



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

City of Fairfax City Council Work Session, Tuesday, February 4, 2025

Date Tuesday, February 4, 2025
Place City Hall, City of Fairfax, Virginia
Length 3h 26m (video)

- Official meeting video (city, Granicus): https://fairfax.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4088
- Agenda: https://fairfax.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4088
- Minutes: https://fairfax.granicus.com/MinutesViewer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4088&doc_id=4539eed1-e7e7-11ef-a9e2-005056a89546

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-13. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:23] can come around. I'll come around. For you at home, we're just doing some technical things.

[00:00:48] All right. I think we're good. Thank you for joining us here at the work session. I will now turn it over to our presenters from the Planning Commission. Thank you, Mayor Reed and members of the council. Each year, the Planning Commission reviews the Capital Improvement Program in its draft form before it goes to city council and provides recommendations. This is an effort that is defined in the Code of Virginia for the planning commission to do each year. So the planning commission has spent the last couple of months looking at the CIP and preparing these recommendations, which were submitted to you in

[00:01:25] the form of a resolution that was adopted in a public hearing at their last meeting last Monday. Coincidentally, around the same time, the planning commission also developed an annual report as defined in our city code and attached to that an update to our comprehensive plan implementation guides. So the purpose of tonight's work session is for the planning commission to present to you the recommendations from the Capital Improvement Program.

[00:01:47] And then following that, I'll give you a brief summary of what the Indian Report and Implementation Guides are. We won't go through the details of those because there's a lot of information. That's a resource you will have for anything that you'll be working on in the future. So for a quick review of the Capital Improvement Program review schedule, the Planning Commission received a presentation from the city manager on the CIP in November and has spent a portion of all of their meetings since then discussing it and going over the recommendations, reviewing it in comparison to the comprehensive plan, and as I mentioned, had their public hearing at the last meeting on January 27th and adopted the resolution that was included in your packet.

[00:02:26] The role of the commission in reviewing the CIP is to determine the conformance of the proposed projects within the CIP with the comprehensive plan. This is what is defined in the Code of Virginia for them to do. In addition to that, they tend to advise council on city priorities among proposed projects, recognizing that the city council has a difficult task ahead, often prioritizing projects and sometimes shifting the timeframe for some of these.

[00:02:51] And so it is the planning commission's role to define what projects they believe are most important for you to consider as you go through that process. And then lastly, to anticipate future considerations because the Kaplan improvement program timeframe is about five years, whereas the comprehensive plan timeframe is about 20 years.

[00:03:07] And so the planning commission often provides recommendations that look ahead and look for things that might not be showing up in the COP improvement program yet, or things that you might wanna think about that'll be coming down the road in the six year, seven year, eight year timeframe, just to be aware of. So with that, I'll turn it over to Chair Feather of the Planning Commission to introduce the Planning Commissioners and provide a summary of the recommendations to you this year.

[00:03:31] - Good evening, Mayor and Council. Thank you for having us this evening. Mr. Napy outlined the reason for us being here and the basis for which we're here to make our recommendations. Do wanna introduce some fellow Planning Commissioners were able to make it this evening. Kirsten Lockhart is our vice chair. Matt Rice is also our representative of the Parks and Rec Advisory Board. And then I will refer to, I always do, our elder statesman, Paul Cunningham, who's in his 26th year on the Planning Commission.

[00:04:01] And I'm not sure I could do this job without him sitting nearby with all his experience. It's quite valuable, especially as we talk about things like the comprehensive plan and some of the history related to development in the city and projects like that. So the resolution was attached to the staff report that you received.

[00:04:20] And it's important for us to say right up front that our most important comment is that the CIP, as presented, is consistent with the comprehensive plan. Now, I will say there are a number of items in the CIP we do not spend a lot of time talking about because the CIP also includes some ongoing maintenance, infrastructure repair, and so forth. We don't spend a lot of time doing that. That's kind of based business. Our focus tends to be on larger things that get particular shout out often in the comprehensive plan. While the material you received ahead of the meeting listed as the draft resolution, we have finalized it and the

[00:04:57] slides will be up to date. I'm not saying that these are drafts. So the resolution as presented has seven major sections and we'll spend a little time talking about each of them as we go along this evening. The highlights for us, and we're going to give you a little bit of background, I guess, as to why we're

presenting what we're presenting this evening. I should say it's a little different from what you've seen from us. I should say you've seen from us, but many of you are new to the process. What we've typically provided have been often more specific recommendations on some specific projects. You'll see some mention of some specific projects as we go along.

[00:05:34] This year was a little bit different. The CIP draft that we had received last fall looked a little different in a couple of respects. When we reviewed the FY25 comp plan, which was approved was \$32-some million from the general fund.

[00:05:57] We're not talking a lot about some of the other external funding. It showed a projected growth for FY26 to \$51 million, 65%, which is an ambitious growth. What we actually received, so that was when we saw it for the 25 program, what we received for the 26 program was even larger, \$83.6 million, 156% above.

[00:06:20] I think you can see, you can probably start to imagine the challenge we have is trying to identify priorities when there's such a big growth and such a change from the outlook that we've seen previously. So that frames a little bit about what the recommendations this year look like and why.

[00:06:39] This growth left the commission asking itself a few questions. One was how it grew so fast. Two was where that growth occurred so we could better understand what their recommendations should be. Third was whether the city had the capacity and funding and execution resources to actually carry out an ambitious program with a huge jump for the next fiscal year.

[00:07:00] And then whether the timelines proposed for such spending were achievable and necessary. So these are tough questions you'll have to answer as you deliberate in setting the budget for FY26, but we wanted to couch our presentation and recommendation with that background so you know a little bit of the struggle we had in being a little more specific this year.

[00:07:28] So the resolution and the priorities that we feel compelled to recommend to you are first to prioritize completion and follow-through of recommendations of ongoing and upcoming feasibility studies to ensure that funds are being used thoughtfully and efficiently at right timeline.

[00:07:46] We'll talk a little bit about each of these a little bit later. The second is to support projects that improve or expand existing public facilities first as a priority. Third is to protect our previous investments in projects that continue or implement previous recommendations and things that you've allocated and appropriated money for.

[00:08:09] Fourth is to continue to seek opportunities to utilize external funding sources, including grants and so forth, foundations and the like. Fifth is to ensure that project schedules and funding timelines are aligned.

[00:08:27] The next is that in light of discussions we've had in our deliberations, we recognize that Mr. Napdi alluded to this, discussions on timeliness of some of the projects. So whether projects, for example, this is not exclusive to one project, but examples projects like the Van Dyke Master Plan implementation, which had a very early schedule move up. Projects like that that haven't yet been fully started and appropriated should be considered for the further deferral so we can hit some of the other priorities.

[00:09:02] And then finally, we emphasize projects in a handful of particular areas. Public safety number one, our schools, our parks, our pedestrian and bicycle safety and our environmental projects, and we'll

talk a little bit about why we've come to some of these as we go along. Okay, the next slide is feasibility studies. There's certainly wisdom in ensuring that the feasibility studies that we've commissioned are complete before we can really make a reliable, thoughtful plan for execution of projects. We discussed some of

[00:09:38] the examples, and you see them up here. The city property yard is a known vulnerability in the city. We've been talking about it for a long time. It's our understanding that the feasibility study is actually underway. The original plan was the appropriation for the study would be for FY26.

[00:09:54] It's our understanding. It may be corrected by Mr. Summers if we're wrong that it may have actually kicked off. The proposal for the FY26 program we first saw last year was for half a million dollars for the study.

[00:10:11] It's changed dramatically for the FY26 program and several near-term years out with substantially more money for the execution. The reason we bring this up is one, to make sure that before we get too excited about schedule and appropriation, we're sure that the feasibility studies are done.

[00:10:30] They're vetted by you to weigh the considerations for the city and its budgets, and then we can talk about, or you can talk about, what the right timing is, recognizing there's a risk involved with its location and the ongoing concerns we've had with flooding and so forth.

[00:10:51] Schools are another area like that. This is one where we know that the public has approved the bond referendum last fall, very large referendum. There are a lot of projects to be considered for those schools.

[00:11:07] Certainly our former school board members are better versed at addressing what those are than we are and what we've seen. At this point, we have not seen what that's going to look like in the CIP. The out years in the proposal don't come near the level of funding that was considered for the bond referendum.

[00:11:26] So this is part of the planning process, the study process, that we think it's very important to do so we get it right and get a realistic outlook for our budgets. And the third example is Fire Station 3. We know this is already a work in progress. It's an important upgrade that's needed for the city.

[00:11:43] But just to be sure, the Planning Commission wanted to ensure that the entire nature of the project was understood and the options and so forth, potentially before undertaking a very aggressive schedule. So these are the kind of things we thought about when we were thinking about the importance of getting the feasibility studies done and right as we try to allocate, and so you can make decisions about where to fund what when.

[00:12:08] Okay, next slide. The concept of improving, and I would invite my commissioners to poke me if you'd like to add something. If I can just add one more thing to what Chair Feather mentioned about the feasibility studies and waiting to see what the results are, particularly for the first two bullets there, but a little bit for Fire Station 3 as well.

[00:12:30] All of these studies, we say feasibility, but they're really assessments of not just facilities and facility condition and assets, but also operations, particularly with the property yard. That's co-located, not just stuff, but no kidding, security operations. So really understanding what is where and where those things should be properly located.

[00:12:48] Same with the schools. We know the physical condition is one thing, but what does the school of the future look like? What capabilities, what student populations, what services are going to be provided out of those schools? So breaking out both kind of swim lanes of the assessments and making sure that appropriations match that, that we're not just looking at these as big capital improvement, moving dirt projects, but also people projects and future planning projects as well. Thank you.

[00:13:13] Thank you. So the next item to talk about is the improvement and expanding of existing facilities as a priority. perhaps prior to undertaking new things. Maintenance and so forth, providing additional capability.

[00:13:30] All important, these items do show up in the CIP in many respects. The item, one of the items that we think is worth making note of as well is how any particular project that's underway may serve multiple purposes.

[00:13:46] That may give particular weight to some projects that are in progress or even new ones that you really are seriously contemplating to begin where something might serve a particular or multiple purposes. One example could be a trail project that not only serves a recreational need, but a transportation needs, provides theaters into city businesses, provides connectivity to our adjacent communities.

[00:14:12] That kind of project may be more useful that would benefit the city in a number of respects could be an example. The examples up here are just some of the ones that came to mind that we see in the project. The police vehicle garage is one that's sort of been on the radar for a while.

[00:14:31] It's starting to show up. City hall renovations obviously underway, all-town renovations already underway. We need to protect and preserve the things that we have. When you look at the police vehicle garage, we'll look at also protecting, not only protecting the equipment that we have, but keeping it in better shape so that it's more accessible and readily available when it's really needed.

[00:14:54] Willow-Sherwood expansion is a huge thing. It's an important partnership with the county. It's well along the way. Would not anticipate it would be vulnerable, but this is one that we've talked about in prior years as being an important consideration from the Planning Commission standpoint for meeting some of the objectives in our comp plan.

[00:15:13] Are we sure there's anything? Protecting previous investments. There's a little bit of a linkage to the last slide where we've already invested money to promote and protect and move things forward.

[00:15:30] But there are other types of projects that also fall into this bucket where we've already invested significant resources in planning, development, and these are things that we think, again, should be prioritized moving forward.

[00:15:47] Willard-Sherwood, again, is another example of that. We've invested a significant amount of money and effort in moving that forward. It should continue. Parks, another area, a number of projects going on. Let's not lose sight of the fact that these are important to the city and where we've got something going on and we've invested already.

[00:16:06] To us, as you saw in our sort of short list of things, parks are highly important as far as we're concerned and really play an important role in the well-being of the city and our residents as we've outlined in the comp plan. And the transportation projects of various sorts.

[00:16:23] Again, we've got an excellent transportation staff, done very well at securing money to get projects moving and moving them along. We need to keep those moving. They are all, I think, as you have seen, very well thought out.

[00:16:40] And the fact that we have money on the ground and effort already invested in these, these are projects that we should keep high on our radar screen. Utilizing external funding, again, transportation is a prime example where there's been such great success.

[00:16:56] I think they're probably a gold star performer in securing external funding for very important priorities in the city. But there's been some recent successes in other areas as well. As you know, the grant we received that funded the Sprout program.

[00:17:12] There's opportunity out there. We expect as a commission that there are more opportunities like that. You see ARPA mentioned up there, of course, those funds have been all appropriated. They must be spent. We probably won't see those for any time soon again. But to the extent that almost one-of-a-kind opportunities come up, We should be in a position to identify what those are and exploit them if we can.

[00:17:38] Other considerations, public-private partnerships. We probably still think there's opportunities there. There's probably linkages to our parks and the recent Parks Foundation. But there may be other examples where such partnerships could be exploited to fund some of our initiatives. One area that came to mind was, for example, environmental and sustainability considerations.

[00:17:58] So we need to keep our radar sort of broad where such opportunities are. or maybe so that we can seek grants and additional resources like that as we undertake a fairly ambitious program in the upcoming years. All right, next.

[00:18:16] We talked about funding timelines and priority. You'll recognize this as kind of one page. I don't expect you to read this. You'll recognize this as one page, one of the summary pages from the comp plan. This isn't up here to point out any one particular project necessarily, but it's to show the thought that goes into to planning the projects, the timelines for funding as they go on in out years.

[00:18:41] This example happens to illustrate a near doubling of CIP items from the adopted 25 program to the proposed FY26 program in the general funding category in the recreation and community appearance capital projects.

[00:19:00] These are the kind of things that gave the Planning Commission pause for how we make a recommendation when a program proposal doubles in a year. And we've seen this in other areas as well. In the general government capital projects area, growth was very significant from \$16 million in FY25 that was adopted to over \$41 million in the proposed FY26 program, 160% growth.

[00:19:26] But then it tapers off very quickly in terms of longevity of capital facilities to 2030, \$13 million. There's a huge upfront loading and a significant tapering off.

[00:19:42] Now, I realize that getting trustworthy crystal balls is pretty hard to come by as to really what our needs will be. And there will be some increases and drops, huge spikes and valleys, maybe something that we could spend a little time focusing on, though, to see whether those are necessary to try to budget for, plan for, and dare I say tax for or borrow for.

[00:20:07] So these are the kind of considerations that have been going through our minds. I'll pause here to see if there's any other chiming in yet. Okay. I mentioned Van Dyke Master Plan. This is an example of a

project that we could consider the timing for.

[00:20:30] During our discussions, we asked for insights from Mr. Martinez, the CFO, about our concerns with the overall budget outlook and projection for our CIP. Excuse me. He was able to provide us some options that you might consider for how to manage some of these near-term proposed projects and spreading them out.

[00:20:53] Van Dyke Park was one example of those that we talked about, and there are others that I'm sure you'll see that we had seen. This park is no doubt a jewel in the park system. It's our center of the city, used for everything, and in need of rehabilitation and upgrading.

[00:21:12] But it's an example that brings together some of the concerns we've had about getting things completed that we've already started versus starting something new and how the timing of these should all be worked out.

[00:21:29] So just one example that we use as illustrative, and it illustrates to us the difficult decisions you have before you, because this is the major central park in the city. But it's the kind of thing we have to make some decisions about where the priorities need to be, what the schedule needs to be.

[00:21:48] So these are the kind of thoughts we went through and wanted to lay out before you. Anything? So first, the Parks Recreation Advisory Board really cares deeply about Van Dyke Park and seeing that it works well.

[00:22:07] For a decade, I've watched development proposals within the neighborhood and other things that essentially the people presenting, and I as a member of the public watching this happen, were unaware of the connections between a proposal, for instance, at Layton Hall and their neighbors right over the fence.

[00:22:29] I think this is a central connection between everything happening in the city, the kind of St. Leo's and the Daniel's Run folks transit through the park on a daily basis. It is an important connection. And in the context of Willard Sherwood and activities within that center that may utilize the park, there will be a really important connection between those two.

[00:22:52] And I think focusing on looking at this carefully is a very important resource, more so than a park might normally be because of its center location and connection to other things happening in the community. I was going to say, as a planning commission, we really like to look at things in context of other projects and other things going on.

[00:23:12] It's just so critical for actually coming up with thoughtful recommendations on proposals, on plans. And so Van Dyke, again, recognizing its criticality and its value and its history with the city, it's also going to be significantly impacted, for better or for worse, by increased usage of the Willard Sherwood property.

[00:23:31] And so what happens at Willard Sherwood, what that looks like, how people are using it, is also going to have a ripple effect on how people are using Van Dyke. So making sure that the plans and the studies that are going on right now, the community input, all of that engagement of what people really want for the park. I believe the last time the major outreach efforts were done was actually pre-COVID in terms of what people wanted to see from Van Dyke.

[00:23:50] So I wouldn't be surprised if some of those answers are radically different after five years of both intensive park usage and also just different usages of things in the city. Swimming pool, I mean. So, you know, I think giving time and space to the Parks Department to continue their good work and their thoughtful work in terms of how all these facilities play together and what the right prioritization of actions is.

[00:24:14] very important with regards to this asset. Thank you. Okay, this is my last slide. With all this being said, this finally simply reiterates what I said earlier about some of the priority areas that we see. Public safety, job one, as far as we're concerned. Again, there are a number of items in the CIP related to keeping our equipment and so forth current, reliable, and so forth.

[00:24:46] We don't spend a lot of time thinking about that, but also don't be tempted to think that we should, you know, eliminate some key upgrades that may be needed in our public safety facilities or equipment or capabilities. Schools, again, obviously the curriculum is managed through an agreement with the county, but we also know that we own the buildings and that well-maintained, well-designed, current for academic purposes today.

[00:25:14] the facilities are crucial to ensuring a good learning environment and keeping our students on the track that they need to be. Routine maintenance is key. There are such items in the CIP currently. It's going to be very important going forward, of course, to really thoughtfully scope out the pace and so forth of the major renovations that will be needed that are supported by, that will be supported by the bond issue. We spent a lot of time talking about parks already.

[00:25:43] I'm not sure I need to emphasize that. High-quality parks, key to the city. It's a vibrancy. It's utility. And the places that it provides for our community are essential, and we think they should be prioritized.

[00:26:00] We've talked about this in previous years, pedestrian and bicycle safety, very key. There are continuing to be areas within the city that represent safety concerns for the coexistence of motor vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists. There are studies underway to the extent that they'll make recommendations for improvements that protect the people who are not in motor vehicles.

[00:26:24] To us, those are very important projects to consider and support. Finally, environmental projects. We've raised this in the past as well. Simply, we keep it on our radar.

[00:26:42] The environmental sustainability initiatives grew in importance and emphasis in the update to the Comprehensive Plan amendment. And we raise it here again to emphasize the momentum that's been established in the past should continue in our mind to make us a more environmentally safe, sustainable, greener city.

[00:27:00] So that's why we, as a commission, came to consensus. This should be one on our short list. Again, we appreciate the effort that we've had from city staff, Mr. Martinez in particular, facing our challenging questions. Our resolution is before you.

[00:27:18] It's in your hands. It wasn't an easy task for us. It's, I dare say, going to be a more difficult task for you as you do the budget planning for this coming fiscal year, but we believe we've provided a fairly sound analysis, recommendations worthy of your consideration. Happy to answer questions, take your comments before we turn it back over to Mr. Natty for the rest of the presentation, and any closing comments by my fellow commissioners at this point.

[00:27:44] Ms. Lockhart. Thank you, Chair Feather. I'd just like to add that, again, to echo what Chair Feather mentioned, And the staff and the other commissions that provide input and help formulate these plans and these budgets are so good at what they do. And they care so deeply about what they do and about the city.

[00:28:01] Obviously, if we could all wave magic wands and win the lottery and fund everything, it would be phenomenal. But there are hard decisions to be made. I do feel like the city, the planning commission's recommendations and the way that that's reflected in the city's investments really paves and continues to pave the way and place the city in a position of leadership so that developers follow suit. Obviously, most of what we see is private landowners, private developers that want to put forward things that they think will benefit the city. But by making strong investments in these things that we put forth in our resolution, we're setting the tone.

[00:28:33] The city is saying, these are the things we prioritize. This is where we want the city to go. These are our environmental standards, and we're not just putting them out there for other people. We're living them, you know, we're implementing them. So really kind of foot stomping that by making these, putting forth these recommendations, we're living and acting on the comprehensive plan and continuing to make it as actionable as possible, like we presented when we presented to council last year.

[00:28:57] We want to not just say things that sound good, but show how we're going to do those things that are good as we move forward in the city.

[00:29:13] Thank you. As corporate memory, I guess, as long as I can remember, it was the best of times. it was the worst of times. As it was discussed in past years, the capital improvement program is a long-term program to better the facilities in the city, and it has to be kept in context with everything else you're doing in the budget and all of the other spending that goes on and things along that line. Two points I would make. One, we're never going to run out of projects,

[00:29:52] provided we have good leadership in all of our departments and the staff to say these are things that we can improve. Therefore, it's something that you have to come down and say that we've got more than we can do.

[00:30:08] Let's do a reasonable amount, keep it in balance with everything else, and look out there, which means that we should not be out of projects in four years or five years. There should be projects on the Capital Improvement Program that fill out the entire five-year budget.

[00:30:26] Some are more important than others in that they have to be done for safety reasons or other things. Some are things that we just would like to have that might not fit immediately, but we have to have them on the list to plan for them. So the Capital Improvement Program should, in its totality, stretch out to the horizon, if you will, because we're not going away as a city.

[00:30:51] It's not like my house where once I get certain things done, they're done for a long time or forever. We're a different kind of organization. So from that standpoint, keeping the capital improvement program in proportion to everything else that's going on. When I say it's the best of times, it's the worst of times. Right now, times are pretty good. But we have been at other times on my term on the planning commission when it was the worst of times, when the capital improvement program was a million dollars for all of the city's general projects. And when you think

[00:31:29] of what you can get for that, and it includes repairing roads, keeping up the sewers, buying new vehicles, all of the rest of that, you're saying, how could we exist? But in the worst of times, that's where you might find of yourself. So I would recommend budgeting a cushion into things so that when the economy changes, because right now, in the best of times, it's never going to change, but something is going to happen to cause us. So have a pad so that you can adjust and adjust the projects that we have to do and work with. And from that standpoint,

[00:32:05] looking at the capital improvement program and saying, yeah, but we could finance all of this stuff and just take bond issue and take a little bit of cash and bring on a lot of debt and do all of these projects. Is that fiscally responsible? Keep the capital improvement program in the fiscal bounds of the city that's the challenge that we've had for a long time in recommending projects and when we look at it in its totality over five years saying yeah it's balanced these things work these are most important and that's where I think most of your judgments come in for how we're going to move forward and that's what I will add because all the projects on here are good projects all of

[00:32:45] the projects have been vetted and fitted in to the plan by the department managers and the staff and everybody else so we're not in the process of weeding out we're in the process of trying to say here's what recommendation we can make that hopefully will help you make this the best city that you can and we know that's your goal thank you mr rice anything okay thank you okay um that's it from us we're happy to have ongoing conversation with you as you deliberate as well but at this

[00:33:24] point we'll turn it back to you madam chair okay thank you so much and that was a very thorough and excellent presentation i i appreciate the information i'm sure my colleagues do as well and i know there are people poised to ask questions so i'm looking over here at council member peterson what have you got for them well first thanks a lot of work much appreciated you have a set of priorities are these equal or are they rated or ranked so that we've got tiers really yeah i consider more of a balance than anything when we look at the uh you know the

[00:34:02] Short list and number seven, from the ones that we've listed, those are probably priorities. When we look at the rest of them, they're really very much complementary in many respects. Well, maybe to restate it, if we sweep through a listing, should we assume that everything on that list is equally viewed as a priority or are some of them high, some medium, and some low in comparison to each other?

[00:34:31] Are you talking about a list of any individual projects? Yes, I am. I'm not sure we've vetted it that finely. Again, this was a particularly difficult year when we looked at the magnitude and the number of projects, which is why we took a somewhat higher-level view to help provide you some of our insights as to your priority setting.

[00:34:50] Again, we're happy to have further consultation and deliberations and discussion as you ask or direct. And then we have listings of expenditures, as I read it correctly here, but I'm not sure how far along we are at matching sources to uses.

[00:35:07] for instance, how much of this is debt, how much of this is grant, how much of this is tax, et cetera, PAYGO stuff. I'm guessing that's forthcoming. We'll know more about that later. Is that right? So that's not a similar? Is that right, Mr. Martinez? We had a similar discussion. Okay.

[00:35:23] Exactly. And then within the expenditures, and there are a couple of big-ticket items here for sure, but really in all of them, how far along are we at identifying additional flexibility in those estimates?

[00:35:38] for instance, in terms of taking a second look at their timing, et cetera. Just getting started, is that midstream, or are we on that? Mr. Martinez, would you like to address that? We're having, Mayor and Council, we're having those discussions now as far as, so one of the things that we're, while the Planning Commission, thank you, let me extend my thanks for the work that they've done in helping to review and make recommendations.

[00:36:06] We will, to your point, as far as, like, we will have a breakdown as far as how much is debt service and pay go, and as well as schedule adjustment in order to fit what we're able to do within the budget for next year.

[00:36:25] Thank you. Super. And then just to build on that point, again, some big numbers here, Sherwood, Van Dyke, et cetera, and they show up as up-front lump sums. Presumably at some point they get spread. If these are debt financed, these actually get spread out over time.

[00:36:40] So we're not there yet, but that's how we should be understanding. Because even if you fall off a cliff here in terms of what the table shows, but realistically that won't happen. Public-private partnerships, I'm guessing that also is a very, very early stage discussion in terms of where that might be possible.

[00:36:59] But I am curious to know as that develops, and perhaps this will be later stage, Whether we get to the stage where we're actually contemplating transferring public assets to private ownership, which is one of the versions of PPPs, I'm guessing that issue has not come up and we're not far enough along on that.

[00:37:19] But I just want to note that because I think it's eyes wide open on PPPs if we think that's an opportunity for some cost savings. A neighborhood issue that may be way down in the weeds and just to call out on the Van Dyke list, and I don't know whether this fits into Van Dyke or it's a separate thing.

[00:37:42] Because of recent developments in fencing, we don't have a way to get from Country Club Hills over to Van Dyke, and I think there's a conversation underway on finding a path that would go around the municipal field, for instance, at the Catholic Church. I don't know whether that's on the radar and a part of this or whether that's not on this.

[00:38:00] We can find a way to follow up on that later, but it's a timely issue. And the rest of the questions I think are all going to come up later, which is the question mark of, in terms of fiscal bounds, what's our running room here that we have to deal with that we will then work with when we're identifying priorities that go into the actual budget, right?

[00:38:25] So that's a later stage thing that we'll come to. Yes, sir. And once the budget's proposed and we will, you know, go over a lot of this, but then as we have our work sessions and subsequent meetings, that's really where we will be able to dive in and really both explain sort of how these things ought to work, but also to your feedback.

[00:38:49] So if you want to change priorities or, you know, want to look at different things, that's all a part of the discussions we'll have. And I know we've got multiple questions. meetings already scheduled uh with council uh and then as we go through if you think we need to have additional meetings we can certainly do that as well and then just to maybe follow up in my last question slash comment the resolution before us it it seems to me that what you're asking for is us to let you know that you can continue to further develop uh all of these

[00:39:26] things here so that they support this more detailed discussion we'll have later is that a fair characterization if it's the request of the council to do so normally we would turn it over to you but we're happy to engage in any way you like it's typically the role the planning commission is to review and recommend which is what they've done so typically their role in this process is complete until next year and then we'll do this all over again but now it's really up now it's typically staff and then council um to continue to work on this and and then this especially um the first

[00:40:03] year of the cip is what's what you're going to see in the budget the other four years are what's planned but as far as what you're going to take action on and appropriation of funds it's only the first year of the cip so you're going to run away now i think mr rice had a comment so all of us are deeply embedded in things happening in the city uh you know i attend prab uh on prab things uh um you know planning commission were deeply involved and there's inevitably going to be interactions between council and planning commission and the city manager to sort things

[00:40:43] out um mr martinez has been incredibly responsive uh he's already made some extensive kind of modifications to the outlay of money in future years and that sort of responsiveness in in And echoing our concerns was very, very good to see, and it was done very quickly.

[00:41:03] And so the city staff is great. We're very confident that with our role kind of diminishing a little bit, that for the next 11 months, things will be handled very well. On the neighborhood issue, the issue you're discussing is problematic.

[00:41:21] It concerns me a great deal. And it's a very difficult one involving, you know, insurability and a school and a number of other things. But under no circumstances that I think that, you know, transit to a park from Sydney neighborhood should be disrupted like it has been.

[00:41:41] It seems unacceptable just on a personal basis. And so there have been discussions that have already been ongoing about this, and it'll certainly continue to be discussed until it's resolved. I just want to make a final comment about that, Mr. Peterson, you made me think, and that's that some of the things that we suggest and prioritize have a payback.

[00:42:08] One of the most important things I think that I made as a recommendation was to invest in surveillance of the stormwater system by using money to fund a GIS position, and that has paid off many, many, many multiples in terms of the investment, And it's allowed us to do maintenance on that system in a way that otherwise wouldn't be possible.

[00:42:32] So there are some things we recommend that we really feel strongly about in a general sense. And there are other things that you will vote on that have a huge payoff. And that investment is a way of saving money into the future. And so although we haven't given you a specific ranking and list of specific projects, I think this year, given the scope of the CIP, this is appropriate.

[00:42:56] So the items listed in number seven I think all of us just strongly agree are worth focusing on. I know that you've been involved in ESC, and every single board and commission that we spoke about when we were doing our comp plan revisions spoke very strongly about the need for care about the environment and sustainability.

[00:43:16] And so some of those items of feedback we've embedded within our comp plan revisions, and partly due to your leadership of ESC. So those things are, we agree strongly that we support investment in those projects.

[00:43:32] And we are confident in your ability as a city council and the city staff's ability to implement those on a case-by-case basis with projects. Other questions? Council Member Amos.

[00:43:50] It's not really questions, just comments. First, I wanted to thank you all for your diligent work on this. This was an excellent presentation. You did a great job. As a Leighton Hall resident, I echo your comments, Commissioner Rice. Like many others, I am a frequent flyer of Van Dyke Park, so we really have two walkable, quote-unquote, walkable connections to Van Dyke directly from Leighton.

[00:44:12] There's a third, too, but the police chief is here, so I won't mention anything about that one. Just kidding. So one is a dirt path that comes out behind a dumpster right by the health center, And then the other one is an exercise trail, which is on a very steep incline from the bottom parking lot.

[00:44:29] So even in terms of accessibility, just because you have connections there doesn't mean those are the best connections either. And to make Director Bruno very happy, there's a lot of economic opportunities coming with the updates to Van Dyke Park, Thays Park for tourism and other aspects.

[00:44:48] Moving on, I also appreciate your diligent work on focusing on mixed-use designations. especially since that is going to be pretty much the way of the future throughout the region and the country moving forward. And actually our next upcoming work session items cover mixed use, so that should be fun.

[00:45:07] So appreciate that. And I think something that you briefly brought up that we should talk about more is pedestrian safety. Having walked across the city, I will admit that I've nearly busted my butt and wiped out more times than I'd like. So sidewalks aren't just the solution because a scooter will still crack and fall on a sidewalk.

[00:45:26] So we need to do, together with the Planning Commission and City Council, we need to figure out better ways to improve pedestrian safety. Other questions or comments? Council Member McQuillan. You had mentioned, Mr. Feather, you had mentioned that the property yard, the cost for the feasibility study had increased.

[00:45:51] Did I understand that correct? Or something had increased? Actually, the item in the plan changed its nature. Okay. We saw the FY25 program, FY26 showed the property yard feasibility study. Current proposal before you is the implementation.

[00:46:09] Okay. So that was the change. It wasn't the way the item was presented in the budgets were phrased slightly differently from year to year. That's what the change was. That makes sense. Our understanding is that the study is still ongoing, so it's not as if the study was complete and this is the output. That was going to be my next question.

[00:46:26] Wonderful. And then the same thing with the pedestrian bicycle safety studies. You said that they're currently underway. When do you expect to have? They're actually just beginning, and that's going to be about a year and a half process. So that's going to be quite some time, probably middle of 2026.

[00:46:44] Thank you. Other questions or comments? Well, so I want to talk about the property yard. It seems to me that that is urgent. So when you talk about important, I think these things are important.

[00:47:02] But the sense of urgency because of the flooding issue, the fact that so many employees work there, we have an investment of so much equipment that's in a floodplain, buses, you know, gravel, salt, and it seems to me we're on borrowed time.

[00:47:19] And even though I realize that this is a complex project and we don't have a solution yet, it seems to me that when we talk about, aside from the schools, I mean, we have a school bond referendum, have to do something about the schools to me the property yard is the next huge very complicated but incredibly urgent project we have to address we have people and equipment critical to the operation of the city and our residents located in a very dicey area and it seems to me that we're kind of on borrowed time that's just my perspective uh anything you'd like to say

[00:47:55] commissioner rice so i've had a student working on a project um the theme of the project would would simply be a flood risk in the city and the changes between the 2006 FEMA flood zones and the 2023 flooding zones and that part of the city is the lowest in elevation so all the water except for where I and Mr. Feather live on the very southern edge of the city where we drain south everything else drains directly to the property yard and then beyond so it is a really problematic

[00:48:31] location. If you look at the changes that FEMA projects, there's those hundred year floodplains and the city's flood manager would be able to verify that. It's a significant issue and I echo your concerns. My impression of Public Works as a department could not be better. They're just simply every single part of it runs exactly as it should with exceptionally good staff and that is an Achilles heel that part and the sooner we could shift some of those activities and

[00:49:07] critical functions either within the property yard toward the parts that don't flood as quickly which is kind of just triage but move them to other locations other places that may become available that have similar functions right now within the city well I look to the planning commission too and the staff to figure out creative solutions for this because I really it would be a lot of assets at risk should something not go the way it's always gone,

[00:49:42] especially with flooding. And that's people as well as equipment. So like I said, all of these things in the CIP are important, but I do think there is an urgency scale too about what you can kick down the road, how many times you can kick it down the road before we're going to be in a position where maybe what's not an option so any other thoughts before we say okay thank you so much we appreciate the resolution and thank you for all the work thank you mr. Natty I'm sorry we do have a one more thing this will be very brief typically we we just provide the CIP

[00:50:20] presentation but since we have so many new council members and we had the major members of the comprehensive plan adopted in the fall in addition to receiving the resolution on the CIP the next couple of days you'll also receive the Planning Commission annual report and implementation guide so I just want to explain what those are for everybody we're not gonna actually go through any material because there's not enough time for that but essentially the the annual report for the city code the Planning Commission prepares it every year submitted to council it highlights the major tasks of the Planning Commission over the past year some of the major efforts that went underway public hearings resolutions and those types of things and you'll see in this this year's report a summary of some of the

[00:50:59] major changes that we went through when developing the updates to the comprehensive plan that was really the primary effort of the Planning Commission over the past year separately the implementation guides these were established with the rewrite of the comprehensive plan back in 2019 and they follow each of the tasks that are identified in the comprehensive plan in addition as each of the smaller plans have been adopted since then they've had their own set of implementation guides so combined between the comprehensive plan and all the smaller your plans and the revisions to the

conference of plan were adopted in october we're going to have over 400 actions in the whole set of implementation guides these are updated twice yearly by coordinating with all the city staff that

[00:51:39] are responsible in the various departments and those are provided them publicly for anybody to see so i know that's a lot to review and so just to kind of summarize it this will be included in the letter from the chair about the annual report this is a list of the major efforts that resulted in the majority of the updates in the implementation guides again you can see this in there so i won't go through all of them but this shows this the huge number of tasks that are underway in the city right now and this is not everything combined but if there's something in particular that you're interested as you do look at the implementation guides i should say the links to these separate

[00:52:18] links for each one is provided in the cover letter that you receive from from the chair when this comes to you this week this is what it looks like inside the invitation guides each one of these rows is one of the 500 tasks and the with these we have the the action as it is spelled out in the comprehensive plan or the smaller plans whether it is ongoing work which we call base work or a specific project that has to be initiated the lead department we try to consolidate down that down to one in some cases we have to have more than one we try to have a primary responsibility for each one in a time frame so some things are ongoing but things some things have a set time

[00:52:57] frame for when we expect them to be completed and the years are 2026 2028 2030 or 2035 and then lastly we have the status and this is what is updated twice per year through our consultation with city staff anything in red text was changed from the last update six months ago so you can see what's happening currently so i just wanted to make you aware of that as i mentioned you'll receive this the summary of this in the next couple of days via email we're not sending you the full invitation guides the links there are links on there to where these are posted on the website um again these are available for anybody to see uh so if you have any questions that you start to look through them then feel free to reach out to myself or emily and denny who also helped

[00:53:36] put these together so that's all we have on that thank you thank you council member hardy chandler just one quick point on that i think when i was looking at it it was a lot of opportunity this is not a comment for you but to our neighbors out in fairfax i believe there was a lot of opportunities for community engagement so i really want to emphasize with those plans inviting the voice of the community that our neighbors really should take advantage of those opportunities and anything that we can do to enhance that input there are plans and things that are internal

[00:54:12] but the engagement piece i think is really important very thoroughly uh spread throughout all of those plans as i recall quick look but it's more beyond you to the greater community TO PARTICIPATE IN THOSE OPPORTUNITIES WHENEVER THEY COME UP.

[00:54:29] COUNCILMEMBER MCQUILLEN. THANK YOU MAYOR. I JUST WANT TO PIGGYBACK ON COUNCILMEMBER HARDY CHANDLER'S COMMENT IN THAT I ACTUALLY ACCESS THE SMALL AREA PLAN FOR OLD TOWN IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE ONLINE AND I WELCOME EVERYONE OUT THERE TO CHECK IT OUT BECAUSE IT IS PRETTY USER FRIENDLY.

[00:54:53] YOU CAN LOOK AT IT AND UNDERSTAND ALL THE INFORMATION AND IT WAS VERY ACCESSIBLE AND easy for me to use. So thank you. Great. Thank you. All right. Anything else for the good of the body? Okay. Thank you very much. Ms. Clark. Our next item is a pre-application briefing for redevelopment of Ox Hill Block B 4031 University Drive. Claire Schweiger, city planner, will provide

[00:55:22] the staff presentation. Okay. Good morning or good evening, Mayor Reed and council members.

[00:56:03] Tonight we're here to discuss a potential redevelopment of the Aux Fairfax Block B, located at 4021 and 4031 University Drive. We're currently in the pre-application phase of the development review process.

[00:56:20] Staff has had initial discussions with the developer, and multiple agencies have also met with the developer to provide their initial feedback, but a formal application has not been submitted at this time. Because this proposal will likely only include special exceptions and special use permits, this proposal will only be considered by the City Council and not Planning Commission.

[00:56:45] The subject site is bounded by Sager Avenue, University Drive, South Street, and East Street. Existing on the site at 4031 University is a five-story office building, and at 4021 University is a two-story office building. Subject site is located in the CR Commercial Retail Zoning District and the Old Town Fairfax Historic Overlay District.

[00:57:08] And the future land use designation of the site is Activity Center, and it's located in the Old Town Activity Center. The near-term development goals for the Old Town Activity Center, which this would be in the next 15 years, are an increase of 1,250 units of residential, an increase of 25,000 square feet of new office space, an increase of 60,000 square feet of new retail space, and to fill 20,000 square feet of currently vacant retail space.

[00:57:39] a new 100-unit hotel, and an increase of 100,000 square feet of institutional and arts spaces. The potential applicant is proposing a new six-story mixed-use building with roughly 240 residential units, 10,000 square feet of retail, 4,000 square feet of office, and 300 structured parking spaces. There are residential vehicular entrances from Sager Avenue and East Street, and then there's a vehicular entrance to the parking garage for retail from South Street.

[00:58:16] Pedestrian entrances would be provided from University Drive. This slide is showing the potential tenant mix of the building on the first floor. So there would be retail primarily along University Drive and South Street and then residential along East Street and Sager Avenue and then the entire floor plan of the upper five stories is proposed to be residential.

[00:58:43] The potential applicant is proposing two courtyards, one in the interior of the building above the underground parking garage and another behind the building in an area where the building steps down considerably. And then the next few slides, I'm just going to show the overall design of the building. So this is looking at the potential building from Sager Avenue. And then this is

[00:59:15] looking at the potential building from the corner of Sager and University. And then this is looking at the potential pedestrian entrance to the retail parking garage from University Drive. And you can also see some of the design for the residential with the balconies on the upper stories of the building.

[00:59:37] The potential applicant would be looking at a few land use requests, a general development plan with modifications, a special use permit for upper story residential mixed uses, and a major certificate of appropriateness for architecture and landscaping. And the next steps are for the applicant to submit a complete application, and then staff would review, and then we would hold a work session with council, and then also a hearing with council.

[01:00:10] And that concludes my presentation. Happy to take any questions you all have. Do we have questions? Councilmember McQuillan. What kind of units are these? Are these condos or apartments? I believe they're apartments. Okay, thank you.

[01:00:26] Other questions? Councilmember Hall. With regard to the special use permit for upper story residential mixed use, can you expand on that a little bit, what that means? Yeah, so in the CR, commercial retail zoning district, mixed use and or upper story residential is only permitted with a special use permit in those zoning districts.

[01:00:56] So does this mean because they want to go more than five stories, that's why that is? Because it's mixed use and because it's upper story residential. so it's both okay i might come back to that in a minute thank you councilmember amos so for the adu ordinance they would be they would require to be provided what like 14 80 affordable units out of the 240 is that about right it would be six percent is the requirement so around 14 15 okay

[01:01:30] not sure how i feel about that councilmember hardy chandler so on a related note did i see in the materials or the report that they were looking at 20 general and 24 affordable per acre or is that some other project yeah that's well that would be the density requirement for the zoning ordinance so because they're over 30 units um they would be required to have the six percent affordable

[01:01:59] and so the 24 dwelling units per acre would apply to this property other questions or comments on the pre-application council member hall with regard to the 300 parking spaces how many of those are designated for the actual units versus um commercial i don't have that information at this at this time is there a ratio that we typically require when it comes to number of residential units i'm sorry i'm sure these are basic questions but i just i don't know the answers

[01:02:34] phoning a friend yeah mr harden no per unit depending on the size of the units

[01:03:19] in for commercial retail parks at one space per 200 square feet of floor area this property is located within the old town historic overlay district and so there would be a 50 percent reduction in the number of spaces that are required by the baseline zoning given its inclusion in that overlay and so that would reduce the requirement for both the residential and the commercial so both residential and commercial with

[01:03:56] the expectation that I could understand the commercial side because there's other surface area parking lots but what is the rationale or the method for the the idea behind the reductions in the historic district are that generally we want to see preservation of existing buildings and and limit the influx of surface parking and that sort of thing in this area this block is a little different because it's it's probably not one that you think about when you when

[01:04:31] you envision our historic district but nevertheless this property has been zoned that way I think since the historic overlay district was implemented my guess would be which was decades ago my guess would be the thought was probably not so much on the parking necessarily but the idea of limiting height in this area given its proximity to the historic overlay district I will note since that time in the recent small area plan that was adopted additional

[01:05:05] height was recommended beyond what the zoning overlay provides for but nevertheless this application or this potential application I should should say is looking to increase the height beyond the zoning overlay and beyond what the small area plan recommends here okay thank you I'm not a huge

proponent of we need to, you know, provide all of the parking in the world, but I do recognize the fact that people do have vehicles at this time, and while we don't want to give them a ton of parking, we do know if there's not enough, they're going to park somewhere else

[01:05:41] at inconvenience other homeowners or other areas that do become a problem, so I recognize that that's a fine line there. We would certainly expect the, if this comes in as an application for a breakdown on the allocation between the residential and the commercial, so the council could get a sense of what the developer envisions in that regard.

[01:06:00] Okay, thank you very much. Sure. Okay, just one more question, Mr. Hardin, just for clarity on affordable use and the ordinance. There is an ordinance that was adopted, I think we established like back in 2020 or something. Correct. It is a percentage, so people can do more, they just can't do less.

[01:06:18] Correct. Right, so it's always going to be a calculation based on the number of units if it's over 30. Correct. But as far as what those units look like, We can't necessarily dictate specifically what those affordable units can look like.

[01:06:36] That's correct. The idea behind the ordinance is that the affordable units blend in with the market rate units, and so you don't necessarily see, obviously, a difference between those units. But for a multifamily development or an upper-story residential mixed-use development like this one, the requirement would be 6% of the overall number of units.

[01:07:03] And if it's rental, they would be at 60% AMI, area median income, at a maximum. Okay. I think that's just good for us to keep in mind because we have development projects coming up, and there was a reason that we put an ordinance in place. And people can ask for exceptions.

[01:07:20] They may always ask for exceptions, but the reason we have ordinances is because we want to make it very clear that this is what the city decided is what we want to do with affordable housing and these multi-family units. Did you have a question, Councilman Amos? Yeah, I mean, just to build off of that, part of it is that if this were to move forward, the location of it is just so prime for increasing that percentage of affordable units, personally. I mean, it's an extremely walkable area near a lot of our economic hub in Old Town, so I just, hopefully we could find a way to

[01:07:56] incentivize them to go a little bit beyond that 6% because you calculate it 240 divided by what 0.06 you're looking at 14 15 units that's not enough think about incentives mr. Harden any other questions or comments councilmember Bates thank you in the staff report I see that the the bank building is about 8,000 square feet of commercial space and the office building itself is about

[01:08:28] 48,000. So we have to confirm 56,000 square feet right now and they're only proposing 14,000. Is that right? Schweiger is pulling that up, but I believe that is correct. Yes, that's correct. Yeah. Yeah, and I'm sure how I feel about that either.

[01:08:50] Thank you. And that's why we have these work sessions. Any other Councilmember Hall? Just a clarification. I just googled what the income is for the county. What is the AMI specifically for the city?

[01:09:06] It's the same. It's for the metro area. Okay, thank you. Any other questions or comments? All right, thank you both very much. This has been very illuminating and I appreciate having this information ahead of any submission that we might be seeing later.

[01:09:25] Thank you. Ms. Clark? Our next item is a discussion on a request for rezoning from the RM residential medium and CR commercial retail zoning districts to CR commercial retail, a comprehensive plan amendment, a special use permit, and nine special exceptions for Gatewood Plaza, 10201 Fairfax Boulevard.

[01:09:48] Clara Schweiger will also give the staff presentation for this. Okay, this is a work session to discuss a redevelopment proposal for Gatewood Plaza located at 10201 Fairfax Boulevard.

[01:10:05] We are in the post-submission phase of the development review process. The applicant has submitted a complete application, and staff has provided comments on a second submission. The applicant is requesting a zoning map amendment, a comprehensive plan amendment, a special use request for upper-story residential and mixed uses, and nine special exceptions, including a special exception for density, building height, bulk plane required yards, transitional yards, parking, and resource protection area.

[01:10:37] The subject site is located to the south of Fairfax Boulevard and to the north of the terminus of Stratford Avenue. To the west of the subject site is a Toyota dealership and to the east is Captain Pell's Restaurant. The site is currently developed with an approximately 93,114 square foot five-story office building that is 90% occupied. The subject site is currently split zoned and the majority of the property is zoned CR Commercial Retail and approximately 5,436 square feet of the subject site is zoned RM Residential Medium. The surrounding properties

[01:11:16] are zoned CR Commercial Retail and IL Industrial Light to the north, CR Commercial Retail to the west, and CR and RM to the east. Properties to the south are zoned Residential Medium. The subject property and all properties directly abutting the subject property are within the Architectural Control Overlay District. The subject site's future land use designation is Commercial Corridor.

[01:11:42] The future land use designation of the properties to the north and west are also Commercial Corridor. Properties to the east are designated as Green Network Public, and properties to the south are designated as Single Family Neighborhood. This slide shows the proposed general development plan for the subject site.

[01:12:03] The applicant is proposing a seven-story mixed-use building with underground parking. Proposed tenant mix is 307 upper-story dwelling units, approximately 20,000 square feet of commercial retail, and approximately 21,000 square feet of office space. The applicant is requesting a special exception for density to provide 307 dwelling units.

[01:12:26] The maximum density in the CR zoning district is 24 units per acre, and the applicant is proposing a density of 111 dwelling units per acre. In addition to a special exception for density, the applicant is also requesting special exceptions to encroach into the required side and rear yards.

[01:12:44] I've highlighted the required 10-foot side setback and the 25-foot rear setback lines in yellow. The proposal is a mixed-use development with retail and commercial uses located on the first floor, and this slide shows the layout of the first floor.

[01:13:07] The residential units will be located on the upper six floors. A special use permit is requested for upper-story residential and mixed uses in the CR zoning district, and the applicant has submitted this request. Here are some elevations.

[01:13:26] On the left is the north elevation, so this would be looking at the site from Fairfax Boulevard, and on the right is the east elevation, and this would be looking at the site from Captain Pell's. On the left is the south elevation, and this would be looking at the site from the Stratford Avenue side of the site, and the left is the west elevation, and this would be looking at the site from the Toyota dealership side of the site.

[01:13:53] The applicant is requesting a special exception to modify the non-residential district's standards table to allow 85 feet or seven stories. The maximum height permitted by the zoning ordinance is five stories or 60 feet. In addition to the special exception for height, the applicant is also requesting a special exception to exceed the maximum bulk plane requirement. The zoning ordinance allows up to a 45 degree bulk plane and the applicant is proposing a 60 degree bulk plane.

[01:14:25] The increase in height would cause stories three through seven to encroach into the 45 degree bulk Plain. Here are some renderings. On the left is looking at the northwest corner of the proposed building from Fairfax Boulevard, and then on the right is looking at the northeast corner of the proposed building from Fairfax Boulevard. And then on the left here is looking at the southwest corner of the proposed building from the Stratford Avenue side of the site, and on the right is looking at the southeast corner of the proposed building from the Stratford Avenue side of the

[01:15:01] site. And I've included the renderings and elevations in my presentation. However, a Board of architectural review application has not yet been submitted, and a major certificate of appropriateness is required as part of this application. This slide shows the proposed landscape plan. The applicant is proposing a tree canopy of approximately 12%. The applicant is requesting a special exception to not provide transitional yards in accordance with the TY2 transitional yard specifications. The general area where this special exception is being requested

[01:15:35] is highlighted in yellow. Because the applicant is proposing to disturb the resource protection area, An RPA delineation and site-specific study is required. The RPA site-specific study is administratively approved by the zoning administrator.

[01:15:54] The applicant has submitted the study, and this is currently under review. In addition to the site-specific study, the applicant is requesting a special exception to encroach into the landward 50-foot buffer component of the RPA. Staff is not clear on what is being requested with this special exception request and has asked the applicant to clarify with the last comment letter.

[01:16:17] And I included this slide to show the RPA area, and that's in green, and then the red line shows the limit of impervious area in the RPA. So everything to the northwest of that line is impervious, and then everything below that red line would be pervious area.

[01:16:37] The subject property is served by the city's Q bus golden green routes. The applicant is providing sidewalks ranging from 5 to 10 feet wide along the south, east, north sides of the proposed building. The applicant is also proposing a pedestrian connection at the terminus of Stratford Avenue. A 10-foot-wide sidewalk is proposed along the Fairfax Boulevard frontage, and this slide shows the proposed circulation plan. The blue dashed line shows the pedestrian path, and the red line is the vehicular path. The proposed parking garage would

[01:17:12] be accessed from the east, and the applicant is providing vehicular interparcel axle to inter-parcel access to the west and then a stub to the east for future connection. A total of 676 parking spaces are required for the proposed uses on the subject site, and the applicant is proposing 417 spaces. The

applicant is requesting a parking reduction and has submitted a parking study, and that study is still under review. The applicant has submitted a special exception

[01:17:47] request for the 39% parking reduction as well. Parking is proposed in a below-ground parking structure. 20 bike parking spaces are required and the applicant is proposing 20 spaces within a bike room and the parking structure and on outdoor bike racks. The applicant is providing the one loading space required by the zoning ordinance. The subject site is currently split zoned with the majority of the property zoned CR commercial retail. The applicant is requesting a

[01:18:27] zoning map amendment to rezone the entire property to CR commercial retail to accommodate the proposed uses. The applicant is also requesting a comprehensive plan amendment to amend the future land use map to change the designation from commercial corridor to multifamily neighborhood.

[01:18:48] The comprehensive plan's future land use map designates the subject property as commercial corridor. This place type includes a mix of retail, restaurant, service, medical, office, and other commercial uses. Residential uses are not recommended in commercial corridors because this proposal includes a request for a special use permit for upper story residential and mixed uses, and because the commercial corridor place type does not support residential uses, a comprehensive plan amendment is required. The multifamily neighborhood place type applies to

[01:19:26] neighborhoods that are primarily developed with multifamily apartment or multifamily condominium housing. The multifamily neighborhood place type does not accommodate commercial retail or office uses. The multifamily development, any multifamily development that is adjacent to single-family detached neighborhoods within city limits should have a maximum of three floors and provide landscape setbacks for portions of the site that are adjacent to any of those uses. And the multifamily neighborhood place type supports up to 24 dwelling units per acre. And this is what

[01:20:00] the future land use map would look like if the application were approved. The planning commission held a work session with the applicant to discuss the proposal on January 27th. Some of the main issues discussed during this work session were concerns with height, parking overflow in the neighborhood to the south, parking overflow on the subject site from the site across Fairfax Boulevard, development in the RPA, the lack of sidewalk on all sides of the proposed building, concerns with allowing mixed-use development outside of the activity centers and along Fairfax

[01:20:36] Boulevard, a concern that the proposal does not fit within the multifamily neighborhood place type, concerns with the special exception for bulk plane, loss of green home and loss of the green home features for the affordable units, and the applicant can provide more information on those features of the proposal. Some positive aspects of the plan identified by the planning commission were the smart and green home features, exceeding the tree canopy requirement, proximity

[01:21:15] to the North Falls Activity Center, provision of affordable units, reduction in impervious area, and some commissioners liked that this is a mixed use and residential proposal, and some did not because the mixed use is not located within an activity center. Also, there was considerable discussion regarding the mixed use place type and the parcel specific considerations in the comprehensive plan. So typically, staff does not provide analysis at this stage of the development review process. However, this proposal is unique in that there is no future land use designation

[01:21:50] that supports this proposal. This proposal does not fit squarely into any of the place types described in the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan recommends mixed uses only in activity centers and in the parcel specific considerations. So commercial corridor and multifamily neighborhood are not viable options for this proposal. There is no current policy to support this proposal and the applicant has been made aware of this from the beginning of the land use process. Staff does not recommend that council and planning commission allow individual property owners or developers to amend the comprehensive plan. And I want to be clear that

[01:22:27] because we do not currently have a policy to support this development, staff cannot support this proposal. So with that being said, if the applicant can revise their application to align with the current adopted policy, then the next steps are a plan resubmission and a council hearing.

[01:22:47] And I forgot to add this to the slide, but they're also required to have a major certificate of appropriateness for architecture and landscaping. And that concludes my presentation. I believe the applicant is here to present next. Thank you.

[01:23:20] Good evening. I'm Sarah Moriska with the land use attorney with the law firm of Oden Feldman Pittleman here on behalf of the owner of the property at 10201 Fairfax Boulevard.

[01:23:38] With me is George Hong as well as Kevin Yoon on behalf of the owners. And then also I have Will Rich who is with the Calvary Real Estate Advisors to speak a little bit more eloquently than I can about the fiscal impact of this project, which I think is really important for this group to understand in the context of the conversation that we've been having in terms of priorities, goals, and really the future of this possible development.

[01:24:06] I do have a short presentation. I do not want to go into a tremendous amount of detail because really we are here to discuss and get some feedback before we think about next steps. But I did want to provide a little context beyond staff's presentation and beyond what was in the materials that we had formally submitted to the city.

[01:24:28] Thanks, Clara. I think this group is very familiar with the site. It's directly across from Boulevard Marketplace, which I know has been a very big success in the city. Captain Powell's is on the right-hand side of our site and on the left-hand side it's a car dealership. And this site, known as Gatewood Plaza, is developed with an office building that has been there for a number of years.

[01:24:50] And just to give you some visual familiarity with the site, this is at a signalized intersection. You can see that office building there. And in the rear, it actually has a standalone separate parking structure that is proximate to the neighborhood is existing.

[01:25:06] It's very close. It's even visible from that existing neighborhood today. So I want to bring your attention to that existing development pattern and how this site has been used for many years. Again, to give you a little bit of a different view and context, there is that roughly 93,000-square-foot office building at the signalized intersection as well as a standalone parking structure in the rear near the existing single-family neighborhood.

[01:25:32] And then there is RPA in the southeastern portion of this site that is largely impervious service today that we would be hoping to improve and revitalize that area. So even though there is an existing office building with a significant component of a successful office use in the city, it's about 84% leased is my understanding.

[01:26:01] And that number is going to continue to decline. We have a number of leases that are expiring in the very near future. And based on the conversations we have had with tenants and prospective tenants, there is just not a demand for continued use of this building.

[01:26:20] And I think this group is very familiar with significant changes in the need for office. The amount of office that we need has evolved. The location that office tenants are seeking to go have evolved. I think just the demand for office has dramatically changed over the last several years.

[01:26:39] Do a variety of factors in terms of the need for space, teleworking, the state of other office development in the area. And just really also the retail space has dramatically changed given kind of consumer patterns. So the owners have been seeking flexibility with the fact that the likely need for this much office space in this configuration is just not likely in the coming years.

[01:27:05] When we originally were looking at this site, and actually when this was originally brought before council for a work session, we were looking at a much different amount of commercial space. And based on conversations that we had had with stakeholders and this council and others, we have drastically increased the amount of space with about half of the first floor being retail along the front of the building, which we think would really be the right place for it to have street visibility and frontage and would really align with that commercial corridor desire as well as the development pattern across the street at Boulevard Marketplace.

[01:27:42] And then we did add a significant commercial component to try and bring forward the office space within this building in maybe a different amount, a right size in our minds that would carry forward some of the success of this building, but in a number or amount of square footage that is more realistic based on the current market conditions and what we see happening in the future.

[01:28:06] and I know in some conversations there is a need for secure government contractor space that could be used and so our thought here would be that this could be accommodated in this space but we just don't see the need or demand for something beyond about 20,000 square feet of retail on the first floor and then about 20,000 square feet of commercial on the first floor. So I just want to make the case that this is bringing forward some of the desire that we see to have a commercial component at this location but with a project that is realistic based on current economic conditions

[01:28:41] and and as well as here to speak to in more detail this project would have a significant economic benefit for the city the thought that we have in this building is that this would be something wildly different than is currently within the city or really within northern Virginia we are looking at a integrated unit type that has a lot of technology that would allow these to be efficiently designed uses with a lot of flexible features I'm going to go through some images to provide a little bit more context and really make this kind of a model project that

[01:29:20] would have this green building focus energy efficiency and this technology integration into the units and could really be a model for this city and for the region in terms of this kind of development so just to give a little bit of context and some visuals i mean the the thought is that these units based on conversations we have had with technology providers would have things such as the closet could have an integrated system whereby clothes could be steamed in the closet appliances could be controlled from your smartphone you can see in the bottom right hand image you can see the inside of a refrigerator

[01:29:59] when you're sitting on the couch or potentially even out at the grocery store, thereby saving potentially a trip to the grocery store, saving opening of the refrigerator. Some other things that we have been looking at are space-saving features.

[01:30:16] You can see on the left-hand side the bed that could retract into the ceiling and become a different space use when that bed is being stored. And then similarly on the right-hand side, There would be the integration of tables into the design such that when the table is not in use, it could be retracted into the kitchen and really, again, allow for a more efficient, adaptable space and then have some technology integration into the entirety of the unit so that you could really have a lot more accessibility and a universal design that really is something that we haven't seen to date.

[01:30:57] And then just a few other visuals of what the interior of these units could potentially look like based on the conversations that we've had and a few more illustratives to show what this could look like. Another thought that we have envisioned and proposed is that it would be the thought that this would be very green-focused.

[01:31:18] And one of the features that we have proposed and contemplated is that glass would actually be energy-producing. So this is something that I have not seen, but it's something that I think really is looking toward the future for how this building could be a positive influence to the city and to the area.

[01:31:41] When I conclude, Will will provide a little bit more detail, but I think that the main point is that this building has an overwhelmingly positive fiscal impact for the city compared to the retention of the existing office building. And I know that there is some concern about the change or the reduction in the amount of office and the amount of commercial, but even with that change, this would have an overwhelmingly positive benefit to the city.

[01:32:11] And then some other things I wanted to quickly highlight would be that this is a completely new and different type of building that would increase housing in an area that has a housing shortage and crisis. We would be proposing to provide affordability within the units in compliance with the city's affordable ordinance.

[01:32:29] We are aware of the need to enhance pedestrian connectivity and have proposed some sidewalks and connections, and we would continue to be looking at those. And then, again, some of the other things in the green focus design, an active first floor with the commercial uses and the significant positive fiscal impact.

[01:32:48] we are early in this process and have a lot of issues as this group probably knows it's a very iterative process where we will have changes and discussions and we are here tonight to to hear the feedback so that we can think through the next steps and how we might change to respond to those concerns and with

[01:33:09] that well I think maybe if I can pull up thanks Sarah good evening mayor Reed and counsel. My name is Will Rich and I'm Managing Director of Advisory Services at Cavalry Real Estate Advisors, which is a Falls Church-based real estate advisory firm. I've been with Cavalry

[01:33:47] since October of 2024 and prior to that I was president of Delta Associates, which is a DC-based real estate research and consulting firm where I conducted hundreds of consulting assignments for clients across the DMV and in markets across the United States for over 20 years. My colleague Ross Lickenhaus was also planning to join us, but he wears many hats, and he's the chair of the Falls Church EDA, and

they're having a meeting tonight as well, so he sends his regrets. So we were hired by 10201 Fairfax Boulevard LLC to analyze the fiscal impact of this proposed 358,000 square

[01:34:23] foot mixed-use project located in the city of Fairfax. The project would contain a mix of retail, including potentially a specialty market and restaurant space, along with commercial uses, including skiff space and professional services on the ground floor with 307 mixed-income apartment units above over a 10-year period our analysis estimates over a 10-year period our analysis estimates that the project will produce 21.3 million dollars in gross revenue against 11.3 million dollars in city expenditures for a total net fiscal impact of about 10 million dollars or

[01:35:01] just over 1 million dollars per year on average the proposed development is estimated to generate about \$3.3 million per acre and \$27.93 per square foot. So this compares to the net fiscal impact of the existing building, which we estimate is about \$560,000 per year.

[01:35:22] So the proposed development with its mix of commercial, retail, and mixed income apartments will generate nearly double the net fiscal impact. Our analysis was based on reviewing the fiscal year 2025 operating budget for the city and allocations of revenue and expenditures.

[01:35:39] We spoke with the city assessor to ensure that we use the proper method for calculating real property tax revenue, which is the largest source of tax revenue for new development, by incorporating the income capitalization method for all proposed uses, accounting for a reasonable escalation of revenue and expenses over time.

[01:35:58] Cavalry conducts hundreds of real estate tax projections per year for our clients, concentrated in this region but also across the country. Education spending makes up a large share of the municipal expenditures for residential development, although the per-pupil tuition is offset somewhat here in Fairfax City by what the county pays for rental schools and state aid.

[01:36:20] The proposed mix of uses at this project will generate a variety of revenue streams for the city, including the proposed specialty market, which is a good source of sales tax and prepared food and beverage tax. Meanwhile, the proposed SCIF space provides a specialized type of commercial space needed by smaller government contractors that need space to discuss or review sensitive materials in a secure environment.

[01:36:43] So thanks for having me this evening, and I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you. Okay. So we have our city staff. We have the applicant. Do we have questions from the dais? Council Member Bates.

[01:37:01] Thank you. So first off, the fiscal analysis, that takes consideration the change in the building value as well as the change in the cost of city services due to the change in use? That's correct.

[01:37:18] And for staff, has staff reviewed this analysis? No, this hasn't been submitted to staff yet. Okay. Well, personally, you know, while I support the comprehensive plan, there are a few points that I do not agree with, and one of them is the recommendation against residential and throughout most commercial corridors, and personally, I'm supportive of considering that and, you know, being a bit more open to that.

[01:37:56] I do have concerns, of course, about the loss of commercial space, but as long as staff's analysis confirms a significant net fiscal impact of this project, then I'd say that those concerns would be mitigated.

[01:38:17] Certainly, there are issues left to work out here, I think, but the potential to reduce impervious service in the RPA and hopefully to increase tree canopy and certainly to eliminate above-ground parking in favor of underground parking is certainly something I don't want to pass up and also increase the city's housing stock and including an increase in affordable housing.

[01:38:50] And, see, I would love to see maybe another floor, half a floor of commercial space ideally but you know as long as we're seeing a net positive fiscal impact and the city can confirm that on their end the and also this would be increasing the proportion of housing in the city and you know in the region that is along bus routes which I think is certainly not an

[01:39:21] additional significant benefit and the use of sustainable technology and construction but we also need to make sure that the neighborhood to the south is okay with the project and that we have an appropriate amount of screening from the neighborhood that being said there is already a building here and the back end of a parking garage that basically backs up to somebody's backyard that personally you know I would love to see this next to my house rather than

[01:39:57] back end of a parking garage but definitely want to make sure that that they're on board yeah so that's all I have for now if anybody else has anything thank you other comments councilmember Amos yeah so thank you for the fiscal impact analysis I was actually my first question so appreciate that going back to that. For the personal property tax, is that based off of the parking space reduction?

[01:40:29] It's based on the parking that's proposed. Okay. Okay. Okay. Let's see. 28 ADUs is good. I can work with that. What is your timeline exactly for this project once it were to hit construction? Some of the materials you plan on using and the smart base technology, that seems like it's going to drag on for a while and construction costs will be high. So if it were move forward I mean how long would this project actually take George I don't know

[01:41:02] if you want to speak to that in terms of timing or as you know when we purchase this property this property was approximately 97 percent occupancy on it it's been a little bit over a year now because a year and a half and it has gone down from 97 percent to approximately 84 percent occupancy and there are some other tenants are at least our experience or they will be moving out unfortunately as well

[01:41:36] so with that being said this is not something that we are trying to develop immediately we started this because we kind of figured out where the office markets are going and we wanted to protect our assets so we wanted to have alternate options and and that alternate option was to develop this into a mixed-use property. So we still have a legally abounding lease with tenants such as PE systems and Trident. They still have four years left. So I have to make sure that we are legally binding. So I have to stay with them until they, you know,

[01:42:15] vacate the premises. So without being said, it may take anywhere from four years to, you know, five six years before we start the construction okay and have we received comments from the adjacent businesses like captain pelz and oarsman on this project we have not we again are we have spent a lot of time working through kind of technical comments and we are well aware that we will need to have conversations with captain pelz car dealership and most significantly the single-family homeowners to the rear so anticipate that we will have ongoing conversations with all

[01:42:53] those stakeholders okay and I also wanted to echo Councilman Bates Council member Bates's comments regarding the the public transit infrastructure that's that's a good to know councilmember

McQuillan so looking at these special acceptance requests you're looking at changing density from 24 per acre to 111 that's correct correct okay and then I see here you're proposing 400 417

[01:43:25] spaces for 676 required. Can I ask why the discrepancy there? Why do you think, is it based off of the units that you expect to, I noticed that you have like a space saving elements in each unit. Is that because they're all expected to be studios or? So there's a number of factors.

[01:43:46] One is that the mix of units in terms of the bedrooms we think would be a lesser incidence of needing the spaces. So there are smaller units and predominantly one bedroom, smaller number of vehicles likely.

[01:44:04] There would be, I think if you take a look, if you are looking for some bedtime reading and cannot sleep, take a look at our parking study. But there are a number of factors in that. I think we would suggest that the parking rates in the city are on the higher end of what you might see in comparable jurisdictions.

[01:44:25] I think the size of the unit is important to consider. There would be some shared parking between the retail and the office and the residences such that there is some different use of parking that would be beneficial for purposes of that parking supply.

[01:44:42] So based on a number of factors, we would suggest that a reduction could be supported and we can continue to determine the right number because I am sensitive to some of the concerns that the Planning Commission raised in terms of what's the right number, but that's kind of a high-level summary of what we had proposed.

[01:45:01] Thank you. And I echo council members, his comment. I'm sorry, I just blanked. Give me one second. Sorry, I'm looking here.

[01:45:17] Bases. I'll come back to it. It'll come back to me. Council Member Peterson. This one question that may go to staff and even planning commission while you're here, Just the movement away from commercial to residential in this corridor, is that consistent with our long-term plan and vision for this corridor?

[01:45:42] As adopted right now, no. No, it's not. And as was noted, this was something that we certainly made the applicant, the applicant's attorney, aware of from the very initial conversation.

[01:46:05] As was noted earlier in the staff report, there isn't a place type designation, a land use classification in the comprehensive plan for this proposal to go into. The comprehensive plan is very clear that residential is not supported in the commercial corridor.

[01:46:27] That's for a number of reasons. It's a longstanding policy that we've had in the city. it was strengthened with the adoption of the plan in 2019 it was revisited in the update that was adopted last year there was discussion about mixed-use development in the commercial corridors the Planning Commission spent a lot of time evaluating that this applicant and his representatives were involved in that discussion it was identified that this isn't a property that the

[01:47:05] comprehensive plan would be amended to to provide for mixed-use development there were other properties around the city that were the the mixed-use development that is contemplated in the comprehensive plan is in our activity centers those are areas around major intersections that have have a

lot of depth to them and ability to handle more intense levels of development I think the proposal that's before you is very clear as to why that's been the case,

[01:47:41] that the comprehensive plan hasn't supported this kind of development. In the commercial corridors, these are very narrow lots in terms of their depth generally. They back up to neighborhoods. So the proposal that's being discussed tonight has a 10-foot rear yard setback.

[01:47:59] It doesn't meet the bulk plane requirements to mitigate height as it's coming back toward a neighborhood. The activity centers, again, have depth and dimension that can handle larger footprint development, taller buildings.

[01:48:16] Those areas were designated not only for those dimensional characteristics, But there are areas where we can grow and enhance a neighborhood that's already there, like in Old Town, or we can create a neighborhood like in North Vax that has value, that we can create a grid of streets, we can promote walkability, we can do all those things that our plan outlines, as opposed to providing for kind of haphazard development occurring along our commercial corridors,

[01:48:52] as staff we are very very concerned about we want to derive the most value we can for all the dollars that are invested here in this city and the city has taken a very strong position in terms of redevelopment in fact there's more land that's zoned commercial that's now been designated for redevelopment in those activity centers then there's land that's not those activity centers consume more commercial land in our city than the commercial corridors do so where there's commercial corridor left where we haven't put that out as a policy staff absolutely has concerns about moving in a different direction and what

[01:49:30] we told the Planning Commission and their discussion the other evening because there is no designation that this application could be reasonably considered within we recommended if there's a desire to move forward with this that they take a step back they look at the comprehensive plan and they take a look at whether there are amendments that that should be made as was noted earlier staff isn't going to support a developer rewriting the city's comprehensive plan there are map amendments that occur from time to time associated with with the development proposal but we're certainly not going

[01:50:06] to condone a rewrite of portions of a plan by a developer and that's what would be needed in this case so if there's a desire to move this forward we really Can you take a step back and evaluate that policy and whether it's something we want to continue with or not?

[01:50:25] And to build on that, in terms of the fiscal impact analysis, you have an analysis that compares the proposal against existing use. But theoretically, there are alternate and enhanced commercial design options for this site that could be the subject of a fiscal impact analysis, and that would be consistent with taking a step back here and being consistent with the overall current view for corridors.

[01:50:56] Just to note, I think the other, two other quick questions. One is, I don't know if we got an answer to the question of why there is some incursion into the resource protection area, a forested area. Do we know why that is happening here?

[01:51:11] So there is an existing RPA that has impervious surface. We are demonstrating that there would be significant improvement, but still a small amount of encroachment into it.

[01:51:28] We will work with our wetlands consultant to get a more technical answer, but that's my layperson understanding that we can confirm as we work through the process. Okay. My final question is the question about schools. How many children are we looking at adding into the school system with this development?

[01:51:49] approximately 36 35 to 36 students thank you councilmember Hardy Chandler I guess so my thought in the presentation was and this comes from other comments that I've made asking questions about how many exceptions are reasonable and how many exceptions actually throw out the plan completely was going through my

[01:52:22] mind during the presentation but I'm curious what have the people who are are leaving saying in terms of what they are doing i know that there were conversations pre-covid and i can understand changes in work models and those kinds of things but do we know for sure do we have the data from the people who are leaving and uh to sort of connect to council member peterson's um point is there a way to redefine commercial spaces in new and innovative and high tech and green sorts of ways that actually meet the needs of the people who are leaving in some

[01:53:02] model redesign because i like the innovation i like thinking out of the box and i'm just wondering if that box could also that outside could also be commercial well the one of the major things i left recently is the insurance agency they've been there for a long time they're occupying approximately 9,000 square feet so they were considered as one of the third biggest tenant large tenant in our building so they left and the reason for their living was that

[01:53:36] they were consolidating with their other location so into one small space in tyson's corner so they moved out another tenant that left recently was medical spa they've been there for over five years and again their business is not doing well so therefore they ended up not renewing their lease and they left the premises another tenant that left recently is called suncorp their solar panel installation company again they've been there for i think at least five years and their lease

[01:54:15] expired last year they renew for one year and then after the first amendment extension after one year they left. So that's another tenant. And another tenant is the IT company. Their lease expires end of this month. However, they haven't come to our building for years. And they keep asking me if they can do early termination because they don't need to come to their building anymore because they couldn't get government contract insecure for them to keep their business going.

[01:54:51] So their plan is to leave the vacated premises by the end of this year. I just wanted to clarify a comment that I made earlier to Council Member Peterson's question.

[01:55:10] It's actually 28 students. Council Member Amos? A quick question that I forgot to ask was, I'm a little confused on how you would assess trip generation with this property. Could you provide some insights on that?

[01:55:27] I would be curious on how you would assess it based off of one overtime dwindling office space. But it sounds like a lot of people are already working from home. So typically the transition from office to residential would lead to lower trip generation.

[01:55:43] But is that still the case here? So a couple of different things. We do have a traffic impact analysis that looks at both traffic counts to give an indication of what is actually coming and going from

the property. but then we also have included information based on ITE, Institute of Transportation Engineer, information for what would be kind of a more standard rate that we might see.

[01:56:10] And then with this proposed development, we are looking at the likely impact based on the mix of the retail and the commercial and the residential, and there would be an increase in trips.

[01:56:26] It is not such that it would significantly adversely impact the network. It would be an increase based on the mix of uses and based on the projections. But kind of to your point, given the existing use and the existing patterns and the new mix, it's essentially a slight increase but not a major impact in the transportation.

[01:56:49] - Do we have the numbers on that? And could that be shared around? - Yeah. - Specifically when it comes to Fairfax Boulevard, I mean, Stratford as well, but I think that'd be good to consider. And we can certainly provide greater detail. I know Clara has, and I have it, and it's roughly, I think, the average daily increase in trips is about 2,000 additional trips per day on Fairfax Boulevard.

[01:57:11] The analysis is that that number would not be a significant adverse impact on the functionality of the transportation network. And then, you know, to Council Member Bates' point, there is a pretty robust bus line that we would seek to take advantage of and would hope to expand the connectivity to the trails and the bus network and the connectivity to the neighborhood would be a huge benefit.

[01:57:37] And then certainly given the contemplated parking reduction as well as the trip increase, we would be proposing a transportation demand management program as part of any proposal that would go forward. So we can dig into more details and specificity on that and could bring our traffic engineer to speak in greater detail than I provided, but, you know, I think our analysis is that part of the reason that this is an advantageous site is the infrastructure that's in place and it wouldn't impact the network.

[01:58:10] Councilmember Hall. All the great ones that have been answered or asked so far. So you said they're injured in seven units. I know you referenced bedrooms, so we're talking 28 students.

[01:58:26] I'll come back to that in a minute. So the lost revenue over the next four-plus years with reductions in your leasing tenants, things like that, do we have a number on what that cost to the city is versus what we're currently getting when it's at 97% occupied versus 84%?

[01:58:46] Do we know what that lost revenue number is potentially? Could we obtain that? We don't have that modeled out, but we can definitely do that. Okay, just, yeah, curious what that cost would be. And if I'm clear, we're bringing in roughly 500 and some thousand now.

[01:59:03] This would bring it to a million dollars a year. So we're having a net increase of about \$500,000 per year. Okay. Unfortunately, that is not fully covered for an expectation of 28 students in our buildings. So if we estimate 28 students at 18,000 per student, which is a very low number right now, I know we're going to have a huge increase, that's \$504,000.

[01:59:28] So there goes our entire, no? So that's already incorporated into the estimated expenditures, the students, the increase in the number of students. Okay, where, I guess where is that number?

[01:59:46] In the estimated expenditures of \$11 million, that's inclusive of the increase of the 28 students to the school system. Okay, my apologies, thank you. I didn't have a breakdown on that. Yeah, itemization on that would be helpful. Okay, thank you.

[02:00:03] And then I don't know a whole lot about bulk planes, so if we can go back to that slide for a minute and just discuss from the Stratford side what the 45-degree versus the 60-degree with the change in setback, like what visually that makes for them. Yeah, let me pull the PowerPoint back up.

[02:00:32] While you're doing that, this is Providence Elementary School, correct? I believe the typically south of Fairfax Boulevard is Daniels Run, but I believe those that front on Fairfax Boulevard are Providence, but we will confirm that.

[02:00:47] It's weird because it's not this tricky for it currently. Okay, thank you. Can you repeat your question about the bulk plane? Yes, in my technical terms, yes. 45 degrees versus 60. I'm just looking at slide 11 trying to understand what exactly that means and then how the setback changes visually change.

[02:01:07] They're looking at a garage structure right now. No one's looking back at them from units, but what would that look like differently for them as far as how much more they would see versus not? Okay, so for the 60-degree bulk plane to comply with the zoning ordinance, the building would need to be set back from the property line 60 feet.

[02:01:42] Does that help clarify at all? I think so. So it would need to set back 60 feet, but it's only being proposed to set back 10 or 20? So the building is set back more. The reduction in the setback is necessary not because of the building location, but because the drive aisle is within the required setback.

[02:02:08] So what would or something that we can think about and talk about is that some other ways of addressing this bulk plan issue is a modulation of the building and some reduction in the rear and thinking about how that rear of the building is visible and viewable from the neighborhood.

[02:02:31] So there are a number of ways that we could think about that compatibility relationship. So I guess just to be clear, the reduction in setback is because of the drive aisle, not the building location.

[02:02:47] The bulk plane, though, is based on the kind of scope and size of the building. So the bulk plane, imagine, as shown there, it's an imaginary angle coming from off the property line, the rear property line.

[02:03:03] And so to comply with that provision, you need to be less than underneath that 45 degree angle. So as shown, if the building stayed where it is, it looks like about two stories, at least at that initial, and then would have to step back and it can gain height from there.

[02:03:19] but the idea is that it is creating light and air and it's not allowing buildings to hover over a residential district and so to miss Mariska's point there are different ways that that could be accommodated you can move the building you could step it back but that's the that's the idea behind it it it's a standard provision in the zoning ordinance when commercial properties but residential properties, basically.

[02:03:49] Okay, so I guess in very layman's terms, if I'm sitting in my backyard or my front yard and I live on Stratford, what am I seeing now versus what am I going to see if this were to pass exactly the way it is? And that's something that actually I think bears some further visual because I think there's the existing book plane that you would see from the rear versus this.

[02:04:14] So all that to say is I think it would be helpful for us to have a better understanding of what's existing versus what's proposed, and that might be a helpful illustrative that I don't have that today, but

that's something we can look at. Okay, thank you. And I just have one other parting comment, which is that my visual in this is that this is already an elevated visually piece of property when you drive by.

[02:04:37] I think it gets away with what's currently there as far as the commercial because it's hidden, it has the mature trees. What is proposed, I think, is a very, very tall for what the space is, and I don't know that I would be willing to support something that's that tall in that space.

[02:04:56] All that to say, I honestly don't know if I would support the residential conversion at all, but it's too tall for my visual of what I see there for the city. But thank you very much for coming out and answering all my questions patiently. - Just to follow up on the one confirmation that it is Providence Elementary.

[02:05:17] - Council Member Peterson. Just a practical question for the residents. When they walk out the first floor, where do they go? Where do they walk, literally? This is kind of squeezed right in with, you know, a road right in front of it, an RPA in the back, and it's kind of rough territory.

[02:05:34] That's where I live, right? So where do they go? Well, hopefully one of the sidewalks that would be added to the property. And then hopefully they could easily go to direct Boulevard or Boulevard Marketplace across the street.

[02:05:50] They could access trail connection across the street. They could walk along Fairfax Boulevard, which does have an existing sidewalk that they could use. And we do hope that the residents would take advantage of the retail that would be part of this building. So that's something that we could continue to show connectivity and kind of where people would travel from this building.

[02:06:10] But just that's a few thoughts off the top of my head. Is there anything on site that kids would be able to do in terms of some space? We have not gotten to that level of detail, but something for us to think about. Okay, and then just the other general comment on density.

[02:06:26] There's been a lot of comments in prior meetings. Fairfax Plaza, as I understand it, has 48 units per acre, a total of 96 over 2 acres. I know there's been lots of numbers put out about density and some expectations around that, but just to note, there are models of development in the city that are at lower density scales for consideration.

[02:06:54] Other questions, comments? Okay, well, sort of my perspective is that the zoning designations, single-use zoning designations, industrial, commercial, and residential, are about 100 years old, and they came about because of cars.

[02:07:15] So when cars started carving up cities, it seemed like the thing to do was segregate housing from commercial from industrial. And so those concepts are about 100 years old, and it's very kind of 20th century. And now, globally, people are talking in terms of 15-minute cities.

[02:07:35] And 15-minute cities kind of rely on being able to mix up different kinds of uses in different kinds of spaces. I don't think it's revolutionary. I think it's something that's being done in other communities close by. It's being done in European cities.

[02:07:52] And so I do think we have to kind of think a bit more expansively about what we're trying to do here in the city. And maybe this very structured kind of zoning that's been around for 100 years really needs to be rethought.

[02:08:08] And that is something that is a bigger question than this project, and yet it is related, right? Because if we are saying no to projects based on this is not what the zoning is, this is not what the comprehensive plan is, we have a plan, and this isn't it. I would also point out that when Boulevard 6 was built, where Paul VI High School was, that is a commercial corridor.

[02:08:30] Is it not? Was it not? It was designated institutional at the time. But on either side of it, it's in the commercial corridor. That's correct. Correct. And so an exception was made for Boulevard 6 to be built, where there is businesses and not necessarily residential.

[02:08:51] And so I just would like for us to think, and I agree with what Mr. Harden is saying about a development, not rewriting our comprehensive plan, but I think we also need to think, is comprehensive plan or are these 20th century ideas about zoning does it fit with what the world actually is moving toward if you're thinking about ideas like 15 minute cities we're only 6.2 square miles we should have mixed use mixed use is one of the things that was recommended in our small area plans for that very reason so as we kind of move forward and thinking in terms of this

[02:09:30] project i think this council needs to think in terms of and working with the planning commission too moving forward you know i think other areas and other locales are starting to think about creating different kinds of designations for zoning and so let's not necessarily limit our thinking here that's my only comment if we don't have anything else i will thank everyone here for their time our next item is a discussion on potential zoning options for accessory dwelling

[02:10:09] units. Eric Foreman, city planner, will provide the staff presentation.

[02:10:13] So we're talking about accessory dwelling units, and this topic has come up in a few

[02:10:50] contexts over the past year or so, and tonight we're talking about potential approaches to expand options for property owners to construct accessory dwelling units, or ADUs, as they're frequently called, on single-family lots.

[02:11:08] And these are zoning-related approaches, so in other words, what's regulated by the city's zoning ordinance. This is not the first meeting on this topic. The City Council and Planning Commission both held work sessions on ADUs in July of last year.

[02:11:27] Those sessions were very general in nature. In November, we held a community meeting on this topic. few council members were at that community meeting, although the meeting itself was fairly sparsely attended. At tonight's meeting, we'd like to introduce some of those high-level issues to the new council and also get advice regarding city council's opinions on this topic. And I should mention the overall issue here of accessory dwelling units. It's not a quick process.

[02:12:01] There are some aspects to this that could be done quickly, but the bigger issues, and specifically big issues like whether to permit detached accessory dwelling units, if there's a desire to move forward with that topic, those big issues are rather complex.

[02:12:18] Complex topics require a good amount of public comment and a good amount of time, so just wanted to get that out of the way. This isn't something that's expected to be decided on tonight or anytime soon. But again, tonight's presentation, as you see here, this is really a mixture of that basic introduction from the summer work session, along with additional information from the November community meeting.

[02:12:43] This first item that's up on here says, what is an accessory dwelling unit? I know that seems a little bit rudimentary, but it's important. And one of the reasons it's important is it's not necessarily intuitive. So we'll just start right there. There is an actual definition in the zoning ordinance of accessory dwelling unit.

[02:13:04] It's important enough, I'll just read it right here. An ADU is defined in the ordinance as a dwelling, including separate kitchen, sleeping, and bathroom facilities that is attached as part of a principal single-family dwelling and is subordinate in size to that dwelling.

[02:13:24] So in everyday terms, the definition says that an ADU is its own dwelling unit, so with kitchen and bathroom, so that basically means an apartment. That's important. It's also part of another house, so it's attached, enclosed, in with another house, and it's subordinate or accessory to the main house, and that means that the ADU is significantly smaller than the main house itself.

[02:13:54] So these points are all important because this term is occasionally confused with other things. So it's important to know what ADUs are, also what they're not for folks who remember the work session from July.

[02:14:12] We went over this slide, so I'll go over this again. Just a few quick things about what are not ADUs. These are on the right-hand side of the screen here. renting out a portion of a house is not considered an accessory dwelling unit. An ADU is a physical dwelling, so again, it's a separate dwelling unit. It contains kitchen and bathroom. Renting out a bedroom, renting out a basement just independently is not considered an accessory dwelling unit that we're discussing tonight. The second topic is eliminating single family zoning. This is not something that we're considering, but this concept is sometimes talked

[02:14:51] about. This is different from accessory dwelling units. And it's not different just because it's a more intensive idea, but because the types of units that that type of process would seek to create are fully separate units. They're not accessory to, they're not part of another house or another property. So that is something different from what we're talking about tonight, as is this bottom issue of short-term rentals. Short-term rentals are rentals like Airbnb and so forth. Short-term rentals are currently not permitted in Fairfax City. In some places, these two things do overlap.

[02:15:30] You see accessory dwelling units that are rented out as Airbnbs in some places. From a zoning perspective, which is what we're dealing with tonight, these two things operate independently. If the city at some point would wish to permit short-term rentals, that is a completely different discussion, so that is not something that goes along with ADUs.

[02:15:54] So hopefully that's a little bit helpful. I'd be happy to come back and discuss any of these issues if anyone would like. But as I mentioned earlier, at that July work session with city council, we discussed options for expanding property owners' ability to construct ADUs, and the reason I said expanding is because ADUs are currently allowed in Fairfax City under certain conditions. We won't go through every detail of this tonight, but I think it's helpful to look at just what the current standards

[02:16:29] are. This top one is a big one. It is the big one. Currently, ADUs need to be within the home itself, so attached in the parlance of ADUs rather than detached. There are also size standards.

[02:16:49] The size standards ensure that these units are accessory to the main dwelling. So right now, an ADU has to stay under 35 percent of the total house's square footage, also has to have a maximum of two

bedrooms. Now, in addition to the size standards, there are also standards that pertain to ADU occupancy. Here's a summary of what I mean by that. These are also standards in the zoning ordinance, so they're similar to the physical standards and how they appear in the

[02:17:22] ordinance. There's a provision that you see up here that the property owner must live in either the house or the accessory dwelling unit. Also for occupancy purposes, the ADU and the house are counted together as a single household. And the reason for this is to minimize the likelihood of houses with ADUs being used as high occupancy boarding houses or the like, trying to maintain the neighborhood character. Now, in addition to that are what's labeled here as age and

[02:17:58] disability requirements. What these requirements mean is that either the main house or the accessory dwelling unit must be occupied right now by either someone who's age 55 plus or a person with a disability. Now, at our summer work sessions with Planning Commission and with City Council and at our community meeting in November, there was support for removing these requirements.

[02:18:28] And this is an area that would be relatively simple to expand ADU opportunities. Staff is planning to address this through a zoning text amendment, which would be during our next amendment process. So we can talk about this further as well, but there was some pretty clear support for eliminating these age and disability requirements as they appear now.

[02:18:49] So these are the main operational or occupancy and physical standards related to accessory dwelling units. Now, if you look through the zoning ordinance in section 355, you'll notice that there's actually about two pages worth of standards that are listed there.

[02:19:11] Some of these standards are listed here, not all of them, but some of them. And some of these, so like the parking standard, which is number two on this list, some of these are things that will likely be discussed if we continue looking at accessory dwelling units.

[02:19:26] Other standards here represent more operational items the city's perspective so detailed things like what happens to an adu and a property transfer or specifying that inspections can take place and and so on there's there are other standards in in the zoning ordinance i'm showing these here uh this kind of stuff is necessary from a policy perspective from day-to-day operations perspective not terribly exciting to read or to talk about but just wanted to let council know that there are more detailed regulations standards so all of that

[02:20:00] combined is our existing standards for ADUs. And that leads us to some of the city documents that have mentioned ADUs from a policy standpoint pretty recently. And these two documents are shown here. One is the citywide housing assessment. That housing assessment was completed about a year ago. And one of that report's recommendations is, as it says here, to expand permission, permissions for accessory dwelling units. So the housing assessment noted that ADUs

[02:20:37] can increase available rental supply, and specifically for students, for single occupant households, possibly for seniors. It also noted that due to ADUs potential or usual small size, that affordability is generally maintained as the units age. And with the housing assessment, If you remember that document, you might recall that there was a community-wide survey as a part of the housing assessment.

[02:21:10] Residents were asked some questions about ADUs and had mixed opinions when asked about their support for expanded use of accessory dwelling units. About half of the respondents in the survey

said that they support additional opportunities for ADUs.

[02:21:28] the rest either opposing or being neutral on the topic. But that split opinion is one of the reasons why we think that ADU changes really require a lot of public input. It's a topic that just necessitates very careful scrutiny, careful planning. Now, the other document here on the right side of the screen, this is the comprehensive plan. A comprehensive plan was just adopted last fall. So it's a new document. Housing goal number one calls for the city to support a wide range of

[02:22:04] housing types, like it says right here. And one of the actions to support that goal, like it says at the bottom, is to research changes to expand opportunities for accessory dwelling units. And the last part of this phrase is important, while ensuring that they do not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. So we'll get back to that phrase in a little bit because that will come up repeatedly. But that brings us to the recent meetings that we've had on this topic.

[02:22:38] So like I mentioned back in July, both Planning Commission and City Council held work sessions on accessory dwelling units. Those work sessions were very general. We talked about various policy options related to potentially expanding adus if city council and if planning commission wish to do so and and the presentation from those meetings it is uh posted on the city's engage page if you go to the engage page there's a section for adus and you can find that high level discussion from July but at the end of city council's work session council expressed an interest in again eliminating

[02:23:17] that age and disability requirement that we've just mentioned and we're ready to go forward with that and also to examine or to begin examining other options for expanding adus including examining detached units and that's what our November community meeting focused on and that's really what we'll focus on for the remainder of tonight's meeting as well so before we get into some of the details on things like height and measurements. You might think you've had enough

[02:23:52] height and measurements for today, so I apologize that there's more coming. It's probably helpful, I think, to just have some visual examples of what detached ADUs are, and this hopefully gives some kind of an idea of what various examples of this kind of structure look like. Most ADUs tend to be about a few hundred square feet, five, six, seven hundred square feet, or so on. Beyond that, there really can be a great deal of variety. So just looking at these examples, we tried to pick different looking examples. We can see that some of these were clearly built as accessory dwelling

[02:24:31] units. Some have been converted from other structures. It's not uncommon for ADUs to be built on top of garages. So that's the reason that we're showing this example here in the bottom right? We're not endorsing any of these types or images as a good model for us. The reason for showing all of these really is just to give a rough idea of what the rest of tonight's discussion really pertains to, and also to help frame some of the discussion that we will get into about size and about height and about other characteristics. So I can flip back to this slide at any time. I

[02:25:09] also have another slide with another six ADUs that are somewhat similar, so I'd be happy to share this again or share the other one. But again, detached ADUs can be an option for expanding ADU opportunities, so it's similar in some ways to what the comprehensive plan and what the housing assessment recommend. And basically what that means, what allowing detached ADUs means, is allowing property owners to construct secondary housing units, typically in the

[02:25:43] rear yard of their houses. Most important is what it says in green here, and this again is straight from the comprehensive plan, that in moving forward with expanding ADUs, that the city would need to ensure that they do not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhoods. That is important.

[02:26:04] And again, it's a complex topic. There's a lot of different kinds of impacts, a lot of different kinds of neighborhoods. Impacts can be different if the lot is small, can be different depending on houses, like neighboring houses, how they're situated on the lot, how they are in proximity to the neighbor's rear yard, and so on.

[02:26:23] And that is why what follows the next few slides, why this is so crucial here, ensuring that if detached ADUs are examined, that community character is not compromised. So doing that means creating standards and that those standards would ensure that ADUs would fit into neighborhoods as seamlessly as possible.

[02:26:51] Examples of those kind of standards, most of those would be zoning standards, but examples are shown here. And these are important because frequently with ADUs, the devil is really in the details. that things like height, things like setbacks really go a long way to achieving that goal that's up at the top here.

[02:27:14] So a bunch of bullet points can be a little bit obtuse in this context, so we'll show a few visual mock-ups of this sort of thing, what it would mean in a real-world application. Hopefully that can better illustrate what concepts like these, setbacks, privacy, and whatnot could mean in practice.

[02:27:37] So our first example here, so this shows a sample house in Westmore. This is just a visual example using a typical property in the city. As far as we know, this property, this house has no connections to ADUs.

[02:27:55] It's a good representative lot, which is why we're using it. It's also a small lot, and it's helpful to look at a small lot in this instance because some of these issues regarding dimensions can be more challenging in this type of setting on small properties. This is about an 8,600 square foot lot, has a house that has about a 900 square foot footprint. Right now, as you can see on the left here, there is no structure in the backyard other than a shed. And again, we'll take a look at this property again, but again, I just want to

[02:28:31] reinforce that this house and some of the other properties that we're looking at are just examples. So we're not recommending something for a particular property. So right now, the city does permit certain accessory structures, which is what they're known as, to be built in a house, in a house's backyard. So for example, a garage. So this illustration here shows what a two-car garage would look like in this house's backyard. This is the same house that we were looking at, from a different angle. Now, there are standards for garages, and importantly, garages, detached

[02:29:11] garages need to be under 50 percent of the house's footprint. Now, there's also height limits, so if something is in what's called a required rear yard for a property, which many of these structures are, it can be no more than 12 feet high, and it's the same type of measurement, measured the same way as other structures in the zoning ordinance. Now, this shows a garage, but garages are not the only thing that's permitted in rear yards. They do tend to be the biggest, and they're really the most similar in size and shape to an accessory dwelling unit, which is why we're showing a garage

[02:29:50] here. But just so you know, this shows some of the other kinds of structures that are currently allowed in backyards, along with the main size standards. As you can see here, there are provisions, so not just for garages, but also for sheds, for play structures, and so on.

[02:30:12] These standards here, again, are in the zoning ordinance to minimize negative impacts to surrounding properties and to overall neighborhoods. So this is the same general idea that we're dealing with when we're looking at detached ADUs, but just different types of structures.

[02:30:29] There are other standards for accessory structures. These are summarized right here regarding height, setback, lot coverage. Again, this is all existing. So, for example, total footprint of all accessory structures can't be more than 30 percent of the rear and side yards combined.

[02:30:50] And that's from an impervious surface type of outlook. There are also certain types of structures that are just not allowed in residential yards or shipping containers, for instance. But the reason that we're showing all of these and also showing the previous slide is really to illustrate that these kinds of standards are present already on residential lots and what's permitted on lots, and that a lot of different priorities intersect here. The need to be respectful of neighboring lots, the desire to minimize lot coverage,

[02:31:25] and appreciation for neighborhood character. Again, like the comprehensive plan says, to ensure that these types of things do not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. So if the city moves forward with examining detached ADUs, then these are likewise similar kind of themes that we'll try to balance, and it really is a balancing act with ADU standards. So with that in mind, we do have a few preliminary concepts for detached accessory dwelling unit standards.

[02:32:01] The reason for looking at this kind of thing right now, this is a very early work session, is to provide some kind of idea about various options for setting standards for the size of ADUs. For example, size in relation to the house, size in relation to the lot, to the neighborhood, and so on. There are three separate types of options that we'll be talking about tonight.

[02:32:28] We're not really recommending these specifically or in their totality. Again, just to give some kind of general idea, we're limiting this discussion today to square footage. Now, as we know, there are other considerations as well. There's setback, there's height, but for an introduction meeting, which this is, I think it's best to keep it to one variable. And if we merge in height, setbacks, and whatnot, it would be a little bit overwhelming at this level right now.

[02:33:01] So just to demonstrate what some of the issues are. And we have illustrations for all of these, which will explain what they mean. But for now, this first option here would theoretically set standards for ADUs that are similar to our existing standards for accessory structures and what that means would be allowing up to 50% of the main house footprint for a detached ADU. So this is similar to the current standards for detached garages. Second option here would set a separate

[02:33:35] limit for ADU square footage so a limit that's different from other accessory structures say that ADUs in the city have to be a maximum of a certain number of square footage, for instance. Option number three down here, this kind of thing could be set to a combination of other standards.

[02:33:55] Here it says to set a maximum size based on either the percentage of the main unit or a maximum ratio of the lot size. And we'll look at this kind of calculation in a little bit more depth in a few slides.

[02:34:13] But for now, we can move on and we can look at visual examples of these three and see what they mean in practice. So for our first example here, we'll go back to our example house, which is in Westmore.

[02:34:30] Again, this house has a 900-square-foot footprint, the existing house. We showed earlier what a detached garage would look like on this lot. If we match our existing standards for accessory structures, meaning garages, this lot could have an ADU that is half of the house's size in terms of footprint.

[02:34:52] And that would be 450 square feet, since we're looking at a 900 square foot house. And this shows here what that kind of structure would look like in this house's backyard. So something to keep in mind with this type of calculation, 50% of the house's square footage means that smaller houses would be, would require smaller ADUs. So, you know, there's benefits, there's also drawbacks in terms of flexibility. That's one of the issues that you have with setting

[02:35:27] a standard specifically to the house's size. So the second option, like I had mentioned, takes a slightly different approach to ADU square footage. This illustrates setting some kind of, again, a flat maximum square footage, regardless of the house size. So in this example, now most ADUs end up really being between 500 and 800 square feet. So this illustrates an 800 square foot maximum.

[02:35:56] And here we have an 800 square foot ADU that is shown illustrated on the same lot that we had looked at before. Now, one issue, one benefit in terms of flexibility is that it enables larger units, but one issue with this, like it says up here, that this kind of calculation could put these ADUs, which are intended to be accessory, could put them really at a similar size to

[02:36:24] the actual primary houses. The third option here limits the, this illustrates that standards like square footage, or it could be other measurements, that they don't necessarily need to be a strict yes or no type of option. So here this blends two different approaches. So this sets a maximum ADU size of 50% like we had talked about with our first option and and this could be a job

[02:37:00] this could be either footprint could be total square footage and and so on or in addition to the 50% also sets a lot size ratio so 10% of the total lot size and permits whichever is smaller so the advantage of this approach is that it can control for a variety of house and lot sizes A disadvantage, which you might be thinking of right now, is that this winds up being a bit complex, and this could be complex looking at just two measurements.

[02:37:36] It can be even more so when introducing more of them. Now, blended approaches like this actually tend to be somewhat common in the ADU world. So locally, Arlington County uses some kind of blended approach. approach. They have a maximum of 750 square feet, I think, or a certain amount of combined square footage between the House and the ADU. City of Falls Church is in the process of looking at detached ADUs right now. They're, I think, at the public hearing stage, but they're considering

[02:38:09] also this kind of blended approach. But again, the implications of this, and especially when sandwiched in with other standards are not necessarily straightforward. If I've done a good job of explaining this, I'd be impressed. If I haven't, that means this is not straightforward.

[02:38:28] So, you know, you might understand the downside here. But in this example, the calculation is based on, would be based on the house's square footage, because that winds up being the smaller number, less disruptive to the community, and we'd end up with the same 450 square feet that we did in option one. And you might be thinking that's a whole lot of effort to get back to exactly where you started from with

the first option. But the reason that jurisdictions sometimes use this is because on bigger lots, it can produce different results. So this shows a three-quarter

[02:39:08] of an acre lot in Little River Hills. And again, this is just an example of a lot, but with this, with this option three, since it's a large lot, the same calculation that we just had in the previous slide would permit a larger ADU than even the same small house would if permitted on a small, if it were on a small lot. So in this example here, the ADU would be limited to a certain percentage of the lot size, and here that would result essentially in a thousand square foot

[02:39:40] ADU. Another thing to notice in this image here on the left is that this ADU is two stories tall, and that's shown really just to draw attention to the fact that consideration would need to be given to things other than just square footage or other than just footprint. So similar again to existing accessory structure standards, so height, total square footage, and so on.

[02:40:10] We've got one more illustration on this option, number three. So this shows yet another lot configuration. This one is a large house on a relatively small lot. And in this calculation, in this scenario, same calculation as the previous two examples, the ADU would be limited to a certain percentage of the lot size, and here would result in about 1,100 square feet or so on.

[02:40:38] So again, these are very generalized illustrations. We won't go into any more tonight, so no more glassy eyes looking at measurements. We've done enough of that tonight, but this is the last example. But what we hope is that these examples have provided some kind of perspective about the types of issues involved in setting dimensional standards for ADUs. And again, this is material that we would cover in a lot more detail if we end up examining this topic further. So that leads us

[02:41:17] to our next steps. The major item here is really this first bullet point. So council's input on this topic, mainly as a big picture, but certainly if council members have input on some of the detailed issues, we'd love to hear it as well. But what we could potentially look at in the next year or so is, in the short term, this age and disability requirements, like I said, we're ready to go with that, and we'll bring that forward with our next amendment package. The longer-term

[02:41:51] item, should there be interest from council in moving forward, is the potential to explore detached ADU options. If Council is interested in exploring these kind of issues in more detail, there's a number of ways we can go. One of the options, like it says here, we could have a preliminary meeting, and this time with more detail and with some recommendations as a way to sort of jumpstart the topic. So with that, I think that's all of

[02:42:24] our details, all of our measurements. So we're anxious to hear feedback. Okay. I'm sure we've got a lot of thoughts here. Council Member Amos. Well, Tom and I went undercover to the ADU community meeting back in November. So I will say one note that I wanted to bring up is I would like to see how we can expand outreach to get more community members there. Because I believe outside of the two of us, there were three other people at that meeting. And the problem with ADUs is

[02:42:58] once they get before the body it gets crazy, especially with detached ADUs and I would like to treat these matters as separate. I think detached ADUs and the requirements should be handled separately on two separate timelines in my personal opinion. The 55 plus and disabled requirement I think that's just outdated and isn't applicable anymore. Especially considering we have George Mason students, people working on visa programs, young families and workers, I I mean, Morena and I, I remember when we first

moved to the city and we ended up at Layton, thankfully, we were looking at other properties and we were ready to live out of some people's basements or in their backyard.

[02:43:37] That was cool with us. We couldn't afford anything else at the time. So I wanted to throw that out there. And going back to the question that I asked at that community meeting, and now I can formally ask you, when it comes to the detached ADUs, how do we plan on handling home-based businesses and home daycares?

[02:43:57] Since a detached ADU would be part of an existing property, the same rules would apply. So this would not be a subdivision of an existing property. So home-based businesses, unless there's direction otherwise from council, home-based businesses and daycares, the same regulations would apply.

[02:44:22] So if I think the question, if I remember the question, was if somebody builds a, let's say, 1,000-square-foot structure in their backyard, could they use it as a business instead? And ADU, to use it as something other than an ADU, the existing standards for accessory structures would have to be modified as well, because right now, and it's a little bit confusing, But right now, houses are permitted garages in their backyards, are permitted sheds, but a shed

[02:45:00] is defined as being up to 250 square feet. If you have a structure that's over 250 square feet, it has to be a garage. So that would have to be changed to permit something like a home-based business to operate out of it. If it's a home-based business that can currently work as a minor home occupation that would probably be allowed. It would not be allowed if it was not a minor home occupation. Minor home occupation is an administrative approval. Is that correct?

[02:45:39] Okay. Councilmember Hardy-Chandler. Let me start by saying I support exploring this option. I think we need to look at a wide variety of housing options. I'd be interested in the research and recommendations and the different options that you could bring forward.

[02:46:02] I come from a city where these are normal and integrated into communities. In Las Vegas, they're casitas, and it's very common. And it's been done, I think, where it isn't intrusive or adheres to communities.

[02:46:25] You'll have even new communities built with them. so um i would be very this is not foreign to me um so i i like the idea of consideration of these options that are appropriate for here and would be very interested in what could be brought back to us for pros cons limitations considerations i encourage it oh one uh supplemental question that i have is where do i do recognize that our city has you know rvs parked you know so

[02:47:02] where do RVs fit in this whole configuration? Right now, this would not change the vehicles. Right now, it is not permitted to permanently occupy a recreational vehicle. The recreational vehicles are permitted to be parked on residential lots in certain instances. But as far as I know, and there's either a ghost in the room or I'm not quite sure how that's happening.

[02:47:38] creative uh mr harden is that correct the recreational vehicles are not permitted to be occupied on a full-time basis that is that is correct there is one provision in the code and this is derived from state code and um for times of emergency or for temporary medical care situations there are some provisions for that but generally no these would be units that

[02:48:07] would be on a foundation would be a complete living unit council member peterson and then council member hall remind me i think you may have covered this in november what is best guess and best evidence about the market response we have two options here first option is to remove the restrictions on the attached units what do we anticipate the market response would be to that

[02:48:42] and then secondly do we have a sense of the market response to detached units if they were permitted Are we going to see an explosion? Is this going to be a non-event? What are we looking at? Locally, the two jurisdictions that have permitted detached ADUs for the longest have been Arlington and Alexandria.

[02:49:02] Arlington County, I believe, has permitted detached accessory dwelling units for eight years or so. They have under 100 units from what I'm aware of total throughout the county. Alexandria, I think, is more recent.

[02:49:20] has slightly more units not not sure why why the discrepancy need neither of those numbers are is exceptionally large these are detached these are detached there are more that are attached you know i i think the issue with the detached units is the cost of construction i mean it is just simply not cheap so if if someone is thinking that that they would get some rental income by building an 800-square-foot house in their backyard. That cost of construction, it takes an awfully long time to recoup that. I think the attached units tend to be more popular for that

[02:49:59] reason. It's just mighty expensive to do that. And again, going back to the attached units, any sense for how much of a shift, how much of a response to the removal of the age and disability restrictions would result. Right. I think there, possibly Arlington County also had very similar age and disability requirements and removed it and did see more attached ADUs as a result, not an enormous number, but it did increase that number. Okay. And then one other question,

[02:50:37] which Mr. Harden, I think you may have addressed in November, but it's been a while. So garages i'm not sure how prevalent this is but i have heard that some garages have been designed to have kitchens bathrooms beds etc do they cease to become garages and turn into uh accessory dwellings when people spend the night and otherwise they remain to be garages is that how this works so um there are instances of that in the city some some of those cases from my understanding predate they've been there for a very long time predate the city predate the

[02:51:16] ordinance and may be grandfathered so to speak in terms of the ability to have a unit when new construction is occurring a garage is being built or a basement is being renovated it is something that city staff looks at very closely and if there are things like showers and full bathrooms and those sorts of things going in there will be questions that will be asked it's a challenging area to to be quite honest because in today's society people you know want to you know create

[02:51:52] different kinds of spaces on their property and and may not be creating a separate dwelling unit but want some of those same kind of facilities so sometimes it takes some back and forth with the property owners we usually try to be very clear when a permit is issued what is permitted and what is not but we do have to enforce on that from time to time i'm not sure there's a silver bullet so to speak to to preventing that but it is um something that takes some time to administer and ensure we're we're meeting meeting compliance thank you just my last question you mentioned short-term rental units has there

[02:52:32] been i don't know the history on that in the city but has there been any serious interest on the part of the community or a part of the city in permitting short-term rentals or it has been really not an issue? I know there are people on both sides of the issue. City staff gets calls from people who want to establish short-term rentals in their houses. And we also get calls from residents who are concerned that their neighbors are operating short-term rentals and it's affecting them, there is a widely divergent matter.

[02:53:08] I'm not sure which opinion is prevalent. I know this has been discussed occasionally, and I think generally thought that the current regulations are sufficient, but I don't think that there's been a detailed examination of short-term rentals.

[02:53:28] Thank you. Council Member Hall. Thank you. there's no familial component to who can do the adu like it doesn't have to be a parent or anything like that or a student right correct okay um i would be open to revising the age 55 plus as well as the disability option um is there a restriction that there must only be one adu per house yes okay we might have an offline conversation about that then um okay and when when it says that the

[02:54:04] property owner must live there that means that I own the house my name is on the property I must live there not my child lives there and then lets people live in the ADU correct okay now now if the property owner can live in the house or in the ADU right but if they don't even live in the state that's not really an ADU anymore correct okay make sure um and then on page 20 um I am I am

[02:54:32] very, very, very cautiously open to exploring, detached, very carefully. My sister lives in California. She's in Encinitas. I think we discussed this. There's a very large two-story structure that was built next to the house that's already next to her that it's not been fun for them. I live in a neighborhood where people, we have very large lots, right? Half acre lots. It's great. That could potentially open up someone to put a larger structure on a yard. You could end

[02:55:09] up with 2,000 or 3,000 square foot homes, depending on what you're doing here, right? That to me is not what this should be at all. So I think in this case of the blue house here with page 20, with the 50% main unit, and then with the 10% ratios, obviously the larger the lot, but also we're talking footprint or we're talking square footage of home because I think those two terms were used on different slides. Correct and it could be either. So right now the standards for

[02:55:42] accessory structure is based off of footprint. In some cases it is based and by some cases I mean in some jurisdictions that have ADU regulations it's based off of square footage. What's a little bit confusing is the current the current standards for attached ADUs are based off of square footage and that's because it's looking at the various levels of a house okay so the reason why I'm asking I guess is because in this case of this blue house the whole house let's say it's one level is 900 square feet in this case it's kind of a square so that the footprint is 900 if it

[02:56:21] had a second level on it would be 1800 theory yes that totally changes your numbers and you're now having a double-decker house and all of those things so i i would be very cautious about that i also would be very concerned about in a neighborhood like mine where you have some older homes where people are putting in new homes i know when we renovated our house we were disturbing too much land we couldn't put a cover on our front porch we also couldn't put in stairs to go from our basement out mind you there are houses that are probably twice the size of the house that we renovated to now in my neighborhood because zoning things have changed so my big

[02:56:59] caution and concern here would be someone buys a house their intention is to renovate that house make that house bigger by default now they could make a larger secondary house on there my third overall point on this is that I think there's a huge difference between someone who wants to put a second small house on their land to rent it out versus someone who's buying the \$30,000 or \$40,000 unit that you can get on Amazon that you set up in your backyard, you add a bathroom, someone's charging a few hundred dollars or whatever for that, versus now someone is

[02:57:36] getting \$2,000 a month for a second rental of a house that's on their property. I think there's always different kinds of units available. There's different opportunities for what units we're trying to bring to the city, but I think that that's a big concern. I don't think we need two houses on a property if our intention is to try to help a student live or help an elderly person stay in their home and then have a family live in the house. So to me, this is an extremely slippery slope. And I don't know that even looking at what they're doing in Arlington or Falls Church

[02:58:15] and seeing who moves in where, I don't even know that that's going to be what would happen here. But for me, it's a very slow consideration. So thank you. I gave you a lot of information there. sorry thank you councilmember hard to Chandler so you mentioned and connected to councilmember Hall's comments that there is right now careful consideration of what's done will this and I'm concerned of course about staff and capacity with this add additional administrative burden that we can handle

[02:58:52] or what would be the impact on our capacity whatever the options are presented or approved or move forward and the the parameters around those is there is is this something within our our capacity currently or what we have to expand our staff capacity to deal with this even with limited expansion I think it would depend on what's included in those provisions ultimately and and that's certainly perspective that we would share with council you know as this moves forward I think the area that staff in particular has concern about in

[02:59:32] terms of our ability to to handle the change is if we got too heavily into design review as council knows you know we have a number of design review districts already the city staff manages that does not include our single-family detached neighborhoods which kind of adds a whole nother level and so there jurisdictions out there that that have aesthetic requirements and do design review for accessory dwelling units that would potentially create something more than we could handle and it also be a little bit of an odd dichotomy because

[03:00:10] we don't do design review for the big house so to speak on the lot doing design review on the little house on the lot might be a little a little peculiar I think there are ways to get at you know materiality and design and those sorts of things without getting too heavy in that regard so generally speaking no we don't anticipate that this would be more than we could handle somewhat based upon what we anticipate

[03:00:40] the demand would be councilmember Bates thank you to follow on to that well first off I definitely think that we're heading in the right direction with regard to the the two potential modifications that you've mentioned we do have a housing shortage in the city and looking into adus was as you mentioned recommended by the housing consultant and and we also i believe have

[03:01:14] responsibility really by the same rationale as housing commercial corridors to make sure that we're using land as efficiently as possible because land is at a premium in fairfax city and throughout the region.

[03:01:31] With regard to the, you know, maybe getting a bit ahead of ourselves here, but I believe that you all would have to still consider the footprint of the ADU and the total building coverage of the site to make sure that we're still under the maximum building coverage.

[03:01:58] Is that correct? green space and tree canopy make sure that's all still within the requirements so it seems to me that looking at the footprint rather than total square footage of the house might be a bit more efficient just due to the fact that you would have to presumably look at that anyway to determine if it's still within the requirements the general zoning requirements for the residential zones so

[03:02:32] Yeah, and these criteria that you have here, I think, are both could be just solely based on the, you know, lot coverage with regard to the total lot size, which I think makes sense.

[03:02:50] But we also do want to be a bit more equitable, and I think that looking at the size with respect to the main unit, but also with respect to the total lot size, makes sense. As far as height, I'm comfortable if there are no concerns with looking at limiting them to one story because I don't think that an ADU needs to be two stories.

[03:03:17] It's just supposed to be an accessory dwelling unit, not, you know, a full two story house. And we want to make sure that, as you said, that this is primarily about housing affordability and, you know, accessibility and just being practical.

[03:03:34] And I think that limiting it to one story might sort of kill two birds with one stone as far as making sure that we're maximizing affordability if, you know, in some cases they're to be rented out, but also perhaps alleviating resident concerns.

[03:03:52] Thank you. Council Member McQuillan. I agree with handling the attached and the detached ADUs separately. That makes sense to me. I also agree with updating the age and disability requirements as stated in the recommendations, and I support moving forward and exploring this topic, but with an emphasis on community outreach, especially in the beginning.

[03:04:19] Thank you. Thank you, Mayor. Any other comments or questions? Okay, so it looks like we have consensus on handling these two things separately and that we're all in agreement that we should remove the disability and age requirement.

[03:04:36] And I think, does that also include the family requirement? We would do that. The issue with the family, there's a term in the standards right now that says that the primary house and the ADU must contain one family only.

[03:04:57] The reason that that term is in there is because in 2016, when the zoning ordinance was updated, there was a definition of family in the definition. section of the ordinance, that term of family was changed to household. And this example here in the ADU section is the only other example where that term family appeared in the ordinance, and it was just glossed over. Nobody changed it. We would plan, when we do the age and disability

[03:05:32] amendments, we would plan to change that term to household. So it would say that an ADU and the primary house would consist of one household only. A household is defined in the ordinance as being a group of related people.

[03:05:49] So related means related by blood, marriage, or adoption. Wow. A group of related people or four unrelated people. Okay. So what that means, that's a way of addressing overcrowding. And

overcrowding being a situation where there would be six, seven unrelated people living on a property.

[03:06:12] That provision in the accessory dwelling unit standards is there to make sure that there's no greater overcrowding in houses that have accessory dwelling units than there would be for other houses in the neighborhood. Very long way of saying that we plan to change the word family to household to alleviate that problem.

[03:06:33] But, you know, you still get down to who's in your household by birth, marriage, or adoption? No. So a household, which is the maximum number of people who can live in a dwelling place, it can include any number of people who are related to each other, plus three unrelated people.

[03:06:56] Okay. Okay. Okay. Okay. I was confused. It's confusing. There's no easy way to describe it, and especially with not showing it on the screen. But that is what the term household, the maximum legal occupancy for a housing unit, that's the definition.

[03:07:16] Okay, so one more time. So you're trying to get your arms around this. Yeah, can I just ask a question? Sure. I live in my house. It's just me. I have an ADU. I decide I want to move into the smaller unit and let people live in my house.

[03:07:33] Yes. It could be a family, blood, marriage, divorce, whatever, all that stuff. It could also be three or four college students that lived in there now. That's what you're saying based upon household. It could be. So current regulations, if you live in your house alone, and if you rent out portions of your house to other people, you could have a maximum of three unrelated people.

[03:07:56] So your example, three college students, assuming they're unrelated, you could have a maximum of three. So three plus you would be four unrelated people. Okay, and that is legally what's allowed now in it? That is legally what is allowed, correct. Okay. And that wants to be considered to be changed to something else or leave that part?

[03:08:14] No, we would leave it. Changing that term from family to household would not affect the occupancy standards for houses or ADUs. It would just get that term. That really should have been updated in 2016. It's now kind of an outlier. So that would just change that term in the zoning ordinance, but it would not change the overcrowding regulations.

[03:08:40] Right. So, yes. So that brings a lot of clarity to all of this, that household is already defined, just that term is not used related to the current ADU. Correct. Okay. There we go. All right. Well, that's really wonderful. So I think we're all in agreement on that part. Yes, Council Member Bates.

[03:08:59] Yeah, so along that same line, so basically we saw earlier on that we limit the number of cars that can be used by residents of the ADU, and then otherwise we limit the number of nonrelated persons that can be part of the entire household, including the ADU and the primary residents.

[03:09:21] To me, it would make a lot more sense to, instead of that, just limit the number of cars that can be used by the entire household, but I recall that we would not have the authority from the state to do that. Is that correct? The current regulation, and I'll cycle back to show it here. I know it's here somewhere. Here we go. So the current regulations in 355 on ADUs say that no more than two vehicles can be used by ADU residents. This is not a popular type of

[03:10:01] regulation on our staff. It is, in all honesty, this is impossible to enforce. If we go through and redo the ADU regulations, I think we would rethink this. My thinking, this predates my time in the city, so

I'm thinking that this came here from a negotiation that there were some people who We're, you know, worried about a lot of cars parked in a driveway if there's an ADU in the house and that this was a way to try to control it.

[03:10:37] Really, there's better ways of addressing it. So this is one issue that would be looked at. I'm not sure it's relevant any longer, but we would look at this. So would you say it's easier to regulate the number of people living in the house than the number of cars associated with it?

[03:10:57] both of them are very difficult to do okay yeah any any time we we get into who's related to who or who's not related it's very complicated uh the quite frankly the less we would have to do of that the better from an enforcement standpoint um so i think we'd want to be careful with this if we're adding to the regulatory oversight that we have for these units beyond what we have to do now currently for a household without an adu just something we can certainly discuss it as we move

[03:11:34] forward but something i think we want to be careful about yeah um so basically it sounds like any changes to that probably would not do a whole lot to alleviate the situations due to how difficult they are to enforce i think so um and i think telling households generally how How many vehicles they can have opens up a whole nother discussion beyond an ADU.

[03:12:02] I don't think we want to tell our homeowners of Fairfax City how many vehicles they can have. I think that will elicit comment from a whole nother segment of the community.

[03:12:19] Yeah, I definitely think that parking is, to my mind, the main issue with the number of occupants, other than noise, of course, and other violations that are addressed in other parts of the city code.

[03:12:35] But certainly want to do whatever we can to, you know, try to alleviate that, not just for ADUs, but, you know, at large. Thanks. Thank you. I think certainly in terms of ADUs, by proxy, limiting size of the units in some form, you know, should address number of vehicles and occupants and those those sorts of things that's certainly something we'll keep in mind yes councilmember hall i i do think that there's should be some

[03:13:11] sort of recommendation on number of vehicles i have to say i think that this is appropriate um i think if you're in this example this little blue house they have a driveway okay but if they don't and if you've now if we've now allowed them to put another house that could have up to two people let's say it's a one bedroom it's a smaller unit if there's no space on the street for them to park they're going to be taking up spaces that the people next to them or two doors down were

[03:13:44] already parking in and if it's one thing that the unit doesn't visually impact the neighborhood but if now I can't park where I'm used to parking, recognizing as a public road, I'm being impacted in a negative way that's likely not going to end because it's just an Airbnb person staying there, right? That's a long-term person. So I'm not saying I want everybody to have a 40-foot driveway that's, you know, three cars wide, but I do think it needs to not just be glossed over. And I think no one wants to have a guideline that we don't enforce, but it allows you to enforce it when it

[03:14:23] becomes a problem. You know, that house that I referenced in my neighborhood earlier, there's parking all over grass and not paved services, and those things are not allowed, right? We deal with it, but if we wanted to be bold and have it enforced, there's an enforcement option for it for good reason to keep up the neighborhoods. So, thank you. One way that some jurisdictions deal with parking, those

jurisdictions that look to address parking concerns, is to have a requirement for a dedicated parking space for the ADU.

[03:14:57] So that tends to be more enforceable from a zoning standpoint as opposed to figuring out which cars belong to which people. So that's one approach that's possible as well. Council Member Amos.

[03:15:16] Thank you, Mayor. Yeah, I just wanted to chime in on that piece. That was a massive issue on the county side. It's something that kind of overlaps a bit between the short-term rentals and the ADUs is that people will take pictures of cars and sometimes they're not there, sometimes they are.

[03:15:31] Code can go out at a certain time and the vehicle may not be there. Maybe they're on a trip. So enforcement is a massive problem and you can't expect staff to be out there 24-7 trying to monitor one vehicle or a license plate. Okay, so I think the current count right now when we had this work session before is that there's 25 accessory dwelling units so far that are attached, obviously.

[03:16:01] We have talked here about trying, if we do it based on footprint, trying to regulate some of this by height standards. You had said something about a one-story, making sure it's one story, but I think what we really need to think about is a certain height limit, and I'll tell you why.

[03:16:20] because you may end up with an accessory dwelling unit that has a loft, like a sleeping loft, which you could put up above a sitting area or, I mean, think about how small some of these units are going to be. If you just say not that it's one story, but that it's got a height restriction on it, then how you configure the space inside standardizes it. So if you look at standardizing materials standardizing how we calculate it standardizing things like height that might be go a long way in taking some of the guesswork and design work and code work out of this the other

[03:16:59] thing is a lot of people are going to use modular buildings there's a lot of you know my shed was just the Amish came down and built it but it was a modular thing and so I think some of these dwelling units might end up being prefabricated in some way not from the ground up so that will also kind of standardize a certain portion of this. I think we also have to talk about evaluating the value of these, too. As I've said time and again, you build a little house, then you tax it like a little house.

[03:17:29] So it's not just that people are going to pay to construct this. Whatever they get out of, if they're renting it or their grandma lives there or whatever, it increases the value of the structures on the property. And so this becomes a revenue stream. Not just helping with housing types and accessible more affordable housing but it's something that generates real estate taxes and so people have to think about that too there's all these things if you're going to build something in your backyard but i do think we need to offer that as an option because i think

[03:18:07] there's just a lot of situations where it could make a difference and the thing about cars we've got a lot of college students we know that rent in our neighborhoods a lot of a lot of these little houses don't have garages at all they don't they have like a driveway and so everybody parks on the curb and so sometimes you've got families i mean you've got two working parents and a teenager or teenagers and they've all got cars you can end up with one family that's got five cars and so then it makes it hard as mr harden was saying and figuring out as you're looking at the street are these who do these cars belong to i think ultimately what we have to come we have to focus

[03:18:46] on is we want to make our city more walkable you know the thing about having paths having sidewalks having a free bus system is the whole i think people more and more people are moving here

because they don't want to own a car and it's interesting to me i would love to see an analysis of some kind about recent projects that have been built the flaccid university scout on the circle and the moxley too to see of the required parking that we stipulated as part of our ordinance if all of that parking is actually being used. If there's, if these, if the, if the flats are occupied or

[03:19:23] mostly occupied and these other high density buildings are mostly occupied, what do their parking garages look like? What do their parking lots look like? Because a reference was made by one of the applicants that our parking requirements seem to be a little bit high. Well, the only way to really know that is to really look at how many of the spaces are occupied and how many of the spaces are empty on a given day. Because I do believe that making our little 6.2 square mile hometown more accessible by something other than a car makes it attractive for people to come

[03:19:58] and live in whatever kind of housing we have, including AAUs. In my neighborhood, there's a Q bus stop right, just right up the street. You know, you can get the Q bus. So if somebody wants to live in my backyard, they wouldn't necessarily need a car to get places. And it's walkable. And this goes back to this concept of a 15-minute city.

[03:20:16] If people can get places where they need to go without a car, I think many more young people especially are going to opt in a place to live that does not require owning, garaging, maintaining, and paying for a vehicle.

[03:20:33] So we need to think in terms of overall planning how all of this fits together. And how all of this fits together is creating a walkable city, something where we've invested in multimodal and we've invested in transit. We live right next door to a university.

[03:20:50] This is what people want. So I do think cars are important, but I think we need to look at this from lots of different angles about how you get people out of cars, too. Council Member Amos. I'll just add to that, and I think Tom may remember this individual from the ADU meeting, but there was a gentleman there who was there in support of detached ADUs, particularly because he's a bicyclist.

[03:21:15] So I think that perspective was interesting. Councilmember Hall. Just to your point, if we're going to somehow do a count, I think it's important to know who has the cars. Is it the college students that live in the flats?

[03:21:30] Is it the young professional that lives in the flats? Those types of things, in my opinion, may change who needs a car, right? think that that's a very big difference so I don't think it can be overlooked if we're going to somehow go through an opportunity to see how many cars there are. True and that could be parking permits one assumes that there must be parking permits issued for or I don't know but yeah it seems to me that if they're issuing parking permits at any of these places that would be a good

[03:22:07] indicator of who's been issued a parking permit. Councilmember Amos. I'm sorry not to keep talking. So I feel like the parking study might be a little bit beyond the scope of this. That seems like a kind of a separate thing to do in itself. I mean, we're looking at the flats compared to an ADU, which is max probably going to be two vehicles. I'm a little confused by the, if someone wanted to explain, yeah.

[03:22:33] So, no, my point is that if developers are questioning our ordinance that says you need this many parking spaces per residential unit, and we are struggling with this as far as adding ADUs to our existing neighborhoods, I think we need to do some kind of analysis as to how we've calculated the

number of cars required for residential units, wherever they are, and whether or not what our calculations are is in the data, right?

[03:23:08] So with ADUs, we're not having parking requirements. We've got this no more than two vehicles thing. But I'm just saying, in general, with development projects, is our number right? And I think the only way you can figure out if our number is right is to look at recent projects that have been built and are occupied and are those parking spaces being fully utilized or are they not?

[03:23:33] And again, I think our goal is to make a walkable city around multimodal and transit, and that's where our investment should be, because I think ultimately we don't like all these cars in our city and we don't like planning everything in our city around vehicular traffic.

[03:23:49] So the only way to get away from that is to make investments somewhere else. And it's all of a piece, right? It is complicated, I realize. We're going way, like, talk about mission creep or scope creep or whatever. But I do think you have to think in a bigger picture sort of way. I think there's a role for detached ADUs in the city, but how do we make this work in the city?

[03:24:12] And we've got a lot of small houses on huge lots, right? But we also have, and this is the other thing we don't know, and I'm sure with the housing assessment you know, I bet Eric Foreman knows everything, that you know how many single-family homes that we have that are not in HOAs.

[03:24:28] Because if you live in an HOA, this is like off the table. A detached, and I don't know that number offhand. I was thinking of saying 4,873 or something. I was going to say 4,000-something. Right. But a detached ADU would likely be off the table for a house and a homeowner's association.

[03:24:50] Right, right. So that takes some of those single-family homes just right off the table, right? You're talking about our older neighborhood with the smaller homes, the bigger lots, and civic associations, and no HOA restrictions. So that, again, further winnows down the potential of where you can build these things.

[03:25:09] Council Member Amos. yeah would that be similar to what the county did recently with parking reimaged I mean that was a they did a whole reassessment of parking and their zoning ordinance based off of that and also I which topic are we talking about I'm okay we're moving now sorry did we leave you behind well we'll get back to ADUs this is now changed into a parking study which we could give staff maybe some more time on that well which is we're connecting these we're just connecting these things however tenuously but mission creep here sorry anything else for these

[03:25:46] fine gentlemen before we okay well I think I think we all have the consensus about separating the thing out and we are we are all seem to be very interested in continuing to work on this is what we're saying so very much appreciate that and unless there's anything anything else for the good of the body, I'm going to adjourn this meeting at 1026 p.m.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com