriented development, infrastructure, existing land use, and planned land use. The Panel recommended developing a

**Attachment 1**
distinct and detailed character for each station through visioning, small area planning, branding and marketing, and the creation of a place, which led to follow up studies of this in the Silver Line area. The Board requested staff to prepare scopes of service for two studies consisting of a land use scenario planning study and a market analysis and best practices study in July 2014. On September 17, 2014, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for consultant services for a land use scenario planning study and a market analysis and best practices study, with contracts not to exceed $200,000 and $125,000 respectively.

On September 16, 2015, Staff presented the results of the Market Analysis and Best Practices Study funded by the Board. In general, the study found that market conditions for office development are likely to remain soft for several years to come. However, the study also demonstrated that the locations within a half mile of Metro stations represented 92.3 percent of overall office leasing activity in the Washington, DC region. To facilitate development, the study recommended consideration of interim uses and enhanced planning with property owners including the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA) to reflect emerging trends of “Airport City” development that looks at non-aeronautical facilities and services in addition to its aeronautical infrastructure. The study also recommended maintaining existing Transit Related Employment Center (TREC) policies and making only minor modifications to reflect recommendations for interim uses and emphasizing the potential for “anchor” and catalytic uses. With regard to airport compatibility, the study provided several case studies of airports around the world. These case studies demonstrated that most airport operators and airport jurisdictions are taking proactive approaches to ensuring compatible land uses and limiting the amount of residential development in airport flight paths.

On January 21, 2016, staff presented the final report of the Land Use Scenario Planning Study to the 2016-2019 Board. The Loudoun County Land Use Scenario Planning Study provided an opportunity to contemplate alternative futures for Metrorail Service District in Loudoun County and measure the impacts of those decisions to evaluate the trade-offs associated with competing scenarios. The result of the scenario planning study indicated that the preferred land use scenario was characterized by focused, dense mixed-use development within close proximity of the stations (within ½ mile or 10 minute walking distance from the stations); walkable, pedestrian-friendly pathways in those dense, intense activity centers that moderates capital facility needs, maximized tax revenue compared to other development scenarios; and provided an increase in employment opportunities. During that meeting, the Board referred (8-0-1; Letourneau absent) the Silver Line Small Area Plan item to TLUC to develop a boundary, work program, and schedule. The previously completed studies and associated documentation are available for viewing and download at www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam.

On February 12, 2016, Staff solicited feedback from TLUC on a recommended work program consisting of the plan boundary, expected outcomes, a process and a schedule. Staff prepared a map showing a preliminary CPAM Boundary that extended beyond the Scenario Planning Study

---

2 The Land Use Scenario Planning Study can be found at https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/117873.
Area (Attachment 1). The study area included an area of approximately one mile beyond the Ashburn and Loudoun Gateway Metrorail Stations while recognizing several existing boundaries. During the discussion, TLUC requested modifications to the CPAM boundary and specifically recommended a boundary that considered all areas in the black outline and dotted blue outline on Attachment 1.

During the meeting, staff discussed the expected outcomes with the Committee. Staff recommended that a targeted area planning approach, drafted as a separate document, be used to recognize the unique set of circumstances and needs for the Metrorail area and provide policies that address those specific conditions rather than relying on somewhat more generic countywide policies. Developing a targeted area plan has the advantage of being incorporated as a CPAM into the New Comprehensive Plan while allowing current Revised General Plan deficiencies to be more quickly addressed, and can be updated and amended more quickly in the future should that need arise. The CPAM would take into account the recommendations and concepts presented in the Market Analysis and Best Practices and Scenario Planning Studies, but specific details like road networks, alignments, and specific land uses will be refined during the planning process. Staff presented an eight phase process for completing the desired outcomes, with a goal of completing the process by the end of November 2016.

Phase 1 – Intra-departmental Staff In-depth Review of Consultant’s Recommendations
Phase 2 – Development of a Preliminary Land Use Plan and Policies
Phase 3 – Intra-departmental Review and Refinements
Phase 4 – Public Outreach
Phase 5 – Planning Commission Review and Recommendation
Phase 6 – Board of Supervisors Preliminary Review and Recommendation
Phase 7 – Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Review and Board refinement
Phase 8 – Board Adoption of Plan

During the TLUC meeting, the study area and specific land use patterns (including data centers and building heights) were discussed. TLUC also discussed the future roadway network that should be considered in the CPAM and, in particular, potential alignments for east-west roadways across the Broad Run. During this discussion, Staff noted that it intended to have Shellhorn Road and adjacent roads reflect the alignments that the Board endorsed (9-0) on October 7, 2015. Supervisor Volpe requested Staff to schedule a meeting with the land owners in the study area to discuss the proposed roadway within the Silver Line study area. This meeting took place on February 29, 2016 and included most of the property owners near the two metro stations, Supervisor Volpe, Supervisor Meyer, and staff from Planning and Zoning, Transportation and Capital Infrastructure, and County Administration. Based upon staff’s understanding, the meeting resulted in:

- Consensus on maintaining the proposed Shellhorn Road alignment endorsed by the Board on October 7, 2015;
- Maintaining all other roads shown on the County’s CTP including Prentice Drive;
• Roadways not on the current CTP but proposed in the Silver Line Land Use Scenario Planning are conceptual and some may not be feasible and will need to be removed/changed;
• Urban design guidelines that need to be approved by VDOT for select roadway segments within the network and planned roadways will be applied as components of the Shellhorn design process and incorporated into the Silver Line CPAM; and
• Additional stakeholders meetings in the project schedule should be added to receive feedback on staff land use and transportation concepts.

On March 17, 2016, Staff presented the discussion that took place at the February 12 TLUC meeting. The Board of Supervisors voted (9-0) to initiate the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for development as found in Attachment 1, and approved the Silver Line CPAM boundary, process, schedule, and desired outcomes as presented.

Overview of Activities since the CPAM Initiation

After receiving direction from the Board to continue forward with the CPAM in March 2016, Staff began evaluating the consultant recommendations from the market analysis and best practices study, land use scenario planning study, and the current trends and conditions. Based on Staff’s evaluation and the Board’s decision on the limits of the study area, a proposed land use plan with land use categories and conceptual characteristics was developed for the entire CPAM Study Area. The proposed land use plan was developed using a combination of: the previous consultant’s recommendations, an evaluation of existing and entitled land uses in the study area, existing plan policies, and the desire to create more mixed use developments within the study area.2

Since the initiation of the CPAM, there have been three iterations of the proposed land use plan that has changed over time based on input from property owners and citizens as well as guidance from the TLUC. The following discussion represents the chronology of the plan development, specifically, the development of the proposed land use map.

Staff held the first public outreach meeting on the CPAM on June 29, 2016 at Moorefield Elementary School to receive feedback on the draft land use plan and the Land Use Typology Workbook which provided the draft land use map and descriptions of the various land use categories on the map. Approximately 90 members of the public participated in the meeting. Participants included interested citizens as well as a number of land owners and their consultants. The draft land use plan map that was presented at the public outreach meeting is included as Attachment 2.

The proposed land use plan is forecasted to result in 15,109 additional residential units and an additional 9,513 jobs by 2040, which is beyond what is permitted in the current Revised General Plan and existing entitlements. Staff prepared a preliminary analysis of transportation conditions

2 The entirety of the consultant land use scenario planning study can be found at: https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/117873.
under the proposed land use plans and has found that traffic conditions would be consistent with other urban environments. Comments from the public outreach meeting were compiled, summarized, and posted to the project website at www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam.

On July 15, 2016, Staff presented the CPAM’s progress to date to TLUC and provided an overview of the June 29 public outreach meeting. Staff also presented first iteration of the proposed land use map (Attachment 2) for discussion by the committee. During that meeting, Staff received the following questions to which answers are provided below.

1. **Can additional mixed-use development areas be supported?**

   There are additional areas within the CPAM Boundary that can theoretically accommodate additional mixed-use development. Planning staff does believe there is a limit on how much mixed use the market can support. As we have seen with successful transit-oriented developments elsewhere in the region, full build-out and development can take upwards of 30 or more years.

   As such, Planning Staff recommends focusing the greatest amount of mixed-use development close to the Metrorail Stations (within ½ mile or 10 minute walking distance from the stations). Planning Staff further notes that areas within the CPAM boundary that are currently mapped for non-residential uses are constrained by existing light industrial land use patterns, the Airport Impact Overlay Zone and the current County policies regarding mutual protection of Dulles International Airport operations and land use under the LDN 65 noise contours.

2. **Why are data centers being considered for the study area?**

   At the time this Board initiated the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, there was a desire to achieve an appropriate balance of four main goals: 1) prompt realization of tax revenues to support future Metrorail operations, 2) maximizing future employment generation, 3) achieving the desired land use pattern, and 4) minimizing demands on the County’s transportation infrastructure.

   Data centers help achieve this balance because they provide significant revenues to the County while generating minimal amounts of traffic or minimal need for provision of capital facilities. Data centers comprise a significant portion of forecast non-residential growth in the study area and are therefore important to maximizing tax revenues in the Silver Line Area. In addition, the strategic location of data centers in portions of the CPAM Boundary furthest from Metrorail Stations allows desirable land use patterns and high employment generating uses to locate in the areas closest to the Metrorail Stations. Planning Staff envisions a series of policies in the CPAM to help mitigate data center visual and environmental impacts and to ensure proper placement to mitigate impacts to other land uses.

   Given the unique impacts and benefits of data center uses along with the fiber infrastructure which attracts them to the Silver Line Area, Planning Staff believes that achieving goals and ensuring impacts are mitigated is best accomplished by providing land use policies specific to data center uses. While Planning Staff believes that these policies are an important component
of the CPAM, Staff has removed the Data Center Overlay from the planned land use map and retained policies in the CPAM text. It also should be noted that significant areas within the proposed overlay zone is already entitled for data center uses, which was recognized as a factor in determining the data center overlay concept.

3. **Why was residential development placed proximate to Dulles Airport east of the Loudoun Gateway Station and the LDN 65 when most of the property is developed (e.g., Post Office)?**

The planned land use map (Attachment 2) shown at the July 15, 2016 TLUC meeting placed residential uses east of the Airport Impact Overlay Zone LDN 65 in the vicinity of Randolph Drive. This planned land use designation was based on recommendations from the Urban Land Institute Technical Assistance Panel, a preceding study of the Market Analysis and Best Practices Study, and Scenario Planning Study, which are also bases for the current plan. All three of these studies acknowledged the benefits of having residential development in the vicinity of the Loudoun Gateway Station while cautioning against placing residential uses in a location that could adversely impact operations of Washington Dulles International Airport. In general, consultant recommendations suggested being conservative and limiting residential development in the LDN 65 and LDN 60 noise contours but making an exception to allow some residential development outside of the LDN 65 at the Loudoun Gateway Station. Notwithstanding, Planning Staff recognizes the ongoing debate associated with this issue and understands that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority and Board members have expressed concerns about allowing additional residential development in this area due to most of the property being developed. Planning Staff previously carried forward recommendations of consultant studies but acknowledges that consensus has not been reached and has since removed that area of residential development.

Planning Staff notes that the proposed residential development near the Loudoun Gateway Station was specifically intended to be comprised of only multi-family residential development. This recommendation is based on the fact that multi-family residential development provides for additional building design features that can more easily mitigate airport related noise impacts. In addition, the land use category was specifically intended to provide limited retail so that supportive retail can be located in adjacent non-residential areas in the LDN 65 without an oversaturation of retail uses.

The previously proposed residential development area near the Loudoun Gateway station replaced areas currently planned as Route 28 Business and Route 28 Industrial. The Silver Line CPAM reflected a long term vision for the industrial uses to redevelop into a residential or mixed-use neighborhood similar to the land use transformation that occurred in the Mosaic District in Fairfax County. Planning Staff acknowledges that some existing uses may not be redeveloped for an extended period of time but the land use plan will serve to set forth a new ultimate vision with a higher use for the land surrounding the Loudoun Gateway Metrorail Station.
The above discussion provides the rationale for including some residential at the station. The most recent iteration of the proposed land use map found in Attachment 5 has entirely removed residential development from consideration near the station. This change addresses concerns raised by TLUC and some members of the public but some members of the public continue to suggest that expansion of the residential area is necessary. Planning and Zoning Staff is seeking further direction from the Board regarding this issue.

4. What is the rationale for no mixed-use at Loudoun Gateway?
   As noted above, land surrounding the future Loudoun Gateway Metrorail creates a unique land planning challenge on account of factors like the Airport Impact Overlay Zone and floodplain, which are significant features throughout the planning area. Since land within the LDN 65 Airport Impact Overlay Zone is not appropriate for residential development, that land is envisioned for a wide range of non-residential uses in a walkable urban format.

5. What uses are appropriate near airports?
   At the September 15, 2015 Board meeting, consultants presented the results of the Market Analysis and Best Practices Study which was specifically intended to address airport compatible land uses. The full report is also available for review at www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam. Overall study findings demonstrated that there is no single best use in airport flight paths and that case studies showed a wide range of land use patterns at airports across the world. However, the study did demonstrate that residential development was rarely found in or in close proximity to flight paths. Additionally, the study discussed how a wide range of major anchor uses could be incorporated.

6. How much residential development is included in the mixed-use areas?
   There are two mixed-use development types contemplated in the proposed plan. Both of these areas are envisioned to include residential development. The mixed-use tall buildings category is envisioned to have a significant office and retail component as market research suggest that areas within ½-mile of Metrorail stations are the most attractive for office and retail tenants. Notwithstanding, Planning Staff currently envisions policies in the mixed-use tall category where a minimum of 45 percent of building area would be dedicated to retail and office uses. Within the mixed-use medium category, a significant amount of residential development oriented around a “main street” lined with retail uses is envisioned. Planning Staff currently proposes policies requiring 10 percent of building area dedicated to retail uses and 10% dedicated toward office uses. Current forecasts for 2040 call for 1,222 single-family attached and 5,938 multi-family residential units in the mixed-use medium category and 7,182 multi-family residential units in the mixed-use tall land use category. These figures apply to the mixed-use tall and mixed-use medium land use categories only. The remaining amount of multi-family would be in non-mixed use developments.

7. How was the 22,419 new residential units number calculated?
   The currently proposed land use is forecasted to result in 22,419 new residential units in the CPAM boundary by 2040 based on rough calculations and evaluation of market trends. This forecast for the proposed land use plan assumes all currently approved projects (i.e. Moorefield
Station, Loudoun Station, and Dulles Parkway Center) will rezone to increase residential capacity to densities allowed under the proposed plan. Land use forecasts based on the current Revised General Plan and existing approvals call for 7,142 residential units in the CPAM Boundary that have not yet been built. However, it is important to note that the current Revised General Plan does allow for additional residential densities beyond current approvals. The 22,419 figure above does assume higher densities and applicants submitting new rezoning applications for higher densities. The proposed land use plan also provides several areas of new residential development that are not planned that way in the current Revised General Plan. The chart below demonstrates the differences in unit counts between the current Revised General Plan and the Silver Line CPAM as proposed. It should be noted that the forecasts include several assumptions to account for the flexibility provided by the land use plan and individual land owner decisions. The table below represents forecasted residential development through 2040. It is anticipated that additional residential development under the proposed plan could continue past 2040 to ultimate buildout. The timing of development is subject to market conditions.

### New Housing Units

**Forecast - 2015 through 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Plan(1)</th>
<th>Proposed Plan(2)</th>
<th>Delta (Increases)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>4,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>16,595</td>
<td>10,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>22,251</td>
<td>15,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The Silver Line Area’s residential development is expected to be built-out by 2040 based on approved projects in the pipeline and the current comp plan.

(2) Forecast for the proposed land use plan assumes all currently approved projects (i.e. Moorefield Station, Loudoun Station, and Dulles Parkway Center) will rezone to increase residential capacity to densities allowed under the proposed plan.

### 8. Why are no single-family detached units being considered?

During the Scenario Planning Study, a wide range of potential land use options including single-family detached was considered. However, based on studies of revenue and expenditures, single-family detached housing was determined to be undesirable for the study area. The Scenario Planning Study evaluated performance measures like traffic, tax revenue, and student generation, and operating costs. Overall, the results of this evaluation demonstrated that single-family detached housing did not meet the Board of Supervisors established goals for the Silver Line Area. In addition, participants in public meetings where asked survey questions about the housing types they desired most for the study area, and single-family housing was generally determined to be the least desirable.
9. Can age-restricted units be provided?
Yes. The Silver Line CPAM will encourage a wide range of housing types that fit within the larger objective of providing an urban development pattern. Age restricted housing that fits within the overall design objectives will be encouraged by the policies.

10. What land is available for redevelopment in the study area?
Based on a review of aerial photography, a significant portion of the Silver Line Area can be considered vacant or undeveloped. Attachment 3 shows that developed land and land with ongoing development activities as a static attribute (in gray) with vacant land with development potential colored according the proposed future land use designations found in the third iteration of the proposed land use plan. However, most of that same land has been rezoned and has entitlements for some form of development. The undevelopable information in Attachment 3 is based on a review of aerial photography, building permit data, grading permits, and subdivision data to identify committed land that has on-going construction and/or grading occurring or is already developed. An under construction layer has also been added to identify areas where development is complete and/or construction is underway. Existing entitlements on vacant land will vary widely in terms of the land uses they allow. In addition, the existing entitlements may not necessarily conform to the vision of the current Revised General Plan or the proposed Silver Line CPAM.

11. Is there an expectation for previously approved re-zonings to return for modifications?
Yes. Any land owners wishing to submit a rezoning application have that ability under the current Revised General Plan and under the proposed CPAM. The CPAM will set forth a new or refined vision for all of the entitled land but it will not affect any existing entitlements or re-zonings.

12. What zoning district will be used to implement the plan?
Planning and Zoning Staff are actively working to determine the range of possible zoning districts to implement the CPAM. A wide range of potential options including a new zoning district, or modification to existing zoning districts have been considered.

13. Why can’t planned land uses simply refer to allowable zoning ordinance uses?
The individual districts that comprise the zoning ordinance allow for a wide range of land uses and land use patterns that are not necessarily consistent with a planned land use vision. Conversely, there may be desired uses or development patterns that are not consistent with a certain zoning district. Within the study area for example, there are many areas that are mapped Planned Development Industrial Park (PD-IP). The PD-IP district allows several light industrial uses and data centers that adversely affect the walkable urban character desired in much of the Silver Line Area. There are, however, certain portions of the study area where these uses would be appropriate. In general land use plans do not define zoning districts. The land use plan serves the collective vision and guide for the use of land within a specified area that may offer a range of zoning categories that can be applied to serve property owner
interests, meet market demands, provide complementary uses, facilities and amenities to the surrounding community, as well as implement the plan/vision.

Therefore, in order to best achieve a desired land use vision, it is best to define that vision in planned land use documents and subsequently create zoning districts and ordinance regulations that can successfully implement that vision.

After receiving comments from TLUC on July 15th, review of comments received from the June 29th public meeting, and additional stakeholder input, Staff developed a second and third iteration of the plan to recognize current development realities, approved legislative applications and balance those changes with the overall Board endorsed goals for the planning area.

The second iteration of the land use plan (Attachment 4) reflects the following minor adjustments to recognize the existing development pattern:

- The Data Center Overlay was removed and recognized by developing policy in the plan text;
- Compact Walkable Office was removed from the new mixed-use area west of Loudoun County Parkway; and
- A portion of the Verizon Campus was changed from Urban Residential to Suburban Employment

Staff continued to study the alternatives for land uses around the Loudoun Gateway Station. The 3rd iteration of the land use plan depicted in Attachment 5 reflects removal of a substantial land area of Urban Multi-family Residential land use east of the Loudoun Gateway Station to recognize that most of the area is already developed for non-residential uses and to support the retention of these uses within the Route 28 Corridor. This third iteration represents the current proposed land use plan that serves as the basis for the rest of the Silver Line Area CPAM, to include the associated roadway network, multi-modal transportation system and fiscal impact analysis. The third iteration also provides an overlay of the LDN 65 and LDN 60 Noise Contours to clarify the geographic relationships of the noise contours and underlying proposed land uses. Additional description and information is provided in the Land Use Plan and Transportation Roadway Network Changes section of this report.

On September 13, 2016, Planning and Zoning Staff hosted an additional public outreach and engagement meeting at Moorefield Station Elementary School to present the refined land use plan (Attachment 5) with categorical descriptions and provide an overview of the remaining components of the plan which included topical areas such as parks and open space, community facilities, urban design, and the accompanying transportation network. The Plan specifically addresses the new community facilities necessary to accommodate new residential development permitted by the proposed plan amendment as well as several aspects of transportation planning.

Approximately 75 people attended the Meeting on September 13, 2016. Participants were given a presentation of key plan elements and given the opportunity to provide feedback and comment on
any sections that they felt required additional information. In general, there was limited public feedback pertaining to the overall vision in the Plan, but participants did offer some specific suggestions on topics like land use changes, transit route options, park locations, and sidewalks. Participants also expressed the need to provide a more in depth fiscal analysis. Several people also commented on noise contours and their desire to see residential development at the Loudoun Gateway Station. In general, Staff has retained the common thematic concepts of retaining the most dense and intense uses near the new stations, carefully balancing the overall future density of the planning area while continuing to maintain with the current County policy encouraging compatible development with the Airport Impact Overlay District, and providing a variety of new uses throughout the planning area. The draft plan documents and the public presentation documents can be found at the project website:  www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam.

Transportation Roadway Network Planning and Community Facilities Planning:

The transportation roadway network plan and aspects of this topic in the CPAM such as the bicycle/pedestrian network and transit system were presented at the September 13th public meeting to solicit more feedback on the proposed multi-modal transportation system that will be contained in the plan. The proposed roadway network which has been determined to adequately serve the new development through 2040 is included as Attachment 6. The transportation roadway network has been developed based on the land use typologies, land geographies, projected densities, desired roadway sections and trip generations based on the proposed land uses. The current transportation roadway network illustrated in Attachment 6 is linked to the proposed land use plan in Attachment 5. The proposed roadway network system map indicates that the overall network will function to support the proposed land use mix and arrangement. However, there are small sections of planned roadways that show that projected traffic volumes may exceed roadway capacity during certain peak hours. This is a common effect on roadway function in urban areas with more narrow street sections, high pedestrian traffic, and slower traffic design speeds, particularly around high volume transit stations / facilities. This does not indicate a systemic failure of the land use plan and transportation network, but is an indicator of the slower movement of vehicles over small portions of the dense, urban areas planned in the current proposed land use plan. A more detailed transportation analysis will be presented at the October 14, 2016 TLUC meeting as the detailed analysis is on-going, as of the time of submission of this report.

Following a meeting with the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority (MWAA) in September of 2016, DTCI staff determined the need to provide for a realignment of Shellhorn Drive for several reasons. First, representatives from MWAA stated that the alignment endorsed by the Board in the fall of 2015 will not work for the Authority and must be changed. Secondly, the endorsed alignment causes significant conflicts with the operation of the County’s parking garage for the Loudoun Gateway Metro Station. DTCI staff proposed a new alignment to the Board at its October 4, 2016 Business meeting which was approved (8-0-1, Higgins absent). This new alignment is incorporated in Attachment 6.

In addition to the transportation planning, Staff has completed preliminary calculations regarding the number of schools needed to support the proposed land use mix, arrangement and density.
Generally, the current proposed land use plan as depicted in Attachment 5 will generate at least 5300 students requiring three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school based on current capital facilities criteria for Loudoun County. General locations are suggested within the current draft version of the Silver Line Area CPAM plan documents and are shown in Attachment 7. A point of emphasis is that these maps are simply general indicators of potential areas where schools could conceivably be located based on land availability, proximity to activity and transit centers with the highest density of housing/people, proximity to transportation systems, and proximity to planned urban neighborhoods. Staff recognizes that future land availability, school format (urban versus suburban school types), and market conditions may influence provisions for schools in the planning area. However, the maps provided recognize and quantify the projected needs for this new community type in Loudoun County based on current criteria and standards. Staff recommends that the Board may wish to consider developing a different set of criteria and capital facilities standards for the urban land use designations within the Silver Line Area CPAM.

Similarly, parks and recreation facilities (Attachment 8a through 8c) will be required to help support the concept of building complete neighborhoods. Staff is recommending a parks system that contains three types of parks which range from small pocket parks (0.1 to 1.0 acres) to provision for neighborhood parks (up to 30 acres) to provide for public use spaces for residents to recreate and congregate. Similar to the school facilities, the locational maps are general indicators of potential locations of these spaces with the same general considerations. Staff also recognizes that market conditions, individual land development projects, and land availability may influence the provision of these facilities. However, Staff has recommended a minimum provision for the planning area with suggested location concepts that achieves proposed Silver Line CPAM policies and supports the proposed land use plan. Staff has proposed these new facilities location to clearly illustrate the facility needs so that future legislative applications can be evaluated to determine how these community needs will be addressed. In addition, by designating these potential locations in the Plan, a Commission Permit would not be needed thereby minimizing the time to develop these facilities.

**ISSUES:** In order to more effectively meet the goal of having an endorsed CPAM by December/January, staff has been meeting with Board members and/or their aides to gather feedback on the current CPAM. Staff will present a summary of the feedback at the October 14, 2016 TLUC meeting. Staff believes there are certain aspects of the Silver Line CPAM that need further Board direction, so these items can be discussed and evaluated during the upcoming Planning Commission Public Hearing and Work Session.

1. **Land Use Plan Alternative A – Mixed Use on the East Side of Loudoun County Parkway Within One Mile of the Metro Stations**

   During the public outreach meetings and through meetings with property owners, staff has received requests to change the current designation of Suburban Employment land use found in Attachment 5 to Mixed Use land use (Attachment 9a).
Pros:
• Properties are generally within one mile of a proposed metro station;
• The change makes it consistent with the mixed use designation east of Loudoun County Parkway and south of the Greenway;
• The properties are outside of the LDN 65;
• Preliminary Proposals shown by one of the property owners provide for the future alignment of Prentice Drive and a potential new school; and
• Office Development is consistent within the Mixed Use Designation.

Cons:
• Properties are generally outside ½ mile of a proposed metro station and generally outside of walking distance to a proposed metro station;
• Properties are separated from the other mixed use areas by a four lane divided roadway (Loudoun County Parkway) which reduces connectivity;
• The residential component of the mixed use designation generates the need for greater services (e.g., schools, parks,); and
• The additional mixed use may be too much for the market to absorb and take away from the mixed use areas closer to the metro stations.

2. Land Use Alternative B – Urban Residential on the East Side of Loudoun Gateway Station and LDN 65 Contour

As discussed in this report, Planning and Zoning Staff is seeking further direction from the Board of Supervisors regarding the support for an Urban Multifamily designation for land area east of the Loudoun Gateway Station (Attachment 9b). The proposed land use plan found in Attachment 5 currently designates this area as Route 28 Business land use as defined in the current Revised General Plan.

Pros:
• Provides for some residential within a mile and ½ of the Loudoun Gateway Metro Station;
• Supports the recommendations from the Urban Land Institute Technical Assistance Panel, Market Analysis and Best Practices Study, and Scenario Planning Study; and
• May help support the significant amount of non-residential uses designated within the LDN 65.

Cons:
• Most of the area is already developed for non-residential uses;
• Potentially takes away from the non-residential tax base; and
• The urban multifamily designation generates the need for greater services (e.g., schools, parks,).
3. Land Use Alternative C – Single Family Residential at the Regency Subdivision and Vantage Pointe Subdivision

Staff has received feedback about the land use plan designation of single family for the Regency Subdivision. The proposed land use plan found in Attachment 5 currently designates this area as Single Family Detached land use. Since staff is not recommending new single family uses within the study area and the Regency Subdivision is within a mile of the Ashburn Metro Station, should it be planned for Urban Residential or some other designation for the long term (Attachment 9c).

Pros:
- The new designation recognizes the potential for redevelopment within the long term;
- Consistent with the staff’s recommendation to not support single family detached uses near metro stations;

Cons:
- Residents may be confused by the designation and believe that it may impact their ability to continue to use their property for single family; and
- A land use category other than single family may be unrealistic in terms of redevelopment potential within the next 10 to 20 years.

4. Land Use Plan Alternative D – Mixed Use along Ashburn Village Boulevard

During the public outreach meetings with property owners, staff has received requests to change the current designation from the Urban Residential land use category (Attachment 5) to the Mixed Use Medium Buildings land use category (Attachment 9d).

Pros:
- Properties are generally within 1/2 mile of a proposed metro station;
- The change makes it consistent with the adjacent mixed use designation east of the area
- The properties are outside of the LDN 65;

Cons:
- The residential component of the mixed use designation generates the need for greater services (e.g., schools, parks,); and
- The additional mixed use may be too much for the market to absorb and take away from other mixed use areas in the planning area

5. Urban Residential Designation

Staff has received feedback regarding the amount of potential single family attached units that could be developed within the study area due to the significant demands they have for
services such as schools and parks. One alternative would be to further designate the type of housing (urban-style townhomes, age-restricted housing, and multifamily units) that does not demand as many services and/or limit the amount.

6. Identification of Possible Areas for Parks and Schools

Staff has received concerns about this issue and whether this needs to be done as proposed (Attachments 7 and 8a – 8d). Staff has proposed generalized, potential locations for community facilities and parks to suggest alternatives for where the needed facilities could be placed without specifically designating an exact location. Staff has proposed this to clearly show the facility needs so each rezoning case can be evaluated to determine how these needs will be addressed. In addition, by designating these potential locations in the Plan, a Commission Permit would not be needed thereby minimizing the time to develop these facilities.

One option to having these facilities shown on a map would be to describe the general locations and needs within the text of the plan. Additional guidance is needed to determine how to recognize the required fiscal impact and facilities and infrastructure needed to support the proposed land use plan with such critical facilities as schools, public safety facilities and parks.

7. Residential Development in and adjacent to the LDN 65 noise contours of the Airport Impact Overlay District

Staff received numerous conflicting comments with regard to allowing future residential development within the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay District. Current Board adopted policy and the zoning ordinance does not support or permit any residential development within this portion of the Overlay District. In September 2015, the Board received a presentation from the County’s Market Analysis and Best Practices Study for the Silver Line Area, which was a companion product of the Silver Line Area Land Use Scenario Planning Study, consultants procured to study the issue that recommended maintaining the current policy and ordinance regarding residential units within the LDN 65 contour of the Airport Impact Overlay District. These studies developed recommendations through analysis of airport land use compatibility at several locations in the US and globally to understand how the compatibility issues are resolved. Thus far, Staff has continued to observe the current Board policy and consultant recommendations from the previous study by limiting residential uses to the Ashburn Station area. Staff recommends that TLUC and the Board of Supervisors address this very broad policy issue to affirm the existing policy or provide Staff with different policy direction to apply to this planning area.

Staff continues to receive input from citizens, the business community, and stakeholders in the Silver Line CPAM process. Letters recently received from the Northern Virginia Building Industry Association and Economic Development Advisory Commission are found in
Attachment 11. Staff will continue to refine the land use plan, land use categories and its components text and policies based on the input received from the public and TLUC. Staff will also continue to refine draft policies and text for other chapters and sections of the CPAM to completion, which focus on areas like natural resources, parks, schools, community facilities and services, economic development, transportation, connectivity and affordable housing. Based on comments received, Staff will place emphasis on policies and text pertaining to schools to accommodate new residential development and on the transportation network and connectivity aspects of the plan. In addition, Staff will prepare a comprehensive draft of the plan for review and consideration by the Planning Commission in October 2016 in order to bring the CPAM forward to the Board for a Public Hearing in December 2016. A copy of the draft comprehensive plan can be found at www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/124018.

Concurrently, Staff will be working with VDOT to submit the companion transportation roadway network plan and multi-modal transportation plan along with the other Silver Line Area CPAM components in order to complete the required VDOT review. Staff has conducted a coordination meeting with VDOT concerning the review of the transportation network plan and the multi-modal transportation system plan that is associated and integrated with the Silver Line Area CPAM and most specifically with the proposed land use plan. As previously reported to the Board during initiation of the planning process, the VDOT review process generally requires a minimum 90 day review period to ensure that the transportation plan(s) meet the functional requirements required by the VDOT and the Code of Virginia. This review process and timing is highly dependent of completion of the Silver Line CPAM plan documents which includes the land use plan, the transportation network plan and the multi-modal transportation system plan. It is highly imperative that the County complete the plan and the Board endorse the plan to the extent possible at the earliest convenience in order to facilitate the VDOT review and complete the planning process with Board approval of the Silver Line CPAM in the most expeditious manner. For this reason, the original schedule for the approval of the CPAM will most likely be delayed by two to three months (March 2017). Staff is scheduled to have the Planning Commission recommendation before the Board’s December Public Hearing. After this hearing, the Board has the ability to endorse the plan and forward to VDOT for its review and approval.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. The Transportation and Land Use Committee can forward recommendations on the CPAM, to include recommended direction on the issues described in this staff report, to the Board of Supervisors.

2. The Transportation and Land Use Committee can continue discussion on the CPAM. This would delay the VDOT review of the CPAM and would be potentially confusing to the public, as the Planning Commission Public Hearing is scheduled for October 25th.

3. The Transportation and Land Use Committee could recommend an alternative motion.
FISCAL IMPACT: Staff has completed a draft of the Potential Fiscal Impacts of the Land Use Changes Proposed in the Silver Line Plan (Attachment 10). This report provides a forecast of the potential fiscal impact of the increase in development envisioned by the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment. It discusses capital needs and financing costs, and the difference that could be expected between County revenues and operating expenditures. This report also includes a calculation of the potential increase in Metrorail Service Tax District revenues.

This fiscal impact analysis:

1. Forecasts capital facility needs and costs.
2. Forecasts the land needed for capital facilities, based on Loudoun County’s current capital facility standards.
3. Characterizes the change to the overall fiscal balance within the County based on the proposed land use changes.
4. Forecasts the increase in real property tax revenue to the overall Metrorail Service Tax District.

Additional information is provided on capital facilities:

- Capital facilities needed
- Total capital costs
- Total land needed
- Cumulative financing costs that would be incurred if the County paid for these facilities

The results of this study show that the additional development allowed under the proposed plan, as compared to the current Revised General Plan, has the potential to be fiscally positive. However, to achieve that, three things are needed:

- A balance of nonresidential and residential development,
- Residential development that generates fewer residents and school children, and
- Developer contributions that offset capital costs.

With a plan and policies to guide this development, market conditions may still lead development to be fiscally negative, if residential development occurs without accompanying nonresidential development.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

1. I move that the Transportation and Land Use Committee forward the request for guidance on the six issues identified by Planning Staff in the October 14, 2016 Action Item to the full Board of Supervisors for resolution and direction for Staff to apply to the Silver Line Area Comprehensive Plan Amendment at the earliest convenience.
OR

2. I move an alternate motion.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Preliminary Study Area Boundary
2. Proposed Land Use Map (Iteration 1)
3. Developed Land and Planned Land Use
4. Proposed Land Use Map (Iteration 2)
5. Proposed Land Use Map (Iteration 3) and Airport Impact Overlay
6. Proposed Road Network
7. Potential School Locations
8a. Conceptual Pocket Park Locations
8b. Potential Urban Recreation Park Locations
8c. Potential Neighborhood Park Locations
9a. Planned Land Use Alternative A and Airport Impact Overlay (Urban Mixed-Use)
9b. Planned Land Use Alternative B and Airport Impact Overlay (Urban Multi-Family Attached)
9c. Planned Land Use Alternative C and Airport Impact Overlay (Urban Residential)
9d. Planned Land Use Alternative D and Airport Impact Overlay (Urban Mixed-Use)
11. Letters from Economic Development Advisory Commission and the Northern Virginia Building Industry Association