



## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING STAFF REPORT

Date of Hearing: January 24, 2017

### PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

**SUBJECT:** CPAM 2016-0002, Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment

**ELECTION DISTRICT:** Broad Run and Dulles

**CRITICAL ACTION DATE:** At the Pleasure of the Board

**STAFF CONTACTS:** Rich Klusek, Project Manager, Community Planning  
Chris Garcia, Program Manager, Community Planning  
Ricky Barker, Director, Planning & Zoning

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM) 2016-0002 is to amend the Revised General Plan (the "Comprehensive Plan") to establish a land use and transportation plan for the Silver Line planning area.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Following the public hearing, Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward CPAM 2016-0002 to work session for further discussion.

#### SUGGESTED MOTIONS:

1. I move that the Planning Commission forward CPAM 2016-0002, Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment, to a work session for further discussion.

OR

2. I move an alternate motion.

| CONTENTS OF THIS STAFF REPORT |      |                   |      |                       |      |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|-----------------------|------|
| Section                       | Page | Section           | Page | Section               | Page |
| Motions                       | 1    | Public Engagement | 3    | Outstanding Issues    | 4    |
| Executive Summary             | 2    | Text Changes      | 3    | Criteria for Approval | 4    |
| Background                    | 2    | Agency Referrals  | 4    | Attachments           | 5    |

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As directed by the Board, Staff has conducted a planning process to produce a Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The process, which aimed to best achieve the balance of Board's four goals was based on consultant analysis and recommendations, public engagements, and collaboration with other department agencies. Staff focus is on developing a Comprehensive Plan Amendment that achieves the Board's following four goals and achieves the land use patterns envisioned by the larger community:

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.

## **II. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

The Planning Commission held a work session on December 20, 2016 to discuss key aspects of CPAM 2016-0012. During the work session, Staff briefed the Commission regarding key aspects of the proposed land use designations. The January 12 briefing will present additional aspects of the plan amendment including the transportation network, fiscal impacts, urban design guidelines, and plan implementation steps. Questions, comments, and discussion points received from the Planning Commission to date include:

**1. What type of cultural center will be included in the plan area? Who will use the cultural center?**

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment provides a flexible and diverse land use pattern that encourage a range of cultural facilities throughout the plan area. While many categories permit this use, the Compact, Walkable, Non-Residential Category (Page 3-29) in particular encourages "anchor" uses which may include facilities like sports stadiums, convention centers, exhibit halls, museums, and amphitheatres.

**2. Provide greater detail to explain airport the noise contours and the location of runways relative to the planned land use map.**

Washington Dulles International Airport is located immediately south of the Loudoun Gateway Station. As such aircraft overflight is common in much of the study area. The proposed land use plan reflects the Airport Impact Overlay Zone that is currently part of the Zoning Ordinance. At its November 29, 2016 meeting, the Board of Supervisors voted to also amend the CPAM to eliminate residential development land uses in the LDN 65 noise contour identified by a 2005 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) noise study which accounted for the current runway location. Both the Airport Impact Overlay Zone and 2005 EIS are shown

on the planned land use map and land use typologies have been developed to account for the airport flight paths.

**3. Why is the Urban Multi-Family Residential area so small and is it necessary?**

The Urban Multi-Family Residential area is different from the Urban Residential category in that it focuses primarily on Multi-Family buildings where noise mitigation measures can more easily be implemented. Previous iterations of the Plan included larger areas of Urban Multi-Family Residential near the Loudoun Gateway Station that the Board of Supervisors voted to remove.

**4. Will there be enough industrial land after the area is re-planned for mixed use?**

The proposed land use plan represents a new land use vision that seeks to capitalize on the plan area's proximity to Metrorail. As such, many areas previously designated for Keynote Employment and Business uses under the Revised General Plan are proposed to be remapped to allow a more mixed-use environment. Notwithstanding, a significant portion of the plan area is proposed to be designated as suburban employment. This land use category allows for flex industrial among other uses.

**5. Does the plan focus too much on residential and rapid development in the tax district to the detriment of the County overall tax base?**

The proposed land use plan seeks to strike a balance between tax revenues, employment generation, efficient transportation, and desirable land uses. A more detailed overview of fiscal impacts of the plan will be presented at the Planning Commission's January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**6. The Planning Commission requested large scale planned land use maps.**

Large scale Maps will be provided for the next work session.

**7. What is the history of the strip of land west of Ashburn Village Boulevard, south of the Dulles Greenway and why was it included?**

The proposed study area was developed to generally take into consideration land within 1 mile of the Metrorail stations but additional factors like physical and natural boundaries were also considered. In addition, consideration was given to whether or not land was developed and whether existing land use plans reflect the most appropriate vision going forward.

**8. What is the land ownership pattern in the plan amendment area?**

In general land in the plan area is owned by a limited number of land owners. This pattern presents a good opportunity for property owners to propose an overall

vision rather than to have to take a more piecemeal approach.

**9. How has economic development been involved in the process? What kinds of major employers or destinations will be incorporated? How will the County want to make young people want to come to the County?**

A key component of the Plan is creation of a new vision based on current market realities and trends. The Department of Economic Development played a key role in drafting the plan and crafting policies to help attract businesses and create environments desired by the potential future workforce.

**10. Why was suburban employment included south of the Greenway?**

The suburban employment area south of the Greenway is located in the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay Zone and is separated from other areas by major roads and floodplain areas.

**11. How does the tax district boundary compare to plan area boundary.**

A map of the Tax districts and plan area boundary is included in the Fiscal Impact Analysis included as Attachment 6.

**12. How will the plan provide for a grid of streets? What level of specificity will be included in the road network?**

The overall transportation vision is discussed in Chapter 2 beginning on Page 2-8. In addition, transportation policies that speak to the desired grid of streets are discussed throughout Chapter 4 and in particular on page 4-11.

**13. What types of uses pay into the tax district? What are short term versus long term tax district impacts for different uses? What are the fiscal impacts of different uses?**

All residential and non-residential uses will pay into the tax districts. More information regarding fiscal impacts will be presented at the next work session.

**14. How will planning for large neighborhood parks be accomplished when property owners are seeking to maximize income on their property? Can the County rely on dedications of parkland? Is it better to have several smaller park areas instead of a few large parks? There is a need to look at parks standards that are different from suburban areas.**

Policies regarding future parks are discussed beginning on Page 5-7. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment seeks to implement new types of parks and park standards that are more conducive to urban development patterns. In addition, several of the parks policies seek to encourage creative and innovative solutions to meeting future recreation needs. Park land is not excluded from

development density calculations and in a mixed use and residential community can draw a considerable premium to the development product.

**15. The County needs creative solutions for schools, including smaller sizes. The sizes of schools considered in plan text are still too large. Can examples of smaller schools and actual sizes be provided?**

Policies regarding planning for schools are found on Page 5-14 of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Documents. The policies encourage smaller, more compact school designs and better integration of schools into an urban environments. The policies also aim to develop new urban school standards. Specifics of the policies can be discussed at future work sessions.

**16. Has there been consideration of smaller unit sizes that would be more affordable?**

The Plan fiscal balance relies on smaller residential units. All of the preferred unit types are to have smaller footprints and floor areas that encourage neighborhood walkability, attract a younger work force and improve affordability. Policies throughout the document reference the specifics types of units desired in the plan area.

**17. What is the process for the Planning Commission making changes to the things the Board already discussed?**

As outlined in Section VII of this report, the Board has given staff and the Commission direction on specific parts of the Plan Amendment, addressing key Board strategic issues and anticipating that doing so relieves the Commission of the need to spend time on these topics. Since direction has already been provided by the Board, staff believes the Planning Commission should spend its time on the many other aspects of the plan.

**18. Can the plan consider two small libraries instead of one large library?**

The proposed plan amendment includes policies that encourage creative and innovative ways for meeting the community facility needs of future residents. With the proposed plan amendment, the County and Applicants would have the option to propose combinations of small facilities that are thought to address the overall needs of the public.

**19. What was the extent of public involvement, communication to the public, and stakeholder engagement?**

The Public Engagement described in Section IV of this report provides a summary of the efforts to solicit feedback from the general public. The County actively sought to get feedback and maintained an email list with regular updates, purchased newspaper ads, and put out press releases. In addition, several meetings were

held with stakeholders to get their specific feedback.

**20. Is the plan achievable given the fact that much of the land has already been developed?**

Much of the land has received entitlements but not yet developed. The Plan envisions the enticements of mixed use, density and flexibility combined with a County investment in infrastructure and public facilities will entice landowners to consider new proposals. Achieving this long term vision will require extensive development and redevelopment that will extend well beyond the year 2040. The plan was developed in consideration of recommendations from the ULI Technical Assistance Panel, Market Analysis and Best Practices Consultants, and Scenario Planning Consultants. While the Plan is passed on market realities, the Plan policies also recognize the dynamic nature of planning and the need to regularly reevaluate the Plan policies and vision as conditions on the ground and in the market evolve.

---

### **III. BACKGROUND**

---

On December 5, 2012, the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors (Board) established a Dulles Metrorail Service District, a tax district created to help fund construction costs associated with Metrorail operations. Then, on October 16, 2013, the Board initiated a Silver Line/Metrorail Tax District Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM) to evaluate the existing planned land uses around the future Metrorail Stations and to ensure that the planned land uses strike the desired balance between:

- 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.

As a first step in this effort, the County retained the services of an Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel (TAP) to conduct an initial analysis of planned and existing land use and zoning in the Dulles Metrorail Service District and to generate a list of development issues and recommendations. The TAP provided a report in May 2014 with several key recommendations summarized as follows:

1. Updating the Comprehensive Plan;
2. Creating Small Area Plan(s), especially surrounding the immediate station areas;
3. Undertaking efforts to create more distinct "places" at the immediate station areas with

each having a unique identity and character;

4. Preparing a market study to identify appropriate land uses or “anchors,” especially surrounding the Route 606 Station;
5. Engaging in more collaborative planning with Dulles Airport;
6. Investing in infrastructure upfront as opposed to relying on proffered improvements with indefinite time periods; and
7. Engaging in more upfront planning to set the framework and guidelines for an urban mixed use concept.

In consideration of the range of ULI TAP recommendations, the Board directed two additional studies to form the basis for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The first was a Land Use Scenario Planning Study to consider a range of potential land use scenarios and the impacts and benefits they would have on the County. The Scenario Planning Study resulted a consultant recommended land use scenario that was developed based on a series of guiding principles as follows:

1. Develop a ‘complete community’ with a full range of uses and amenities that accommodate living, working, shopping, learning, and playing in close proximity.
2. Encourage development types, patterns and intensities that grow tax base, create jobs and provide for fiscal sustainability.
3. Support urban development patterns, intensities, building types, street design and street networks in key development activity centers.
4. Protect the long-term economic viability of Dulles International Airport by promoting airport-compatible uses and densities in the County’s Airport Impact Overlay District.
5. Encourage high-density, mixed-use, urban development within walking distance of the two planned Metrorail stations.
6. Develop a transportation system that safely and efficiently moves people throughout the study area. Emphasize a grid network concept, ‘complete street’ principles, minimum spacing standards, and separate suburban/urban context design treatments to help reduce traffic congestion, maximize travel mode choices, and provide several route options in the study area.
7. Embrace the study area as a technology hub for new data centers located in strategic areas to minimize impacts to surrounding development.
8. Allow ‘interim’ uses to activate unutilized or under-utilized sites in the study area, provide income for property owners, and generate tax revenue. Interim uses should be positioned to efficiently and easily redevelop (or convert to another use) when the

market for more dense, mixed-use development improves.

The second effort was a market analysis and best practices study to better define land uses appropriate for the area surrounding the planned Loudoun Gateway and Ashburn Metrorail Stations given the proximity to the Dulles Airport flight paths. The 5 key recommendations of the Market Analysis and Best Practices Study were:

1. Maintain Transit Related Employment Center (TREC) policies and zoning.
2. Consider partnerships and opportunities for catalytic anchor uses.
3. Work with Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority (MWAA) to encourage airport-compatible development and development according to "Airport City" models.
4. Maintain existing policies to encourage commercial development at the Ashburn Station Area.
5. Consider policy and zoning revisions to allow interim uses to help activate the Station Areas, provide income for property owners, and generate tax revenues.

The studies were completed on December 18, 2015 and September 9, 2015, respectively, and were presented to the Board on January 21, 2016 and the Transportation and Land Use Committee (TLUC) on February 12, 2016.

On March 17, 2016, the Board unanimously approved a resolution to initiate a Comprehensive Plan Amendment [Attachment 1] to the County's Revised General Plan and approved the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment boundary, process, schedule, and desired outcomes. Since that time, staff has been actively engaged in drafting the text for the amendment and public engagement.

---

#### **IV. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

---

During the planning process, Staff held 4 meetings to receive public input as well as stakeholder sessions and meetings with various stakeholders. Various revisions were made to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Document throughout the process to reflect the public feedback that was received. The full range of public comment received at the public meetings is available for review on the project website that established at [www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam](http://www.loudoun.gov/silverlinecpam). Additional comments received via email will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

#### **Scenario Planning Workshops**

Two scenario planning workshops were conducted on May 28, 2015 and August 26, 2015 at Moorefield Station Elementary School. The workshops included various exercises designed to elicit feedback to include urban design preference surveys, written opinion and comment surveys, land use preference mapping, and live electronic opinion polling. A live scenario planning exercise was also conducted using geographic information software.

Overwhelmingly, the workshop participants favored high-density mixed-use development as the desired land use pattern for the study area. For example, when asked do you strongly agree, agree, feel neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree, roughly 90% of participants said that they strongly agree with the following statement: “I think the study area should have one or more walkable, mixed-use centers, similar to Reston or One Loudoun.” Similarly, roughly 93% strongly agreed with the following statement: Having more travel options (walk, bike, transit) in the study area would be important to me. Roughly 90% of all workshop participants also stated that they were willing to see development in the study area even if it means that the County has to pay more for schools, roads, and other infrastructure. Participants also identified photographs of walkable, urban, mixed-use development as being the most desirable form of development.

### **Public Informational Meetings**

Two additional work sessions took place while the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment was being drafted. The meetings also took place at Moorefield Station Elementary School on June 29, 2016 and September 13, 2016. The June 29<sup>th</sup> public meeting was intended to present the initial draft document to the public and gather feedback on elements of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Approximately 90 attendees provided feedback on the proposed land use plan, the proposed land use categories, and the proposed transportation network of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. A full summary of comments from that meeting is provided in Attachment 2. The September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting was intended to present the revised draft to the public, gather additional input on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment elements, and confirm previously presented topics have been addressed. Approximately 75 attendees provided feedback and guidance on the draft plan. A full summary of comments from the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting is also provided in Attachment 2.

---

## **V. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED TEXT CHANGES**

---

Attachment 3 identifies changes being made to the Revised General Plan. In general these changes to the existing Revised General Plan will reference the new policies of the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment, which will simply supersede existing policies. In addition to text changes, the Planned Land Use Map will be amended to identify a new Silver Line Policy Area to which the policies of the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment would apply. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment will also modify the 2010 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) to implement new urban road standards and modify the road network for the Silver Line Policy Area. Amendments to the CTP are shown in Attachment 4. The text of the proposed Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment is provided as Attachment 5.

The policies of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment differ from the traditional policies of the current Revised General Plan, as the amendment more directly prescribes the desired form of development, rather than just the specific land uses, in order to best strike the balance between the four objectives of the Board. The desired development patterns are termed as ‘place typologies’ that correspond with the Silver Line Policy Area Land Use

Map. Overall, the policies seek to accomplish the following:

- Concentrate the highest development densities and intensities closest to the Metrorail stations in a mixed-use, walkable, multi-modal, urban environment that is connected to the study area and surrounding areas;
- Create a design and scale that encourages an active-living lifestyle (live, work, play, learn, and shop) that supports walkability and urban development patterns to form a distinctive community;
- Identify general locations and appropriate types of greenspace and public/civic uses commensurate to the context of the typologies;
- Allow flexibility in site development so that short-term development activities can stimulate investment yet do not encumber the long-term vision of the Silver Line Area to allow future development to maximize its full potential;
- Embrace the technology industry by supporting existing datacenters in current locations and identifying additional locations supportive of datacenter uses that do not occupy highly valued land supportive of transit-oriented uses;
- Protect Dulles International Airport from incompatible uses; and
- Ensure long-term fiscal sustainability for the County by designating the highest and best land uses within the context of their location and proximity to public investment to grow the tax base, create jobs, and maintain the County's economic viability.

In the future, staff anticipates the policies of this amendment will be incorporated within the New Comprehensive Plan upon its completion. Additional changes to the area surrounding the Silver Line Policy area are likely to be made as the new comprehensive plan area drafted.

A Zoning Ordinance Amendment is anticipated to follow to most effectively implement the plan amendment policies as proposed, either by the creation of a new zoning district or revision of existing zoning districts designated for transit-oriented development.

---

## **VI. AGENCY REVIEW**

---

Throughout the planning process and development of the Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) has engaged various other departments and agencies. Previous efforts including regular meetings of a steering committee during the Scenario Planning Study and several individual meetings between DPZ staff and other department staff representing various disciplines affected by the Plan. As such, no specific agency comments are presented in this item.

## **VII. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECTION**

On November 29, 2016 the Board of Supervisors held a special meeting to establish the overall direction for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment text and endorse a general framework that the Planning Commission should operate within. The land use map endorsed by the Board of Supervisors is included as Attachment 2. The Board made key decisions on issues where there were differing opinions from the public and stakeholders and consensus could not be achieved during the planning process. Those decisions made by the Board are as follows:

### **1. Mixed Use on the East Side of Loudoun County Parkway**

The Board discussed the potential to have additional mixed use development on the east side of Loudoun County Parkway but determined that the land use plan should limit the amount of mixed-use development to prevent incompatible residential development from developing proximate to Dulles Airport.

### **2. Urban Residential on the East Side of Loudoun Gateway Station and east side of the LDN 65 Contour**

Planning and Zoning Staff presented the Board with an option to have Urban Multifamily residential to the east of Loudoun Gateway Station. Stakeholder input and consultant recommendations suggested this alternative but it results in compatibility concerns with operations at Dulles Airport. The Board voted to retain the current Route 28 Business designation in this area to prevent compatibility issues.

### **3. Single Family Residential at the Regency Subdivision and Vantage Pointe Subdivision**

Staff received feedback about the land use plan designation of single family for the Regency and Vantage Pointe subdivisions and whether that presented the best long-term view for the area. The Board voted to retain the single-family designation recognizing that redevelopment opportunities for the foreseeable future were limited.

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

During the public outreach meetings with property owners, staff received requests to change the planned land use designation to Mixed Use to afford additional flexibility to that property within ½-mile of the Ashburn Station. Recognizing the relatively small size of that parcel and its proximity to the Station, The Board voted to change the planned land use to mixed-use.

### **5. Urban Residential Designation**

The Board of Supervisors extensively discussed the number townhomes that could be developed within the Silver Line Area under the proposed plan amendment. Some Board members were particularly concerned about the demands for services such as schools and parks resulting from the townhomes. Ultimately, the Board voted to allow townhomes in the Urban Residential land use category but requested that the Planning Commission further discuss the exact locations where this designation was mapped and to consider other potential designations in the area roughly within ½-mile of the Ashburn Station. Staff will be presenting the Planning Commission with additional information about this issue for discussion by the Planning Commission.

#### **6. Identification of Possible Areas for Parks and Schools**

The CPAM proposes 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. This mapping avoids the need to process Commission permits for every facility. In addition to this mapping, the Board directed staff to develop policies to reduce the footprint/size of schools and parks within the CPAM area; to begin work on new urban standards for schools within this area; and to encourage more use of private parks instead of public parks. The CPAM presents the concepts for urban facilities but additional work following adoption will be necessary to implement the Board's vision.

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

Staff received numerous conflicting comments from stakeholders and the public with regard to allowing future residential development in and around the LDN 65 portion of the Airport Impact Overlay District. As indicated above, the Board voted to endorse a land use map that addressed this issue and to reaffirm existing policies and zoning ordinance language that do not support or permit any residential development within this portion of the Overlay District. In addition, the Board voted to endorse a map that also limits residential development in the LDN 65 contour of a 2005 EIS for construction of the 4<sup>th</sup> runway.

#### **8. Changes in CPAM Document**

During TLUC review of the CPAM document, a number of changes were made to address specific language and to make clarifications throughout the document. Specific changes included (1) explicitly stating that existing or pending by-right uses are an important part of generating prompt realization of tax revenues and can remain indefinitely; (2) improving data center language and the support for existing entitlements; (3) changing wording related to data centers to reflect the importance of this use and the continuation of this use within the study area; (4) eliminating unnecessary design standards or updating policies to support market-driven economic activity, (5) enhancing the Economic Development Section of the

CPAM; and (6) using language that is more visionary and less regulatory to market the Silver Line CPAM areas for desired growth.

#### **9. Townhomes within Mixed Use Designation**

Some TLUC members recommend that Townhomes be designated as an undesirable use within the Mixed Use – Medium Designation. Members were concerned about the impacts on student generation and the impacts to school facilities needs resulting from additional townhome developments. Staff recommend to the full Board that Townhomes be designated as a secondary use to address unique site and circumstances where townhomes may be appropriate. The Board discussed the issue and recommend that the Planning Commission provide the Board a recommendation on whether or not to incorporate townhomes and how to implement the townhomes within the overall area. Staff will provide the Planning Commission with additional information to discuss this issue.

#### **10. Removal of Two Proposed Two Lane Roads.**

During TLUC review of the CPAM document, several members felt that smaller two-lane road segments should not be shown on undeveloped portions of the plan since more localized roadway networks could be designed as part of future development on the site. The Board directed staff to remove road segments between Prentice Drive and Shellhorn Road and to include language within the Plan that supports a comprehensive system of street grids to ensure connectivity and access for pedestrians and vehicles to major corridors, adjacent developments, and transit services.

#### **11. Changes in CPAM Document**

TLUC recommended to the Board to support a new crossing of the Broad Run from Barrister Street to Old Ox Road (at the current location of Commerce Center Court) as another option for crossing the Broad Run. The full Board supported this addition but also requested that Staff conduct a traffic analysis of the 606 corridor and Broad Run Crossings proposed with a signalized intersection condition since models presented to the Board included interchanges along Route 606. Staff will update the Planning Commission as new information is developed.

---

### **VIII. CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL**

---

The Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment is in conformance with the purpose of the Revised General Plan to guide and accomplish a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the territory within Loudoun County's jurisdiction. In this case, the smaller area of the County encompassing a portion of the Metrorail tax district is the focus of the plan amendment; however, careful and comprehensive surveys and studies of the existing conditions and trends of growth, and of the probable future requirements of its territory and inhabitants have been considered for the long-term recommendations

proposed.

## IX. ATTACHMENTS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1   | Copy Teste/Resolution of Intent to Amend dated March 17, 2016           |
| 2   | Summary of June 29, 2016 and September 13, 2016 Public Meeting Comments |
| 3   | Proposed <u>Revised General Plan</u> revisions                          |
| 4   | Proposed <u>2010 Countywide Transportation Plan</u> revisions           |
| 5   | Proposed <u>Silver Line Comprehensive Plan Amendment</u> Document       |
| 6   | Fiscal Impact Analysis  |
| * This Staff Report with attachments and additional information can be viewed online at <a href="http://www.loudoun.gov/lola">http://www.loudoun.gov/lola</a> under the application CPAM 2016-0002. Copies are also available in the Department of Planning and Zoning. |   |