



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

City of Fairfax City Council Special Meeting & Work Session, Tuesday, July 7, 2026

Date Tuesday, July 7, 2026
Place City Hall, City of Fairfax, Virginia
Length 3h 15m (video)

- Official meeting video (city, Granicus): https://fairfax.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4609
- Agenda: https://fairfax.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4609
- Minutes: https://fairfax.granicus.com/MinutesViewer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=4609&doc_id=e6282fec-7adf-11f1-9494-005056a89546

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 2026-10-12. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:20] Good evening. I would like to call the special meeting and work session of July 7, 2026 to order. Is there a motion to approve the remote participation by council members Hall and McQuillan? Council member Hardy Chandler. In accordance with city council adopted policy and as permitted by Virginia code section 2.2-3708.3, I move to approve city council members Hall and McQuellen's request properly submitted in writing prior to tonight's meeting for remote participation subject to compliance with the requirements outlined in the City Council

[00:00:58] Adoptive Policy and Applicable Law in all or portions of the City Council Work Session July 7, 2026. Second. The motion has been made and seconded. A roll call vote. Council Member Amos? Aye. Council Member Hardy-Chandler? Aye. Council Member Peterson? Aye. Council Member Bates? Aye.

[00:01:18] Motion passed unanimously. Staff recommend welcome Council Members Hall and McQuill, and I will do my best to pay attention to whether you've raised your hand. I'm making that commitment right now. Staff recommends deferral of action for Agenda Item No. 3 until July 14, 2026.

[00:01:35] Is there a motion to defer Agenda Item No. 3? I move to defer action for consideration of a resolution requesting that the Fairfax Circuit Court order a special election on the question of authorizing

the City of Fairfax to levy a general retail sales tax at a rate not to exceed 1% until July 14, 2026.

[00:01:58] Second. The motion has been made and seconded. A roll call vote. Council Member Amos? Aye. Council Member Hardy-Chandler? Aye. Council Member Peterson? Aye. Council Member Bates? Aye. Council Member Hall? I know she's having issues, so she might not be able to hear.

[00:02:15] Council Member McQuillan? Aye. Okay, motion passed 5-0. I will now recess the special meeting to go into a work session. Ms. Shinneberry, what is the first work session item? Our first item is discussion of a request by Christopher Land LLC on the redevelopment of 4085-4117 Chambridge Road.

[00:02:38] I'm going to recognize Jason Suffin, our Division Chief of Community Development, for the presentation. Thank you for that, and it's good to be pinch-hitting for Mr. Frederick. He is out ill, unfortunately, tonight.

[00:02:49] So where are we in the process with this? This is a post-submission work session for Christopher Land LLC. On January 27, 2025, Planning Commission held a pre-application briefing, and that following February, City Council held a pre-application briefing.

[00:03:32] At that time, the site was 2.52 acres, and the applicant was encouraged to consolidate the BB&T building at 4117 Chambridge Road. The applicant did submit an application that December, which did include the BB&T building, bringing the site total to 3.87 acres.

[00:03:50] The Planning Commission held a post-submittal application work session with the applicant on June 8th of this year, and the Board of Architecture Review held a post-submission work session on June 17th. City staff has provided second review comments to the applicant's representative and awaits a full resubmission.

[00:04:11] The applicant requests a rezoning map amendment, a rezoning map amendment slash rezoning from the CO Commercial Office District to the CU Commercial Urban District while retaining the transition overlay for the property.

[00:04:30] This would include a general development plan with proffers. In addition to the rezoning, the applicant has requested a special use permit for multifamily in one of the buildings and a number of special exceptions. Those include to permit less than 75% of the ground floor area of building B as an upper story mixed-use building, so 75% of it is required to be commercial.

[00:04:55] They request less just in that building. To permit the density to exceed 24 dwelling units per acre. To permit the maximum building height to exceed 48 feet in the Old Town Transition Overlay District. to eliminate the requirement for landscape, strip, and street trees along the private access drive, to eliminate the requirement to provide vehicular access to abutting non-residential properties, to eliminate the requirement for sidewalks on the northern side of the proposed access drive, and a certificate of appropriateness will be required.

[00:05:34] Future land use map. The subject site is located between Chambers Road and University Drive across from the Fairfax County Judicial Complex to the west. There are offices to the north, the recently approved Davies redevelopment property to the south, which is also to be a mixed-use development.

[00:05:59] And all of those properties on this block are located within the activity center designation in the comprehensive plan. To the east, across University Drive, there are existing single-family townhomes.

The comprehensive plan specifies that the activity center place type applies to locations in the city where pedestrian-oriented mixed-use development is strongly encouraged.

[00:06:25] Mixed-use development is pedestrian-oriented development that allows multiple activities to take place by layering compatible land uses, amenities, active streets, and accommodating multimodal transportation. And that new development and activity centers should provide integrated uses with structured or below-grade parking.

[00:06:45] The overall project design within an activity center should improve the streetscape and provide vehicular and pedestrian connections to the existing road network and the surrounding uses as recommended by both the multimodal transportation chapter of the plan and by the small area plan.

[00:07:02] The small area plan provides more specific recommendations on issues such as land use, open space, and transportation, and those recommendations are more specific than what is found in the comprehensive plan for those areas designated activity center on the future land use map.

[00:07:25] It's worth noting, however, that the small area plans are not a lot-by-lot prescriptive form-based code. The guidance provides recommendations on the desired mix of uses, recommended height and density, building typologies, street locations, infrastructure improvements, and open space.

[00:07:43] A key defining feature in the block that this property is located in, which we call Old Town South, is the greenway, which is a pedestrian feature that would connect from Sager Avenue to the north to Judicial Drive to the south through the large block.

[00:08:03] In the short term for this area, the plan recommends renovation of the existing offices with ground level engagement along Cambridge Road for this particular site. It envisions that there would be consolidation and development of properties into commercial non-residential uses, which are recommended.

[00:08:26] And residential uses aren't specifically recommended for this site. The existing stable office market, at least as of 2020 when this was written, was expected to undergo updates in the near term. Most new office development was thought to be would occur in the judicial complex across the street with their development.

[00:08:58] While it is difficult to predict the future, the small area plan provides some benchmarks for the near term horizon of the next 15 years. It anticipated 1,250 residential dwelling units in Old Town proposed by this applicant at this time is up to 392.

[00:09:18] It anticipated that there would be an increase of 25,000 square feet of new office space within the activity center. Up to 29,640 is proposed. However, approximately 120,000 square feet exist at the site.

[00:09:38] and the proposed plan would result in a reduction of approximately 90,000 square feet. It is worth noting that the vacant BB&T building is approximately 35,000 square feet of that. In terms of retail, the plan envisioned an increase of 60,000 square feet with vacant space being filled.

[00:10:02] The applicant proposes just over 7,700 square feet. The current zoning district is CO Commercial Office, and the property is located within the Transition Overlay District.

[00:10:18] The site is currently developed with four office buildings dating from the 1960s through 1988, and they total, again, 120,000 square feet. Under the current configuration, the proposal would require a special use permit for multifamily use in one of the buildings.

[00:10:36] Retail general uses are not permitted in the CO Commercial Office District. Therefore, the applicant has requested to rezone the property from CO Commercial Office to CU Commercial Urban. It's also worth noting that the Transition Overlay District allows by-right upper-story mixed-use development, which is proposed for two of the buildings.

[00:11:01] The proposed rezoning from CO Commercial Office to CU Commercial Urban would allow the site to be developed with an upper-story residential mixed-use building. an upper story residential mixed-use buildings permitted again in the old town transition overlay district however the standalone multifamily building which is going to be building c when i go over the buildings here in a second requires a special use permit because it's standalone multifamily the cu district is established to provide an urban mixed-use development option

[00:11:34] for appropriate parts of downtown and specific other areas this is the proposed general development plan. The applicant proposes to develop three buildings with up to 392 apartments, approximately 7,700 square feet of retail, approximately 29,600 square feet of office, a 26-foot-wide private east-to-west access drive from University Drive to Chambers Road, and a north-to-south greenway of varying widths that connect the Davies property to the south, should it be

[00:12:09] developed, to northern properties, and it does terminate at this property's lot line to the north. It is just to the east of the building that houses the Kelly's Oyster Bar, so it is on that larger, truest parcel. The applicant also proposes constructing two levels of parking under the building, as well as surface parking for the non-residential uses on Chambridge Road. The applicant proposes to connect Building A to Building B on Level 3 above the private street, and Building B to Building C on Level 3 above the greenway. Building A is

[00:12:47] proposed with 72 units and this just over 7,000 square feet of retail and or restaurant with an additional 10,700 square feet of office on on the side of the building that fronts Chambers Road the applicant proposes outdoor seating in various locations around the restaurant there is a courtyard that's proposed just to the the inside of the area shaded red here in the plan and you might be able to make out the umbrella area. It's worth noting that the plans

[00:13:22] have discrepancies that staff's pointed out to the applicant that not all of the plans are showing the doors that are proposed for entrances along the public streets. We've asked for the plans to be coordinated so that they do show those amenity areas. The second floor is proposed at 14,600 square feet of office in building A, which is this one here. There's a connection, as I just mentioned, that takes you at the third floor to building B. Building B is also a mixed-use

[00:13:56] building. It would consist of 154 units and approximately 4,300 square feet of office and 6,300 square feet of amenity space on the ground floor along Cambridge Road. This building is what requires the special exception from the 75% ground floor area that's required to be non-residential. This building also would contain a 2,400 square foot rooftop terrace that is proposed to face Cambridge Road. The maximum height of this building is 70 feet.

[00:14:33] Maximum height of building A is 73 feet. Building C, which has frontage on University Drives, proposed as a standalone residential multifamily building that fronts University Drive and will contain 164 dwelling units. The first floor of this building contains a private amenity space with a pool and the rooftop is proposed to have a fitness center as a fifth floor. Levels four and

[00:15:08] five have a step back of 25 to 34 feet from University Drive while level six has a step back 135 feet on the north side of the building and 60 feet here the applicant proposes a north to south greenway that goes between buildings b and c connecting from the davies property at the south it aligns both in location and grade it circumnavigates through the site north to the point

[00:15:43] that i had called out previously uh there are is a proposal in the garage for 300 637 spaces on two levels the two levels don't connect currently there are two entrances one off of university drive that gets down to a lower level then an entrance uh here off the private street that gets into the upper level the upper level is what's proposed to contain the majority of the

[00:16:12] commercial parking spaces. Of note, the paved surface throughout the Greenway is 15 feet in width. The Greenway itself varies in width, expanding out in certain areas, and it's constrained in certain areas by the choice of surface parking. The multimodal transportation plan and the

[00:16:52] transition district standards require 10-foot sidewalks on Chambers Road and University Drive. the applicant proposes to comply with these and provide those walkways the applicant also proposes a sidewalk along the south side only of the proposed east to west street the private street the applicant does not propose a sidewalk on the portions of the northern part of that private street although there would be portions along up to the parking court coming off of chambridge road

[00:17:26] The proposed street is 26 feet in width. The city's public facilities manual standard is 30 feet. It's an older standard that has not been updated. The street has been reviewed by the fire marshal for safety and compliance with the fire code. There are discussions that are still ongoing about specifics on turn movements and queuing through the street.

[00:17:56] The applicant proposes a bicycle rack in front of building A near the retail entrance facing the private street and in front of building B near the office entrance facing Chambers Road.

[00:18:14] The applicant has also proposed bicycle storage at both levels of the parking structure. The proposed development requires 618 spaces. The applicant proposes to construct these spaces both within the parking garage and additional surface parking for a total of 655 spaces.

[00:18:36] What's highlighted here is that entrance that I've indicated. Well, okay, the arrows aren't cooperating. The first one is the entrance off of the private street.

[00:18:52] The second arrow with the circle is the entrance that is fronting on University Drive. THERE WAS A ROBUST CONVERSATION WITH THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW ABOUT THE AESTHETIC OF THIS. STAFF HAS ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION FROM THE APPLICANT BASED ON THE CIVIL SET, THE ENGINEERED DRAWINGS AND THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS NOT MATCHING AS TO WHAT THIS FINAL GRADE AND CONDITION WOULD ACTUALLY BE.

[00:19:16] WE AWAIT THE APPLICANT'S REDESIGN OF THAT AREA. TRANSPORTATION STAFF HAS MADE INQUIRY WITH THE APPLICANT AS to why the two levels of the garage cannot be linked internally to remove this location which would also relocate the access to the refuse area by the trash truck to this private location which will be more in keeping with what was approved by city council for the Davies project. The greenway area is heavily landscaped. The site does meet the minimum 10 percent tree canopy requirement

[00:19:55] at 10.79%. This is just an illustration of the garage. So this is the lower level coming in from University Drive and the upper level, which is access from the private street. The street, you're seeing a section of the street here. The elevation changes so steeply through the site, it's around 30 feet of drop between Cambridge and University Drive, that the street's actually

[00:20:32] above the garage section here. This is all under grade. The special use permit that I had mentioned is for the standalone building C, which is six stories of multifamily residential proposed in the southwest corner of the site. Again, upper story mixed use is allowed by right in the transition district, but standalone multifamily is not a use that's permitted by

[00:21:07] right it does require a special use permit of note four stories of residential with one story of active amenity space five stories total with portions of the exposed garage entrance would face university drive and the townhouses across the street again the special exceptions that were noted earlier in the presentation number seven has been struck out a determination by the zone

[00:21:39] Administrators been made that the transition yards are not required that the Davies property had been reasoned to a planned mixed district But what's on the slide here shows the location of the proposed sidewalks So again getting from the Greenway on the northern part of the site There are portions of sidewalks with crosswalks that would take you to Cambridge Road Nothing would take you to university one would have to cross the street. There is a

[00:22:12] continuous sidewalk that spans Cambridge Road to University Drive you may recall during the Davies application there was discussion that the Next developer to the north would complete the streetscape and provide the sidewalk connection from University to Cambridge Road On that portion of the property the streetscape is shown but a sidewalk is not shown and this just illustrates the Variety of height as measured by both the building code and the zoning ordinance Here on the right

[00:22:51] Again shows the four stories of dwelling units with the active fitness fifth floor and portions of the garage Which is sort of hidden here behind this this prompt that I don't don't dare move That faces University Drive on Cambridge Road this side of the building There are five stories of

[00:23:16] Residential on top of an office slash retail area the fronts the street the following images were presented to the Board of Architectural Review And our were held a work session on June 17th of this year There was robust discussion by the BAR on the Chambers Road facade And if it corresponds to the specific design and context of Old Town

[00:23:55] There was discussion on the pedestrian scale, and there was also discussion that the doors that are shown here do not reflect on the engineered drawings. The BAR indicated that the design of the University Drive facade would be improved by resolving the vehicular entrance and by showing grades that were accurate to the engineer drawings.

[00:24:26] The BAR did raise questions about the height along University Drive and noted that the sidewalk along the southern property line was anticipated to be constructed when this site redeveloped.

[00:24:52] Here's an image just of that entrance location and the height and space that it consumes. Of note, the dual walls here that are shown here are just, I think, artistic license that the renderer took.

[00:25:07] They do not match the civil sets, which have a different layout for the retaining walls, and the grade does not dip down as depicted here. This image shows where if Davies Street was constructed, it

would be in relationship to the proposed building.

[00:25:27] Staff awaits the applicant's third submission to address any outstanding issues. The items listed here are items that we have had conversation on with the applicant and are awaiting feedback and resubmission on.

[00:25:48] The Planning Commission's work session was held on June 8th, and the following is a highlight of their comments and considerations.

[00:26:05] There was conversation relating to traffic concerns and impacts to University Drive. There was discussion on whether or not the private street is too narrow, and if the sidewalks could be wider. Pedestrian circulation was thought could be improved.

[00:26:23] There was discussion on how pedestrians using the greenway would cross the private street, and if a raised crosswalk or other element would be designed into the street. There was consideration on whether or not the private street could be designed to eliminate the possibility of frequent cut-through traffic, and point 50s street and traffic calming was used as an example. There was a desire to see more open

[00:26:56] space and into and to increase the choke point widths of the greenway. Improvement needed for pedestrian circulation by adding the sidewalk on the southern property line which is what the Board of Architecture Review also pointed out in their meeting. They want to ensure that the grade matches the Davies property to ensure the greenway connection is feasible. The height was discussed, not necessarily a concern, but the step back on University Drive was something that the

[00:27:34] Planning Commission believes that could be addressed. The building is four stories. It steps back a few feet before the fifth story is there, and then it steps back farther back to the sixth. The Planning Commission believed that more step back should be explored.

[00:27:54] They believed that the massing on Chambers Road may be too much. There was discussion on trash and loading and that Building C does not have any non-residential uses. There was also a suggestion to explore rooftop restaurant or other opportunities in the surface parking area.

[00:28:16] Next steps would be the applicant's resubmission of the third submission, and eventually public hearings with the Board of Architecture Review, Planning Commission, and City Council. The applicant is here for presentation, and staff stands by for questions.

[00:28:38] Good evening, Madam Chairman, members of the commission.

[00:29:23] My name is Clark Massey, president of Tetra Corporation, part of the land acquisition team. Other team members that are here with me this evening, one is John Regan, who is president and owner of Christopher Companies, a company that has built over 7,000 housing units over their 50 years in existence, and they are also currently building in Virginia, Delaware, as well as Maryland.

[00:29:55] Also with me is, to my immediate left, is Dave McElhaney, who is with Urban Limited, which is the civil engineer and landscape architect. Also with us is Dave Van Pelt with the Grove Slade, who is our transportation consultant, and Tom King, who is Devereaux & Associates, our architect.

[00:30:25] And last but not least is Ken Dondero, one of the associates also with Tetra Corporation. I'd first of all like to kind of preface some of our opening statements, if you will, that's there to give you a little bit of background.

[00:30:41] We contracted to purchase this property back in August of 2024. We met with county city staff early on in the process. they suggested that we take a look at a project called National Landing over in the Arlington area to get a flavor of the type of, quote, greenway and how it would work.

[00:31:07] So we took our entire crew over there, took photographs, walked around the area, and we thought that it was very meaningful. You may recall that we did meet with the city council back in February of this year, or 2025, I apologize, and listen in terms of different comments that we've received.

[00:31:29] In addition to that, since that point in time also, though, we've received comments from city staff, planning commission, the BAR, Citizens for Smarter Growth, as well as the surrounding community. Overall, there's over 200 comments that have been made.

[00:31:47] We have made many changes to the plan. The plan has evolved over time and will continue to evolve. So we're certainly interested in obtaining your input that we combine with the input that we've received from these other groups and hope to be able to resubmit our plan by September the 14th.

[00:32:10] As relates to the next slide, again, going back to the location, again, as Jason had pointed out so adequately, I call it the block. It's basically at Sager Avenue, it's Judicial, Chain Bridge Road, and University Drive.

[00:32:30] And, of course, across the street on Chain Bridge Road is the Judicial Center. So just giving a little bit of a frame of reference. In terms of the buildings, the four existing buildings that are on the site, they range in size from three to seven stories in height.

[00:32:47] They are anywhere from 38 to 60 years in age. You will notice on the slide that it is showing those four buildings outlined.

[00:33:03] You will see the site, the BB&T site, which was not in our original application. We spent a number of months negotiating on that, but we're finally able to go ahead and, quote, bring it into the fold, if you will, that's there.

[00:33:20] You will notice on this that it shows an HP as well as an LP, referring to the high point of the site and the low point of the site. As Jason had indicated in his presentation, it's fairly significant.

[00:33:36] It's a 26-foot elevational difference between the high point and the low point. It is also worthwhile noting that if you combine our property as well as the Davies properties, that accounts for approximately 40% of that overall area of, quote, the block that I had described before.

[00:33:56] Immediately south of the BB&T property is the community, the Inns of Court, a commercial condominium association that is there. There are 15 separate owners that are there. It's logical to assume that if that property is to develop, it would be a joint effort in terms of selling all 15 owners selling the property at once.

[00:34:21] If that were to occur, then the combination of our property, Davies, and ends of court would be an overall 60% of, quote, the block, so a substantial portion of the overall site. outstanding issues the next slide sorry that was referenced before we're going to do a little tag team here Dave and I are going to provide this response to the issues that's there they will talk about the building height issues I will talk about the greenway and then we will go into into the other discussions at

[00:34:59] this point I'll turn it over to Dave to try and cover some of those issues of building. Thank you, Clark. This slide here is one that has three lines representing three locations of cross sections that will be

shown on the next sheet. Just to give you a frame of reference, again, just recognize that the next sheet is based on the three cross sections that are shown. And as Clark's alluded to, and as Jason did, there is a elevation challenge that we're

[00:35:36] dealing with in terms of just the vertical difference between Chainbridge Road and University Drive so the architect and the rest of our team work collaboratively to figure out how to best deal with those elevation changes and the next few slides I think kind of show you a little bit more vertical information so as I was saying before this is the cross-section that was at the top of the page and that's building a we had a cross-section through building

[00:36:07] B / C and then likewise here as well don't worry my next slide is gonna be a little bit more of a blow-up so you don't need to worry about reading those numbers so this is a slide that we had shared with the Planning Commission and I think really what's important here is to understand both with the horizontal and the vertical relationships are with our proposed building as it relates to Chainbridge Road. So this is on the Chainbridge Road side. This is the lowest cross section that was shown

[00:36:44] on the two slides prior. And you look at horizontally, our building is positioned such that it is roughly 28 and a half feet from the existing curb on Chainbridge Road to the building face. In that area, we have a walkway for Chainbridge Road. We have a walkway specific for serving our retail and multifamily. And then you'll see on the landscape plan, there's plenty of landscaping along the roadway as well. When you look and see how this building looks vertically,

[00:37:20] it is approximately 69 feet from the average grade elevation, which is represented by uh the red line and this is a six-story building as it relates to chain bridge road a portion of this building is actually slightly depressed you'll see that there is a retaining wall because some of the elevation challenges that we're dealing with it was necessary to propose that one of the i think important uh considerations as one is you know looking at you know building

[00:37:55] height is we wanted to see kind of how that related to the recently approved Davies project and what we found was when you look at actually elevations above mean sea level how do we relate to the building that's going to be immediately next door to us when it gets constructed and our building it turns out is just four vertical feet higher than what the Davies building will be so So just to kind of give you a frame of reference in terms of how do we relate to a new building

[00:38:30] that will be constructed next to us, we are very close to being approximately what their elevation is. We're actually about four vertical feet higher. So when you go to the next slide, this provides a little bit more detail in terms of the setbacks that we have from University Drive to the building face.

[00:38:53] As Clark has alluded to, you know, from the beginning, we've tried to be reactive as best we can in terms of the comments that we've heard, certainly from the reviewers, from other staff members, from the community, communities, I should say.

[00:39:13] And so this is something which has evolved over time in terms of, and we're still changing it based on most recent feedback that we got from the BAR. but just kind of zooming in on this drawing a little bit more and you're going to see a three-dimensional illustrative in a moment you look at how we relate to the University Drive this is the existing curb here in University Drive where this cross-section was taken our proposed building is 56 foot from the curb it's quite a bit further back than what the Davies building is at

[00:39:48] this location but there is a substantial amount of green space that's going to be between the curb and the front of the building and again you'll see this in some of the other exhibits when you look at how it relates vertically to university drive as has been indicated the there's a four-story proposed section that is abutting the walkway that runs along university drive there's also going to be a public space in this location.

[00:40:23] And then when you look at how these setbacks work, it's actually 25 feet from the face of our four-story building to the portion that is now five stories. And just one of the changes, just to kind of give you a flavor for that, this building used to be six stories at this point.

[00:40:45] Credit to the architect and John Regan and his team figured out a way to kind of relay out the units internally to the building. And we were able to free up this area such that it's no longer part of a six-story, but rather there now is a 60-foot setback from the face of our proposed building on university over to the six-story portion of the building.

[00:41:12] So when you collectively look at the six-story building, how it relates to the curb on University Drive, it's approximately 116 feet back from the curb where the six-story portion is.

[00:41:28] So, again, this drawing shows a little bit better detail than that previous drawing in terms of what those elevations are as well as the setback. This box right here represents the fitness facility. We're looking at actually perhaps lowering that a little bit.

[00:41:47] That, and you'll see in the next slide, doesn't actually run across the entire width of the four-story buildings. It's just a portion. This is a slide that we have since added since the Planning Commission, and it had to do with, well, how do we relate to the existing townhomes across the street from us in Breckenridge?

[00:42:12] And so it might be difficult to see, but in this top right-hand corner, You'll see a row of townhouses here and a row of townhouses here. We drew a cross-section at the tightest location between the side of the townhouse that faces university and the tightest point of our building as it relates to university.

[00:42:36] And when you look at this cross-section, it shows you that from building face to building face, it's approximately 115 feet to the four-story portion of our building. You can see a comparison as to the approximate height of the townhomes, existing townhouse, again, it's just their side unit, to the height of our proposed residential building here.

[00:43:07] I'll turn it back over to Clark at this point. Thank you again. In terms of what this is meant to do is, of course, to be able to show you some of the elevational issues that we're dealing with as it relates to university drive.

[00:43:31] As David indicated, and I had indicated in our opening comment, we're making a number of different changes and adjustments to the plan based upon a lot of the different comments. As an example, on just this drawing, we are looking at the issue of the precast stone base that is there.

[00:43:52] Dave had mentioned to you, we are looking about reducing the height of the fitness center that is there, changing the roof line to make it so that it is less imposing, working on this publicly accessible space along University Drive that has been brought up to us.

[00:44:13] and trying to provide a stronger townhouse elevation because of the proximity to the townhouses across the street next slide if we can this is a view from the chain bridge road and to be able to give you a feel for what the project would look like we are we believe that the architect has done a very good job of creating a modern and vibrant type of a of an atmosphere for

[00:44:47] it we are looking at the restaurant in the the corner to try and address some of the various comments that we've heard from the BAR so if we can go to the next slide so at this juncture I'd like to go ahead and switch some of the conversation and talk about the Greenway etc and if you will I'd like to engage your imagination of almost taking a walk with me, starting from the Davies property and the southern portion of it. As you will see, the greenway at that juncture, of course, it terminates

[00:45:26] because that is the ends-of-court community. So that's a starting point. So it's 43 feet wide. The length of the greenway is 166 feet, over half the length of a football field, and it goes up and connects with their east-west roadway.

[00:45:47] If we can then shift to the next one, again, kind of picking up, you'll see at the bottom of the screen the Davies property where it is crossing to ours. At that initial point, our greenway width is 40 feet.

[00:46:03] However, if you go back approximately 70 feet, then it opens up, and you will see that this is one of our two courtyards that is there. This is providing the distance from the right side wall to the end of that courtyard area.

[00:46:24] That's 170 feet, so it's a very open type of a field. It closes down, again, as you go further on north, but still, it's 72 feet in terms of width. And then as you go a little bit further, then that opens up in terms of the overall open common area where we have the restaurant, potential outdoor seating that would be there.

[00:46:50] And at that width, it's 180 feet, 179, call it 180. And then continuing on up to the northern portion where it then closes back down to about 42 feet in terms of width. So if you'll notice in the upper right-hand corner of that exhibit, it's actually identifying the open, the greenway area, as well as the accessible, what we're calling the publicly accessible space.

[00:47:21] That overall combination is about 32,000 square feet compared to the Davies Greenway area, which is 9,000 square feet. So we're literally about three and a half times the size of the greenway and associated space.

[00:47:41] If we go to the next slide, it's, again, trying to give you a little bit more feel for what that area might look like. Just to point out in terms of a few of the different character images that are there. The number five is really just showing the walkway with the bridge that we have.

[00:48:06] The character image two is just showing a representation of like tabletop areas with grills along that area. So again, we're trying to make it an active location.

[00:48:23] The third character image is just showing the open lawn area, which hopefully would be an inviting area for people to stay there, have a picnic that is there, again, interactive. And then continuing on is number eight, which is showing the fountain, which is basically an intersection, at staff's suggestion, of the greenway as well as the sidewalk that is going back to the overall restaurant.

[00:48:56] So that, again, is just really trying to give you a little bit of a representation. Now, to really see what it might look like, I don't think that these were in Jason's presentation. But this, if you will notice in

the little diagram in the lower right, this is really being taken between our buildings B and C, looking to the north towards building A.

[00:49:25] If you'll notice in the picture off on the far left is our entryway that is coming through the bridge opening that we have. You can see the restaurant there with the outdoor type of seating and the expansive area looking to the remainder areas of Building A.

[00:49:47] Moving to the next photograph, this, again, looking at the lower right exhibit, this is being taken at the northern portion of our site, Building A, looking back. So as you can see the fountain, and we're really hopeful that this is what it is going to be of an engaging, interactive area, a reason for people to pause and be able to enjoy the outdoors, listening to the fountain, and just engaging in conversation with individuals.

[00:50:21] Again, if you look to the far right, you can see the walkway entering in and part of the restaurant area. So, again, we want it to be an active area.

[00:50:37] That's what we saw with the national landing. That's what we've heard that is important. We've heard that from staff. We've seen it in the various small area plans. So this, we feel, is a big deal. Let's put it that way.

[00:50:53] if we move on to the next slide that is I'd like to kind of change the discussion a little bit and talk about this small area plan and then I'll link it all together obviously as you're aware of and I believe was in Jason's comment the small area plan was adopted on June the 23rd of 2020 it calls for in this plan like renovating the existing buildings but maintaining them

[00:51:27] providing new construction along the university drive and but it does mention throughout this document that it is a guide it's not an absolute but rather it is a guide and just as a little bit of background in terms of that of the comprehensive plan. If we go to the next one, just a little brief history on things.

[00:51:56] The concept of a comprehensive plan was actually approved and passed by a piece of legislation by the Virginia General Assembly back in 1975. And it requires all jurisdictions throughout the state to establish a comprehensive plan for their particular jurisdiction by July 1 of 1980.

[00:52:21] It furthermore requires that the comprehensive plan be reviewed every five years. It doesn't say it has to be changed. It just needs to be looked at. Similarly, in terms of the comprehensive plan itself, throughout the state it varies dramatically. In some areas, the comprehensive plan is very, very generalized, almost like a blob plan.

[00:52:40] Others get very specific, down to almost like individual parcels that are there. And, again, as I mentioned, the Old Town Small Area Plan was adopted June 23rd of 2020.

[00:52:59] However, there's two major events that have occurred since 2020. The first is March of 2020. That's when COVID hit. and it had a dramatic effect initially in terms of so many different business establishments closed. You had drive-through restaurants. No one was going into restaurants. They weren't permitted.

[00:53:23] As time has gone by, things have changed. But during the process of COVID, we heard about new things like social distancing and not knowing what the impacts would be. There were some theories that were saying, well, this is going to mean that office buildings are going to have to be larger because

you're going to have to have a larger amount of square footage to keep that social distancing that was there. It was an unknown. But as time has evolved, we've seen what has really ended up occurring. It forced the situation, if you will, of the virtual meetings,

[00:54:00] which we really had not heard that much of before. It was evolving somewhat. But COVID clearly accelerated that program tremendously. I mean, just look on a daily basis. We have Teams or we have Zoom meetings. People are going into the office, but maybe once or twice a week.

[00:54:18] So it's changed the entire character of what's going on. The second event that occurred was December the 3rd of 2024. That was when the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors approved the expansion of the judicial center across the street and that has had uh and if we can okay good you've got the right image up so you're reading my notes uh so this is though showing where those four buildings are located and you can see university excuse me chain bridge road rather

[00:54:51] on the far right side of it and you can see the orientation of our site uh to that um if you go to the next slide that is there. This gives you a brief description of the four buildings or four phases that is there. The building phase one, it's a 90 foot tall building. It has 90,000 square feet of office space plus an additional 60,000 square feet of other space, which I'll come back to and

[00:55:29] discuss that. Phase two is 100 feet in height, containing 125,000 square feet of office and 40,000 square feet of, quote, other space. Building three is 130 feet in height, containing 190,000 square feet of office and 5,000 square feet of other. And building four is 100 feet in height. There's no office in there, but it is 150,000 square feet of quote other. So the total of office is 405,000

[00:56:04] square feet, 225,000 square feet of quote other. Just as a case in point or as an explanation of the other, it's comprised of 60,000 square feet of record slash evidence room, 100,000 square feet of public use, 15,000 square feet of childcare, 10,000 square feet of retail, and 70,000 square feet of congregate care facility. Urban Land Institute, which is a well-recognized commercial

[00:56:41] association, suggests that the appropriate current space for employee is somewhere between 140 and 180 square feet per employee. But just for simplicity, let's round it up to 200. Based upon the 405,000 square feet of office, that translates to 2,000 employees. 2,000 employees. The question

[00:57:15] inevitably is, where will they live and how will they get to work? I think that it's fair to assume that many workers, given the opportunity, would like to live close to work so they don't have to commute. If you take a look at the next slide, this is one that is contained within staff's report. And it's showing what they're calling their walk shed from the Fairfax County Judicial

[00:57:49] Complex. And that is located in the center of that light pink. You will see our site is labeled in blue. It's within a five-minute walk. It's literally across the street from that.

[00:58:05] So, in phase one, by the way, of the judicial complex, it is going through the site plan approval process currently. It will actually start construction next year, and it is anticipated to be completed in 2029.

[00:58:23] So, it's not a theoretical, it is a reality. When the other three phases come about, there's no specific time frame for that. But it is already approved, and in all likelihood, and it's fair to assume, it will go ahead and move forward.

[00:58:42] Grove Slade, our transportation consultant, took that into consideration, phase one. If you go to the next slide, this is an excerpt from our transportation impact analysis.

[00:58:57] And the item that I've highlighted that is there is saying that Phase 1 was anticipated to include, I'll round it, 90,000 square feet of office use and 60,000 square feet, rounded down, of governmental-related uses.

[00:59:15] And that is that records and evidence storage area that I was referencing for Phase 1. It also, then, if you go to the next page, this is part of the overall conclusion. And maybe as a little bit of background on this, before the transportation analysis was done, there was what is called a scoping session that was done.

[00:59:40] In a scoping session was where Grove Slade got together with the city's transportation folks, staff, and agreed upon what intersections were going to be studied and what assumptions were going to be made.

[00:59:56] It was kind of like making up the rules before the game is played. And so the entire analysis was done. And as you can see, the last item that is highlighted is actually one of their conclusions. And that is that the proposed development is anticipated to generate approximately 41 net, fewer net new trips during the a.m. peak hour and 21 net new trips during the p.m. peak hour

[01:00:30] and 609 additional new net daily trips on a typical weekend compared to the existing uses. So what this is basically saying is that if the current use of that site stayed as it was, you're going to have more traffic than if our community, our project, were built.

[01:00:57] We actually aid the situation. And, again, I think that it's fair to assume that an individual working with the county, and which, by the way, their average age, or median age, I should say, of a Fairfax County worker is 39 years old.

[01:01:20] The market study that we had done for this is indicating that our market is attracting individuals' average age of 32. So we're right in that same general area. I think that it's fair to assume that an awful lot of individuals, given the choice, would like to rent in our project to be able to literally to walk across the street.

[01:01:45] So what we do is we actually reduce the AM peak hour by 20%. We reduce the PM peak hour by 10%. So we actually benefit things. So in summary of our project, as I mentioned before, combined with the Davies properties, we're 40% of the overall plot.

[01:02:10] We are six stories proposing a long chain bridge road versus an existing seven-story building that is there. We are marginally taller than the Davies, as David commented, by four feet.

[01:02:26] We have an enhanced greenway, which is creating a vibrant and engaging community. And the housing that we're proposing is in walking distance to the new judicial complex, thereby reducing traffic on the neighboring streets.

[01:02:43] And that concludes my presentation. Sure. Thank you, Clark. I promised to be brief. I just wanted to close the loop in terms of some of the outstanding items that were identified by staff. Thank you.

[01:02:59] And I think that importantly to recognize is that, as we said before, we've gotten a lot of feedback. We do try to update the plans as we get that feedback. But we're actually going to be making a formal submission on August 1st or before.

[01:03:16] It'll probably be August 1st because we have a fair amount of work to do. And we'll make sure that any inconsistencies that have been identified have been corrected. So I want to just make sure we all understand that. Staff had identified some comments with regard to density calculations, calculations associated with lot coverage, very minor tweaks.

[01:03:40] I've done the math. It barely moves the needle. That information will be provided to staff for their review and confirmation. Turning movements have been questioned as well. We'll make sure that staff is on board with our resubmission with regard to turning movements.

[01:03:59] You've heard Jason allude to it a fair amount. We've heard from the BAR. We've heard from some citizen groups with regard to what I call east-west pedestrian traffic. And there has been discussion about whether or not a sidewalk on the north side of the Davies proposed travelway is, or south side of our building, something that should be constructed.

[01:04:25] And we as a team have spent a lot of time looking at really what do we think in terms of what makes the most sense. How do we balance landscaping? How do we balance pedestrian movements? How do we really be smart about how we want people to move in and out of the various locations, both from the Davies property as well as from our site?

[01:04:47] And how do they get to both Chainbridge Road and University Drive? When you look at the Davies property, all of their access points are along the north side of their building. The black dash represents their proposed sidewalk. Their sidewalk abuts where their access points are going to be. Their sidewalk also obviously is abutting where their greenway is. Our proposed building has no entrances except at this location here that I'm pointing out. That is kind of what we call a backdoor entrance, if you will, into this particular

[01:05:22] building. And we are providing a sidewalk from this point back out to university. There is also a public space here which we can talk about during questions and answers if you want to learn more about that. We certainly are proposing an east-west connection along our main corridor with regard to where all of our access points or most of our access points will be on the building as well as on building a certainly we've got east west connectivity provided and connection to the greenway this narrow strip here is set up such that when this piece if and when they come in

[01:06:02] we're providing ingress egress and at that time there will be an opportunity to provide a sidewalk in this location if they so choose we again looked at this in terms of what type of needs would be there in terms of adequate east-west pedestrian sidewalk movements. And we felt that this wouldn't really be used because there's this sidewalk location in place already. There's no really access points into this parking lot. There's a huge vertical difference between

[01:06:41] our travel way and the existing conditions of this site. So we felt landscaping was probably more of an appropriate use in this location and so again went back to that balance when we take a look at you know integrating landscaping versus where do we put the pedestrian access ways so that was kind of the background as to why the plan was put together the way it was whoops went too far on that sight distance we'll make sure staff is on board and then the last item I just

[01:07:18] wanted to touch on it was identified in staff's report with regard to the sanitary sewer capacity there does seem to be some questions with public works with regard to the capacity of one of the sewers that we're tying into we'll continue to work with department of public works we've done a comprehensive

analysis to look at the capacity not of just this sewer but the sewer downstream of our site and we've looked at full build out of our building as well as the buildings that are adjacent to us that are in this sewer shed as to when they fully develop for the comp plan densities and even really a density

[01:07:52] closer to what we're proposing and we have found based on that model that the sewer system is only at 80% capacity still has 20% extra capacity so we'll continue to work with staff on that but I just wanted to make sure that you recognize that we see the comment we understand it and we'll work with the reviewers to make sure that we've fully gone through the model and shared with them our perspective with that we'll open it up to questions and answers and thank you for your patience I know as a long presentation well thank you for the both presentations very illuminating as you mentioned this is not the first time

[01:08:31] we've seen the project so this seems to be evolving in a way that makes sense and you have pointed out you are incorporating feedback from multiple stakeholders I will now call on councilmember Amos for his questions thank you very much and appreciate both of the comprehensive presentations. I'll start with elements that I do like. I do like the archway off of chain bridge. I like the elements including the fountain and some of the selections that you've made for the the greenway in particular. Also regarding the retail and office I do like kind of the two-floor consolidation particularly on the chain on chain

[01:09:08] bridge. I think that looks really nice. I do have a number of questions but I'm I'm sure some of these will be asked by my colleagues as well, so I will just kind of go down to the core. Just real quick, so based off of what I saw, it looked like a ride-in, ride-out on Chainbridge, but not on University.

[01:09:27] Is that correct? Okay. I won't go into the traffic impact analysis just yet. I might hold on that one. I would like to start off with going into the greenway. So I saw that Building C on the corner encroaches into the greenway a bit.

[01:09:46] The intent of the original Smart Area Plan was kind of for the Greenway not to be disrupted to a significant degree. But then you see right on the corner of the edge of Building C, it just really gets really narrow to the point where it just ends up becoming a sidewalk. And so you could argue that it's only a few feet, not the biggest deal in the world, but then you also have the loading docks right on the other side.

[01:10:07] And so it just gets really constrained. So I'm wondering why was that decision made? Yeah, we spent a lot of time trying to figure out, again, from a practicality standpoint, making sure that we create a very special greenway corridor, give it ample space.

[01:10:33] But at the same time, we understand that we need to provide space for vehicles, loading vehicles and so forth, to be able to get off of that travel way that does tie in Chain Bridge to university. And so three spaces were what were required per code, and our proposal proposes those three spaces in that location.

[01:10:56] As Clark had pointed out and has shown in this exhibit, you can see that the overall public width is probably on average of about 75 to 80 feet, perhaps even more than that, for the public available land for this particular corridor.

[01:11:14] So it just so happens that that is a neck point for the reasons I just shared, but that was really the background for it. Going back to the loading docks, so I know truck access was pointed out as one of the main concerns. I know you're having conversations with staff on that, but could you go into a little bit more detail?

[01:11:33] I think one of the main things that we've heard from people who've sent emails in, but staff as well, is the potential for creating a bottleneck there with the loading docks. Yeah. Well, they're loading spaces. They're not docks. so i just want to make sure that everyone knows that there's not a four foot vertical difference between the back of that space and the sidewalk area that's all at grade so that's an area which staff has asked us to go back and just take a look at our turning movements to make sure we're not putting any fire hydrants or signs in a way that potentially could get clipped and so we we've done

[01:12:07] that work we have not yet provided that to staff we will be doing that on august 1st to demonstrate that turning movement wise everything works and that there's plenty of elbow room for trucks to get in and out of that area and so that's a location certainly that we understand why the comments have been generated but again what's what's nice about this location too is that we wanted to try to find a central location okay some place that is accessible to all the buildings in all the entrances this this seemed to really favor that location so again that's the background behind why it's there. And this is more of a comment rather than a

[01:12:46] question. It's just, and I understand the comparisons with the Davies property because it's adjacent to you and you'd be sharing a greenway. But Davies property also had significantly less acreage. And so just a little disappointed that in terms of open space, we only got to 10.79, which is just right above the minimum threshold. I expected a little bit more.

[01:13:07] That's just one of the things I wanted to point out. And I understand that you had the surface parking right there I'm not sure if you've had conversations about converting some of the residential parking space into commercial is that a zoning is that a zoning hindrance maybe that's a staff

[01:13:23] question all right all good I think you're referring to the tree canopy that is what I meant yes sorry about that okay because when you do the comparison and I don't have the numbers here but we will get them to you when you look at the open space in comparison to Davies I think we really are very favorable and and that's one of the things that we pride ourselves on in terms of what we've been able to do

[01:14:02] in terms of making that green space available to our community as well as to the public. And so that's something which I was just trying to quickly see where I could see the open space calculation, but I found the canopy. Yes, we are tight on canopy. When you're looking at high-density projects such as this, there's a lot of competing interest for space.

[01:14:24] And so we want to be smart about it. We looked at National Landing. They did an extraordinary job. We tried to take some of their really smart ideas and incorporate them into our proposal. And frankly, I think we've done a really good job.

[01:14:40] And one of the reasons why we're resisting adding those extra sidewalks were, honestly, I just don't think they're necessary. At the end of the day, we could put the sidewalks in and come and ask for a modification to the canopy. But frankly, I think the canopy makes more sense. Speaking of sidewalks, so while I understand why you say you feel they're not necessary, and I would concur with you on the private street on the north side in particular, that's fine, where the Davies property line is on that side of the building.

[01:15:12] You are making an assumption that everything goes perfectly and Davies gets developed, but there is a scenario where nothing happens for a number of years or there's delays, and then we just have

no sidewalk there and people just walking in the middle of the street. So while I understand where you're coming from on that, that's based off an assumption of just because we approve something doesn't mean it gets built.

[01:15:34] But what street are you talking about? I'm talking about the private road that's being developed by Davies. So that's not going to happen if Davies doesn't happen. Okay. All right. Fair point. Yeah. All right. And then wanted to touch on the fitness center.

[01:15:51] I'm glad to hear that you're looking at that. When you were describing adjusting it, you were adjusting it from a vertical standpoint. But Jim Feather, during the BAR review, specifically focused on the horizontal setback of the fitness center from the curb and the edge of the building.

[01:16:07] Is that being adjusted at all? Or part of the reason, I believe, is because if you look at it from an angle, you can see the difference. But if you're looking at it straight on, let's say, from the adjacent community, it doesn't really do much in terms of what the height or sight distance looks like.

[01:16:30] Yep. I hope I didn't give motion sickness to anybody. Yeah, we're exploring all options here. We don't want to steal the thunder from the architect, but I think and I hope that when you see the updated elevations and some of the changes that are actually in the works right now that are not even finalized, we don't know for sure yet exactly how they're going to look, but they're done in such a way that's addressing what we heard from the BAR.

[01:17:03] Now, a lot of that has to do with the verticality of it, but I'll let John speak more to that since he's come up and joined us. The tape fell off. Hi, John Regan from the Christopher Companies.

[01:17:20] If you can see on the screen right here, one of the things that I think we didn't do well in our presenting this building, one is across the street is a side of one townhouse. So we're not meeting against an entire row of townhouses.

[01:17:38] This is one townhouse. This glass area, if you're across the street looking at our building, most of that building is sitting in their street, in their road area of this building.

[01:17:54] The one thing I think we didn't do, the architect did a great job. The problem is he put a great overhang on it. He put dark metal on it. So if you look at the picture, it literally flashes itself as a structure.

[01:18:13] What I would like it to do is minimize the roofing area, get it so it's flush with that glass. It's an open glass area as if you were having like a gathering space on that area. So you're not looking at a building.

[01:18:30] You're looking at through glass. Most of it, if it's going to be their gym area, you're not going to see a bunch of equipment because you're looking, again, the townhouses are lower than our site. You're looking up at it.

[01:18:46] So you're looking through the glass in that building. You're not looking at some person working out. Hopefully we're not going to be doing trampoline stuff and things like that. But it's going to be looking. So we're looking at that area in terms of trying to make it lower profile, because this will be the gym area for hopefully 392 people that will be living here, 392-plus people that will be living here, and some of the people who are hopefully working there.

[01:19:20] So we're trying to make it so that, you know, you have to put a gym someplace. I can either put it in the downstairs in the, you know, parking garage, which we're overpart. But this is, I think, a perfect

place to be. The areas on both sides of it, we're putting doors so that you can be on top of that terrace.

[01:19:39] So it's an open space for the people who live there. So that's how we try to design it. The other thing I think we did a little bit that we need to adjust on, the siding on the back of that wall makes it prominent.

[01:19:56] It's dark, which means that you're looking at a dark black or darkened wall, which makes it flash out more. I think we need to lighten the color to try to make it so that looking from across the street, you're not looking at, okay, I've got this giant building there.

[01:20:13] We need to lighten it up so it will somewhat disappear. I won't say it will disappear, but make it feel better from that location. Thank you. So just last clarifying question on the fitness center and then just one comment. So for the fitness center, I'm only curious on why wasn't it built within the building?

[01:20:34] Why was this choice made or why was it not situated maybe closer to the greenway? I'm assuming maybe because of the height restrictions, but why not, for example, an internal gym? The biggest thing about that is, okay, we take the building off and we set it back that 25 feet.

[01:20:53] I've got a giant terrace. I mean, I could either make it so that you have a door coming out of a hallway and I have 25 feet of surface area that people can walk around and stuff. So I basically enclosed it, put some gym equipment on it, and made it so it's usable.

[01:21:12] It was just a natural location where it could easily be used. So it's more about maximizing the space. That's correct. My only comment, and just to what you said about being over parked, and I just briefly said it earlier, I'm not sure how conversations are going with staff, but again, if you're already over parked, reutilize some of that parking for the retail space and get us additional green space.

[01:21:34] That's where I would stand on that, but thank you. Other questions? Council Member Peterson? Thanks. I want to just double check some of the parameters on this to be sure I really understand the height.

[01:21:50] let's start with uh i have this diagram that you showed and if you just help me because from the ground up i after you get past the setback i get one two three four five six seven stories including the bottom one that the car is in at 69 feet did i figure that right so the stories are are not inclusive of the garage but what that's at this shows that being above ground on this picture university drive so that means you have seven levels i'm sorry you're on you're on this one

[01:22:29] here yes and if you look at that from university drive ground level up we have seven levels that go 69 feet is that right so the 69 feet right you get 12 8 and then you work 11-0 and then it's nine one all the way up to nine zero this space right here are you counting no if you go to slide it to you a little bit farther down behind the car work your way up from the ground from the ground up

[01:23:01] from 447 7 you work your way up from where my finger is to the top it's seven levels 69 feet if I'm not mistaken but somebody should jump I think one of the things is if you look at the red line that's on your drawing right there that's the average grade around this site as we pointed out in our presentation from the high point on on 123 or Cambridge Road it is a 26 foot differential so

[01:23:35] Where we just have an overall math problem is the garage, which is literally underground on Cambridge Road, is coming out of the ground as we are going backwards.

[01:23:51] Just one clarification, though. I mean, the garage is not a story. It's a level, though, from the ground up. I'm looking at the height from the ground up for the structure. From the ground, the average grade line, which is what the zoning ordinance is based on, is the blue line. I'm just talking from the ground up at that location.

[01:24:11] It's seven levels and 69 feet, right? The red line is not the ground. The ground is where the car is at University Drive. Am I not? So this first unit, everything under the red is underground. So this first unit is underground. Yeah, so let's get to the, let's get to, that probably shows it best.

[01:24:33] So you can see the way topographically things are happening is that when you come off of University, you're going down into the garage okay you're going down into the garage and so you do have some exposure for from a retaining wall here you have four stories here but this is not a this is not a fifth story here and so i think i think what i'm hearing is that you're you're thinking that there's seven stories on this side right right at this location here we we can you know

[01:25:08] this can be further kind of looked at but what the diagram shows is that in terms of from where the car is on the level which is i guess a parking level it's above ground from there to the top of the building is seven levels six actual living stories but there's an extra level for parking that car is is actually partially underground okay all right so i'm just reacting that's i think that's where the disconnect is is that okay it's it's a little confusing there's a lot of information on the sheet i understand now where you're coming from in terms of potentially thinking that's seven stories, but that garage is buried in that location.

[01:25:43] A portion of it may be exposed, but the entire garage is not visible, and so it wouldn't be a seven-story condition there. Okay, but even where it is at its lowest altitude, it's six full stories.

[01:26:04] Is that correct? Six stories here. Right, you don't have any units that are underground. They're all above ground. Five stories here and four stories here. I know, but if you progress farther to the full height of the building, that's six stories. Yes, here are six stories.

[01:26:20] Okay, wonderful. Six stories are there. Good to know. 392 units, and I am curious in terms of the comment that you're exploring all options. That's a lot of units. If my numbers are right, it's 102 per acre, which is the same as Davies.

[01:26:42] So proportionately, that's a pretty high level of residential here. Any thoughts about having a higher percentage of commercial in this area? Because this is a very high percentage of residential.

[01:26:59] Yeah, a couple of comments regarding that. First of all, there is, as indicated in my presentation with the judicial complex, That's 400,000 square feet of office space that is there.

[01:27:17] And with the trend being towards less office space in general that is out there, I mean, part of it is saying normally the office is desired because of it having a positive impact in terms of on the retail.

[01:27:38] There's just more people in proximity to it. And we believe that because of the judicial complex that is there and 2,000 people, employees, if you will, that's there, that will hopefully be a large demand on the retail portion that is there.

[01:27:59] And we didn't really see the need for additional office for that. Okay. I might want to circle back to that. But it also makes me, I guess it raises a question on the traffic study.

[01:28:15] Did I hear correctly that the conclusion here was that as we add 392 residential units, we're decreasing traffic?

[01:28:32] There we go. Good evening. I'm Dan Van Pelt with Grove Slade. So I think one of the things that we looked at, and I guess from a comparison standpoint, if those office buildings that are currently on the site today are fully activated, and then the traffic that those would generate is very comparable to what this site would generate as residential, which is office, from a density standpoint, generates more traffic than residential does.

[01:29:03] So when you look at the numbers, there is a slight decrease in terms of number of trips that you would compare to these office buildings fully occupied versus the residential project, largely the residential project that's now proposed. So you're saying that by reducing the amount of commercial office space in this location, you are reducing traffic on a total basis, even though you're increasing residential units by 392 at the same time?

[01:29:34] Correct. When you look at those two programs and you compare those two programs, it's a slight decrease in traffic with the proposed program. I mean, this might be a little bit in the weeds, but I would be kind of curious on the assumptions for traffic, trip generation, et cetera, for residential units.

[01:29:54] Part of the reason I ask is that some of the assumptions we've had on developments in the past have not exactly panned out. We had a building assumption for Scout on the Circle that has zero children occupying the residences there.

[01:30:11] They're 56, 57 now, for instance, and that's the kind of thing that can have an impact on traffic as well as a lot of other variables, so I would be curious to know a little bit more about that conclusion. That just sounds a little, well, it sounds like it ought to be reexamined a little bit.

[01:30:29] 392 units of people that are there all the time, coming and going, sounds like just a whole lot in that area. Well, if I might, the daily trip generation will increase, so that is one place we will have an increase, Because from a standpoint of it's residential, you've got a bit of a churn, right?

[01:30:49] Happening 24 hours a day, people coming and going from a site. Where office, it's more, it's very concentrated. It's in in the morning, it's out in the evening. So we do have some increase in daily traffic, but where it counts the most, those peak period trips where the network is the most taxed, that's where we're going to show a very slight decrease in traffic.

[01:31:09] And then I would, just on our assumptions that we include in the study, We use the Institute of Transportation Engineers database. We work with the city traffic engineer and go through and vet all those assumptions. And my experience as a transportation professional is that we have a tendency, usually traffic engineers are very conservative, and we usually have a tendency to overestimate vehicular trips.

[01:31:36] And I think that when we go back and we usually look at it, we've usually found that we have overestimated vehicular trips, which, you know, when I'm trying to think very multimodally, also as a transportation professional, that concerns me because I don't want to overdesign for vehicles because I'm not trying to think very multimodally, which I think is also something that the city is trying to think about, is how do we accommodate all modes?

[01:31:59] So we try to get it right, but if it gives you any little bit of comfort in all this, usually we have a tendency to overestimate vehicular trips. Okay, so if I understand correctly, total traffic goes up, but you're saying peak may be down a little bit, but the total is up.

[01:32:16] In the course of the 24 hours, yes, there'll be a bit more volume, but that volume is going to happen, you know, in the different times of the day because people are living here versus office where it's mainly just commuter in and out times. Okay, do you expect this facility to induce demand for travel and vehicle use?

[01:32:36] I think what we've accounted for is the uses that will be on the site. So, I mean, I think if there's anything that's induced, maybe it's some of the restaurant or some of the commercial space that could potentially bring users that aren't specific, you know, residents of the site.

[01:32:55] But I don't think we're expecting induced beyond that. I mean, this is largely a residential project with people that will be residents on the site. Okay, you're not expecting any induced demand for residences, people visiting, things like that, services being provided, those kinds of things.

[01:33:12] And that's all captured in the trip generation assumption, so everything from the residents' trips to their visitors to the service vehicles and things of that nature. Okay, I'll circle back in a bit. I've got some bigger picture questions here, but just off the cuff here, it looks like this is a lot of height,

[01:33:34] A LOT OF RESIDENT A LOT OF A LOT OF RESIDENTIAL DENSITY AND POTENTIALLY MORE TRAFFIC AND I THINK THOSE ARE KIND OF ISSUES THAT ARE WORTH FLAGGING AND WORTH RETURNING TO THANKS THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER HARDY CHANDLER THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION I ALSO APPRECIATE THE BROADER CONTEXT BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SITE BECAUSE WE DO HAVE TO LOOK AT THINGS HOLISTICALLY IN THESE GENERAL AREAS I ALSO APPRECIATE IT I HAD PUT DOWN in my notes before this presentation that I wanted to walk through the outstanding

[01:34:12] issues. So I appreciated attention to many of those. I'm not sure if there was attention to lot coverage and building coverage, so I wanted to give you an opportunity to cover those two areas. Can I do that now? Yeah.

[01:34:29] I went through it really quick because I know we took a long time, so thank you for asking the question so I can expand on it. Okay. The analysis that was originally submitted to staff based on our initial submission had a lot coverage of 85.3%.

[01:35:00] The methodology that we used needed to be refined slightly to make sure we were preparing it in accordance with the zoning ordinance requirements. Staff appropriately pointed that out to us. And so we went back, and basically their point to us was, you need to take out your proposed right-of-way.

[01:35:19] We are dedicating a little bit of right-of-way. You cannot count that in your overall calculation for density, your calculation for coverage, both for the lot and the building. So when you take a look at lot coverage, that's really like imperviousness, okay?

[01:35:35] How much imperviousness do you have on your site? The site, when we calculated it, was 85.3 based on the appropriate methodology. It ended up equating to the same thing mathematically when it comes to lot coverage.

[01:35:51] Building coverage changed slightly. We went ahead and redid the analysis. We have a little bit less area because we had to take out for the right-of-way, the proposed right-of-way. And so we went from 54.3% to 55.6%.

[01:36:08] And then lastly, related to density, staff had questioned with regards to our density calculation for the same reasons I shared with you with regard to the imperviousness and the building coverage. We went from a density of 101.3 doing units an acre to 103.8.

[01:36:28] Again, we removed the dedication. most jurisdictions you're allowed to use that you're you're allowed to keep the proposed right away in the calculation city and I should have known this the city of Fairfax is not that way you have to take out the right away so when we resubmit we'll be providing those numbers to staff and they'll they'll look at it and make sure that my math is correct but we wanted to certainly make sure that we appropriately respond to that that's an easy outstanding issue for the applicant to respond to and I've shown you the specifics of what they'll see once we do our submission on 8-1. And does that also relate back to the right of

[01:37:07] dedication that changed the data calculations that was mentioned in the staff report? Yes. That's where that is. Okay, thank you for linking that. And the proffers? Yeah, and I'll yield to staff on this, but I think when that comment was written at the time, I don't believe staff had an opportunity to clearly go through all the proffers and that was something that we'll have further discussions with staff in terms of any specific questions that they have on the proffers but staff can elaborate more if there were specific items that we need to address now but we will be working closely with staff and with our

[01:37:41] resubmission. Anything in development in that area or what idea about what's on the table or maybe we can invite staff to talk about that. Sure. Jason, is there anything associated with proffers that's outstanding it was listed as an outstanding item but I think it's just because at the time that this report was published I don't think you all had finished the review but I could be wrong that is right they are under review at this at

[01:38:11] this time we had not completed review okay on the staff presentation on slide seven there was the discussion of the small area plan specific increases in units and square footage and that sort of thing and what this project contributes to those increases do we have information on any other numbers contributing to those increases for projects that are currently under development

[01:38:49] in old town because we have the aim from the small area plant and we have the contribution of this But that is in the context of other projects, too. So I'm just wondering where we are in terms of those increases, knowing that those don't have to be necessarily too rigid.

[01:39:06] We do, and Mr. Harden has put together a spreadsheet with properties I'm probably not thinking of. But Davies was approved at 276 units, City Center West at 79 units.

[01:39:24] This project, around 392 units. Phase 1 of Courthouse Plaza that you all had a work session on recently was 315. The Phase 2, which is not in the near term, the 1,250 units are near term 15-year horizon.

[01:39:43] But if you wanted to look at Phase 2, at least on paper, they're saying 315. The specifics of that plan would come back at some point, and they're saying closer after 2035. So that would be outside that 15-year horizon. And we did have a pre-application briefing many months ago for an office building on democracy where 275 units were proposed at that point in time.

[01:40:08] Okay. Yeah, it would be interesting to see altogether how those numbers are adding up toward that aim. Could you talk a little bit more about, there was a mention in the staff report about interparcel connections. There were comments about in relation to the Davies property and that sort of thing.

[01:40:28] Anything else that might highlight how this sort of builds out that whole area? Certainly. So if you look at what's on the screen here, you see the road. Let's assume that Davies was constructed, that road existed, and there was a road to actually connect to.

[01:40:46] Our zoning ordinance requires non-residential parcels or parcels that don't have single-family, I should say. In this case, it's residential, but it's not single-family, and it has commercial. So citywide, anytime you're building or developing a project with a commercial component, you're required where you front on an arterial collector street to provide an inter-parcel access way for vehicles to travel from site to site.

[01:41:13] So in essence, something that would get into their garage would satisfy that criteria if the Davies project was constructed and the road was there. Same to the north. This parcel abuts both the historic building with the Kelley's Wooster House and then that more modernist building across from the fire station.

[01:41:37] The same requirement lies there. We struggle with this, quite honestly. It's an old code standard where, you know, back in the day, we were trying to seek service drives and other alternative modes of transportation around the city where you had small pad site buildings and drive-thrus and things.

[01:41:58] We wanted those accessed via shared access versus people getting on the street, driving a couple feet, going to the next site. It does work in certain circumstances, but in most cases we're seeing where developers are providing an inter-parcel access easement.

[01:42:15] So, for example, they may provide one through that landscape strip off of their private street for the building to the north. And that's more common of what we're seeing with developments, where there's something more cohesive with a shared private road network, so something like Democracy Lane or Willard Way, where it's a street that circumnavigates through a bunch of properties, they're satisfying that criteria because there's a street that links certain properties.

[01:42:42] It's just not a street from point A to point B through a parcel. Gotcha. Thank you. There was also a comment about, and I just want to make sure that I'm understanding it, with Building C not having non-residential components, and that being based on feedback from the community.

[01:43:04] Is that correct? So I can't speak to the developer's choice to not include residential there. The small area plan does not have either Cambridge or University as a preferred retail location, So the plan has specific locations with red lines where the plan is pretty absolute that there should be retail.

[01:43:28] It's supportive of and accepting of retail elsewhere, but it's not a prioritization area. The second part of your question. Well, the part, I'm trying to understand if that selection of non, not having non, I guess having residential exclusively in building C is integration of community feedback.

[01:43:53] Based on what I'm recalling, and I didn't memorize it, some of the comments from the planning commission about being responsive to that on the university side. Yes, and I think, you know, when we saw Davies come through also, they chose a softer approach, something that mimicked more the design of townhouses with residential use there against residential use.

[01:44:17] Okay, thank you. Council Member McQuillan? Thank you. I had a question regarding the number of stories and what the planning rationale, what the rationale was to support exceeding the

recommended number of stories.

[01:44:43] Thank you for the question. Again, going back, we felt that the enhanced greenway was a high priority. And as had been pointed out, really our densities are the same as Davies.

[01:45:02] So if we've got the same density, we obviously have a larger land area in comparison to the Davies. But nonetheless, the 102 or 103 dwelling units per acre is still valid, if you will, that's there.

[01:45:22] So the enhanced greenway, the only way that we could do that is really is to increase the height if we're trying to go ahead and maintain the same type of density. So it was a judgment call. And again, we feel that in light of the factor, there's already a seven-story building that is out there.

[01:45:43] We're proposing six, so it's not that we're outside of the scope of, if you will, what's already there. So it's a judgment call. We still feel that the Greenway is an offsetting rationale, if you will, for the height.

[01:46:07] It's a judgment call. We feel that it's incredibly important to the success of the project. Okay, so it was a tradeoff for the Greenway? Correct. Okay, thank you. What specific public benefits justified the additional stories aside from the Greenway?

[01:46:26] Anything else? That really is principally the issue, in our opinion. Anyone else want to chime in on that? Go ahead. One of the things I think that's really important on this project is we all want it to be successful.

[01:46:53] It needs to have enough density in order to be successful economically. It needs to be a place that people go to. It needs to be vibrant. It needs to be a place where the retail space is going to survive. It needs to be a place that people feel special in.

[01:47:12] We worked really, really hard to try to reduce the building as much as we possibly could, but at the same time recognizing those other factors that I just put out there. And so I think for those reasons, it was how this building evolved to what it is now.

[01:47:31] The building is not quite as large as it was before. We did hear plenty of comments, as we've indicated. We've tried to tighten it up. We've tried to, you know, take away as much we can that perception of height. But we've gotten a lot of favorable feedback as well with regard to how this building looks, to how it's set up.

[01:47:49] And, you know, we think that this is going to be an example project. To staff's credit, they sent us to National Landing. That was a nice visit. We're glad we went there. We learned a lot. And after that visit, I want to go back again because it just leaves an impression on you.

[01:48:10] We want to leave an impression here. And so, and I hope, as you all have seen this and kind of heard feedback, that perhaps you understand a little bit more perhaps what our vision is and the reasons why we have what we have.

[01:48:25] But that's how I would respond to that. Let me add a couple of other aspects, too. What ultimately it really comes down to is that the economics are dictating a lot of this. As a frame of reference, the four buildings that we're buying are currently assessed for \$17 million.

[01:48:49] The value of the buildings themselves are \$7.5 million. So we're buying a piece of property to tear down \$7.5 million and to be able to go ahead and start a project.

[01:49:07] We're also having to go ahead and have buried a parking garage to be able to help on meeting the height requirement that is there. So to be able to build this, we need to go ahead and buy the site, tear the buildings down entirely, dig down another two levels to be able to put in the parking, construct all of the two levels of the garage, an absolute concrete mass, if you will, that is there, and then to build units on top of it.

[01:49:42] The numbers just don't work if we don't get the density. So again, the trade-off being, we've got the density, which matches the Davies. By the way, based for comparison, the assessed value of the existing structure on the Davies property is \$262,000.

[01:50:02] So it's, again, it's coming down to the math. We felt that the greenway is the vital importance, and that is the offset. I mean, it really comes down, that is the explanation. Could you please go over just some more detail on how you plan to make that greenway a destination and not just a simple walkway through path?

[01:50:33] Yeah, I think that the way that we're trying to create it, And as you can see, the fountain area, as an example, is an intersection. The greenway is the north-south, and the east-west, if you will, is the connecting sidewalk within our project that is there.

[01:50:58] And we feel that that is going to really be an incredibly vibrant area with the restaurant, with people being able to to eat outside to enjoy walking the greenway and certainly it'll be even that much more vibrant hopefully that all these other areas around quote the block do in fact develop so we we are certainly trying to do everything in our power to make sure that that restaurant will be successful that's the reason why we are so stuck on if you will the aspect of

[01:51:35] the surface parking areas that are there, because when you consider 392 units, and there's such things as Amazon, and Uber, and Lyft, and you have fast food deliveries, you have people that want to go ahead and get a pickup from the restaurant, and they have to be able to park easily. I mean, if out of default, people, if you make things too difficult, there's other options.

[01:52:11] They'll go to other merchants. And there's been enough different restaurants that have opened and closed here within the city for varying reasons. And we're just very committed to try and make sure that we're doing everything possible. We don't have a user in hand for the restaurant, but trying to make sure that we've got all the various component parts to make it so that high-quality restaurant would say, this is where I want to be. Okay, thank you. Do you have a projected student yield count for this development? Yes, we do. And what that is, just as a little

[01:52:50] bit of background on that, Fairfax County actually puts out a student ratio, and the most recent one, and I'm going from memory here a little bit was prepared four years ago. It is the benchmark that is used in all the various rezoning cases in Fairfax County where there is a residential component and obviously there is many many residential rezonings that have been approved

[01:53:25] within Fairfax County in the last four years and what that dictates based upon it is that we would generate 24 elementary school students, eight middle school, and 11 high school. So a total of 43 students. Thank you. And then how does this, how do you project this development affecting the police, fire, and EMS response to this area? Yeah, it's basically, we don't really see that it is a negative because really you've got police and fire literally within a selling's throw of

[01:54:04] that. I mean, directly across the street on the other side of University Drive is the new fire station that is going to be built. So if anything, we think that that's a plus because the response time has to be absolute minimal. Okay. So the bringing in that amount of people, you don't see that having any effect on it? No, just an increased population. But again, because of it being in such close proximity as opposed to being, you know, 10 minutes down the road or whatever. This is

[01:54:44] literally two minutes. Okay. Thank you. My last question is just if council, if we conclude that six stories and that number of dwelling units per acre is just not the right scale for this specific location, have you evaluated financially viable five-story alternative or is that just not possible we did take a look at that and the answer is very simple if we take off one level so that we match the aspects of the five four five in terms of on chain bridge four in terms of one university

[01:55:19] that basically drops roughly 92 units that's 25 of the project it does not work thank you so much i appreciate you answering all my questions thank you council member hall yes thank you and my apologies for my camera not working. I hope that this is okay. I want to thank you for the presentation. I do have a number of questions, and I will try to start with some of the good parts, I think. I really do like the fountain. I think the archway is really good. I do appreciate the

[01:55:55] distance from University Drive, and the step up in height seems to really help with the visual from University. I honestly would prefer to see more of that on Chained Bridge Road also, So it doesn't feel so tall right up on the main road. I understand what you just said to Council Member McQuillan about, you know, dropping units would make it not as financially viable.

[01:56:17] But I do have concerns with how close it is to Cambridge Road and then the fact that it feels when you're walking or driving like, you know, a very mini New York City there. And I think that's something that the city has not necessarily seen yet on many of these close local roads that we have.

[01:56:36] I do also like the Greenway a lot. I still wish that this development honestly was focused more on things to do and places to eat rather than just residential development. I think that a lot of what they've done in, let's say, a Fairfax corner heavily focuses on bringing people in to do things and spend their money and then go home to where they live. I personally don't. I just think it's way too many units. But I am curious, you mentioned a lot of the things about the restaurant, and I'm sure you can't disclose exactly what you're thinking, but what type

[01:57:12] of restaurant are you planning for? Who might be interested in this type of restaurant? What are we looking to get out of this? I would think there would be something that would be like the Great American, one of those type of restaurants. We probably want to go more, I mean, they're a local brand, but i mean that that type of of activity okay thank you that actually makes me very happy i think that

[01:57:47] those tend to appeal to a lot more people i think we end up getting a lot of the um the uh korean barbecue places which are all great and have their place but i think you know a great american or something along those lines is something you can go to more frequently and and get something different every time so thank you for that um as far as the visual of it i feel like it really could be anywhere in America. It could be in New York City. It could be Arlington Falls Church. I don't think that anything about this really screams city of Fairfax. I don't think it uses a lot of

[01:58:23] the brick that we typically associate, especially in our old town areas. And I just think it's pretty, don't get me wrong, but I just don't think that it's us. Are there any other opportunities for change in

facade or things along those lines?

[01:58:45] Well, again, the way that we're looking at it is trying to appeal what we see as the market. And, again, the company that we use is called Zonda, and they do market studies nationally, very well recognized.

[01:59:04] And they believe that the market demographics that we need to be working towards in, is anticipating a 32-year-old individual. And because of that young individual, we believe that the type of elevations that we have, the type of product, is one that would appeal to that. So that's why we're specifically trying to gear towards that. And ultimately, of course, in terms

[01:59:41] of the elevations, the exterior, it's almost like art. I mean, there's so many different preferences. So ultimately, I mean, we're estimating that the approximate value of this project is \$150 to \$200 million, a rather significant amount of money. We ultimately need, number one, ourselves to be comfortable that we believe that it is fully viable, but also, though, in terms of the lenders that we're going to be dealing with.

[02:00:11] They need to sign off on it, et cetera. This is our best professional judgment of the type of product that we would want to build and that meets the various criterias of being financially viable and successful. And the BAR.

[02:00:27] Yeah, and I can understand. Oh, sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah, I was simply just going to add. I was just going to add with regard to the response that Clark had provided, which was very comprehensive.

[02:00:47] Obviously, we're getting a lot of competing feedback with regard from the communities. But obviously, we need to make sure we incorporate feedback from Planning Commission as well as the BAR. So trying to find that middle ground, if you will.

[02:01:04] Yeah, and I appreciate that. And it was a very comprehensive answer. I think, with all due respect, I think a lot of your information is coming from outside parties. It's coming from county information, county statistics, Delaware.

[02:01:24] I'm from Delaware, so I understand you're doing things up there. The city of Fairfax is a very unique, small-town feel, and we hold very strongly to that. And I'm quite frankly, I'm just not sure that you are collectively you are taking that into account or are giving that as much weight as it as it should carry.

[02:01:50] So I'll move on to my other comments. But I personally, I understand you're trying to attract a 32 year old resident. And I think if you were building townhouses or houses, I think the person that would be moving into them would probably care a little bit more about what their external building looks like.

[02:02:10] But I think if you make some really nice features inside and you do a really good job on the inside where they're living, to me, that's probably more important than what the exterior looks like. I would also agree more sidewalks are better. I understand why you're not doing them on the one side and that kind of is, you know, if Davies doesn't happen, that that would not be an issue.

[02:02:33] The view from the gym area into the townhomes, I recognize I'm skipping around a little bit, but what does that actually look like from the apartment side of things? Like what privacy are those residents losing by having this glass wall looking into their neighborhood?

[02:02:51] I understand what they're looking back on, but what are you seeing into their houses? Well, basically, as was pointed out earlier, we're actually looking at the side of a unit. I think that it, okay, here, pulling up a slide that might be able to go ahead and help.

[02:03:14] Again, it's almost like the entry street of going into the community. So we're looking at the side of two buildings. It would be different if it was a row of townhouses in the adjoining community looking across university towards ours.

[02:03:34] So we believe that the actual visual impact is, quite frankly, is somewhat minimal. I'm going to add to that. I know this is, I wish I would have had this blown up, but when you take a look at this exhibit that's shown here, we've highlighted in red the location of the proposed fitness center.

[02:03:56] And as Clark's indicated, there's a row of towns here and there's a row of towns here. The side of this townhouse unit is oriented along this red cross section. So there's really minimal overlap with the fitness center with this unit.

[02:04:13] And when you look at the side of this townhouse unit, it's not even in line with the fitness center. Really, the fitness center aligns itself with their proposed travel way, not so much the units.

[02:04:29] So I think that's something important and worth just pointing out so that folks understand that. Apologize again on the scale, but wanted to make sure folks recognize that. No, and I appreciate that. I think that was certainly some of the comments that came out of Breckenridge.

[02:04:45] So understanding that and being able to see this picture helps a little bit more. One of the things that Breckenridge was also concerned about was the ingress and egress and how it might impact their neighborhood. Has that been considered? Again, I'm not exactly sure of the exact dimensions of how far their entrance is from here, but it looks like it could potentially be a problem for them.

[02:05:12] Yeah. I mean, this is Dan Van Pelt with Grove Slade. So what we did when we looked at the traffic analysis, we looked at the counts that are on university. So that was taken into account. And then we looked at the turning movements at the proposed site driveways.

[02:05:36] We actually eliminate one of the existing site driveways, which is a helpful thing. So I think what Dave has just pulled up here on the screen shows you what existing conditions are today. So there is the two-way left turn lane, which is a helpful thing to have on university.

[02:05:53] But we're eliminating one of the driveways that's currently there today. And operationally, that helps simplify the operations of a university drive. And I think if you go to the next slide, the next slide here shows what the future condition would be with the proposed driveways there.

[02:06:14] okay yeah i think they were they were asking if maybe a right turn only you know right in right out would be a consideration for i think one of those i'm assuming they're meaning the one that is on the southern the the more southern um entrance but i'm not certain i'm again i'm just trying to figure out where it lines up from there so i'll have to go out uh in person and kind of check that out a little bit more but just something to keep on your radar i think as as a possible concern okay understood thank you thank you and i know that we've talked about the height we always talk about height um and city staff can correct me if i'm wrong here but the height of the building

[02:06:53] c does exceed the small area plan correct yes council member the small area plan envisions four stories along university drive as shown with the fitness area technically that area does exceed it.

Where you get closer to Chambers Road, the plan envisioned five stories. I believe if the applicant, they're pulling up a plan here. That's where the building is not easy to understand

[02:07:33] because the renderings here show what look like storefronts that are extra tall, but there's a story of apartments behind that transparent glass on the second story up. So it's an extra story there as noted though by the applicant the existing buildings mix and size but there are six and seven story buildings today closer to Cambridge okay thank you for clarifying that you have indicated a couple different times in the conversation that it sounds like you are

[02:08:06] anticipating a decrease in traffic for the peak times maybe increased traffic for non-peak times I also I watched the planning commission meeting and you stated multiple times that you overestimate for vehicles.

[02:08:22] These do seem like bold statements. I'm going to be totally honest. And I'm very curious if our city staff agrees with this estimate that has been provided. I will attest that the city's traffic engineer scoped out the methodology with the applicant and the applicant's traffic team.

[02:08:44] We've also asked them to present scenarios where there aren't internal trip capture or reduction or rideshare or transit use. So they are presenting the range to us in the traffic study, and it is acceptable to the city's traffic engineer.

[02:09:07] Okay, so happy to hear we're going to be taking some extra looks at those. Yeah, I really don't think that anyone can claim in our city here that we're going to see better traffic. I think it really continues to worsen year over year and adding in additional units or other things in general really just contribute to that.

[02:09:26] The sewer situation, again, I heard this during the Planning Commission meeting, and I do really think this is potentially a larger concern than maybe is being alluded to.

[02:09:35] I understand, if I remember the slide correctly, that I think it was 80% of capacity based upon the down lines, and I'm not using the right terminology, I know, and that's all fine and good for your building at this time, but if the expectation is that others are going to come and want to build and do other things as well, what ends up happening is if we don't really play hardball on this in some ways with with our developers. What we end up with then is that our city residents then have to increase

[02:10:14] their water and sewer bills in order to cover the cost of sewer buildouts that really would not have been needed had there not been additional residential development in some ways. So I think that's kind of a key thing here. It might be good enough with what you're putting in, but I don't live anywhere near this in the city and I don't want my taxes to go up to have to pay for their sewer to be dealt with in the future. I would like to just clarify so that there's no misunderstandings. Our model took into consideration, not just our proposed building,

[02:10:49] but we took into consideration the adjacent buildings. And if they were to build out at maximum densities, it was based on that scenario that the system was only at 80% capacity. So it wasn't based on our building at ultimate capacity plus the existing uses in place today adjacent to us, we assumed that those adjacent buildings would have been redeveloped as well. So we took a most conservative approach, and we were only at 80% capacity. So it's fine if you still have that comment. I understand that, but I just want to make sure everyone understands that we modeled

[02:11:24] in the most conservative fashion, and there's still capacity left in the sewer. Okay, that's All right. Thank you for clarifying. It did still sound like, despite my misunderstanding of it, that our staff was still concerned about what was being proposed. So I'm happy that, again, they're taking another look at that with their expertise. My last comment really just goes to the number of units. I understand that you are proposing mostly one and two bedrooms. Is that correct? Correct. That's correct. Okay. So again, this is kind of back to a city versus county thing.

[02:12:01] You cited numbers from four years ago for county yields. We have a fantastic planner, Eric Foreman, in the city who can tell you the student yields of every single development, every building, every apartment complex and all of those things right here in the city.

[02:12:18] And he does them annually. And what I will also tell you is that Scout on the Circle is 400 units. They expected extremely low student yields. We now, about four years later, five years later, we have 57 students there. So you might be anticipating 43 students. I have a feeling, despite having one and two bedroom units, that we're probably going to get a lot more than that.

[02:12:43] And at a cost of \$24,000 per student at your estimate of 43 students, that's a million dollars a year in tuition education that our city taxpayers need to pay. So I understand you're going to be bringing in, I forget the exact number you said, you know, multi tens of millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars of this project generating real estate taxes.

[02:13:07] But those are really true numbers for us as far as tuition goes. And it also 43 students would now be added into our elementary schools, 23 elementary school students alone. That's an entire classroom. So I understand they would be likely broken out over different grade levels.

[02:13:25] But I think that impact certainly is something that needs to be recognized and explored. So and in tandem with that, I'm also curious if you were to get the 43 or more or less students coming out of this unit.

[02:13:43] where would they load for the bus? Has that been considered, that there's room for them to safely load and unload? If you don't mind, let me comment on the first portion of your comments first.

[02:13:59] We are, to the best of my knowledge, we have not actually received from the city their analysis of the schools. What I was referring to and where I was coming up with my numbers, My understanding is that the city, on generating their estimates, relies on the student ratio that Fairfax County uses.

[02:14:29] So that's where my numbers... Yeah, that's incorrect. I'm sorry? That is not actually correct. We can use those yields to come up with general numbers, but we know exactly what our yields are for a high-density housing, for townhouses, all of those.

[02:14:46] So I don't think Eric is in the audience right now, but I'm sure he could provide city-specific figures. And they might be identical. I don't know. But I do know that the county population continues to drop, whereas the city student enrollment continues to increase.

[02:15:01] So we are not the same as the county in so many areas when it comes to our schools. Councilmember, this is Mr. Sutpen again. Mr. Foreman did run the numbers. They're a bit dated. They would need to take into account the current density and unit count and also the most recent student population counts that we have.

[02:15:25] But when he did run it, based on our very specific methodology that we use, which is different from the county, he estimated student count of 46. Again, that needs to be refined. Okay, thank you. So, again, not an extraordinary difference, but still a difference and certainly one that may be accurate or not.

[02:15:47] Okay, so thank you for that. If you have more comments on there, I'm happy to hear them, but otherwise I would like to hear the bus conversation as well. And I don't understand the answer. Yeah, I think that would probably be something that we'll look to the city to identify where the bus stops would be.

[02:16:07] I mean, presumably I would think that it would be either on Cambridge or University, But I'll have to yield to the city as to where they believe the bus stop would be. Okay. Well, I guess what I'm asking is the entrances, this photo that you have here, when you go in there, is that tall enough for a school bus?

[02:16:29] Yes, as well as a fire truck. Or does that just lead to, okay. Okay. And then when you go in there, is there kind of a central standing area that the kids could potentially use so that the bus goes in and loops around? Or it might be the answer is they're supposed to stand and wait on Chambers Road.

[02:16:47] I'm not sure. I'm just wondering if that has been considered in some of your conversations with planning for students. I did bring up an image. I would think that the school bus and again, we've we've not heard directly back from the city school folks.

[02:17:06] So we'll research this more and make sure we can answer this appropriately the next time. But there is a large turnaround area in what I call a courtyard location that I'm circling now on the screen that could accommodate a bus turnaround if they chose to turn it around there, or they would just come through and tie back into university or vice versa.

[02:17:29] Okay, very helpful to see that. Thank you very much. Those are all my questions. Mr. Sutvin, overall, has our school enrollment been flat? I mean, as far as we are talking about the number of students being added in high, But it seems to me when we were talking previously about this, we talk about this a lot, that Mr. Foreman was saying because enrollment has dropped in single-family neighborhoods, although we have new high-density projects with more students, that in fact our enrollment has not spiked.

[02:18:05] I believe that's an accurate statement. Right. So I do want to make sure we're having the right conversations overall about not just where the students are located, but enrollment in our schools overall. We've got a high school, a middle school, two elementary schools, and I don't believe 100% of the students there are city students.

[02:18:26] So just keep that in mind. Councilmember Bates. Yeah, and to follow on to that, it's actually Eric Foreman's numbers that are considered as part of the fiscal impact analysis, not the SCPS ratios or the applicants' numbers.

[02:18:44] And that fiscal impact analysis also does consider additional infrastructure costs, et cetera. So, I mean, that's, I understand, to be forthcoming. Thanks. Councilmember Amos.

[02:19:00] I was just going to say I also think it's a good sign that at least the preliminary estimates for students and the applicants is also very close as is, so that will probably be a more accurate count. I know, you know, for Scout on the Circle, I believe that the development team, they were, like, around 35 to 38, And the staff was actually more in the 48 to 50 range, if I recall correctly.

[02:19:23] 51. Okay. So I think it helps that the gap is very more narrow on that. The only other thing I wanted to comment on, because I do see our economic development director kind of hiding out, was if you wanted to comment on the office space and how conversations have gone there.

[02:19:43] Thank you. Yeah, I did have a chance to meet with the applicant and talk about the commercial usage. And we did run some preliminary numbers on what the impact could potentially be. As it stands right now, these are commercial buildings, and so switching to residential, we see a reduction.

[02:20:01] We do know, however, that these buildings are entering the end of their usable life as commercial structures, meaning we can't count on being able to see the same tenancy going forward at the same rates unless the buildings are renovated or updated.

[02:20:19] And in today's market, as the applicant has indicated, the cost of that is going to continue to be a challenge. So with roughly 29,000, almost 30,000 square feet of commercial uses that are updated modern uses with a significant portion of that, if I'm getting the ratios wrong, they'll correct me, but about 7,000, under 8,000 into retail or restaurant and the remainder for office, that gives us a healthy amount of office we are looking right now at what that would mean in terms of the current tenants if we needed to move the current tenants again all things being equal with

[02:20:56] a lot of leeway for things not being accurate as listed we do have sufficient commercial space in the city for all of the tenants in those buildings even with the reduction so we would have space both in the new project and an existing commercial space at equal or higher value real estate to accommodate all of the tenants. Just to follow up on that, what I hear a lot about is flight to quality. So really we have our class A space is Willowood and most of the other space is class

[02:21:31] B and class C, which is a great value. And we have a very low vacancy rate because we have very quality valued properties here, but to the point about what happened in 2020 and the fact that people are working remotely means that one of the reasons that everyone's got empty office buildings, regardless of whether it's class A, B, or C, is because people are working remotely.

[02:21:55] And we're also looking at the fact that a lot of businesses are simply downsizing the number of employees they're actually employing. So when we talk about building mixed-use development, which is really great for a small city to have residential retail and commercial, it gives us flexibility way into the future, number one.

[02:22:13] But number two, around this judicial complex, we have a lot of attorney's offices, and a lot of those attorneys are in old office buildings. So we might end up with less space, but it will be new, high-quality commercial space, well-positioned around the judicial complex.

[02:22:31] So I just want to help people understand that it can't all be about the math and the numbers. Having buildings, old buildings of old space as opposed to a smaller amount of square footage that is in demand because it is quality is a tradeoff that I think we should consider making.

[02:22:50] I mean, what are your thoughts on that? No, absolutely. The whole region is seeing a flight to quality. So one of the things that we're working on is looking at the lifespan of the remaining commercial properties, what properties can be redeveloped pure commercial. But the market dictates a lot of that.

[02:23:07] And you're absolutely right. We have talked to other businesses. We've talked to law firms in this corridor. We have talked to other businesses. And proximity to the courthouse is absolutely the

attractor in that specific location. And they generally need smaller spaces. Now, I will say that one of the largest tenants in one of these buildings is, in fact, a law firm.

[02:23:25] But, again, with an updated space, I think we stand a good chance of a retention project there, but also of seeing additional net new commercial that is looking for that space. So we absolutely agree there's a flight to quality and that we do have to take into consideration the usable commercial use on the buildings as they are and what the path is and the gap is to get them to what will be competitive for the next 10 to 20 years where some of these buildings, their lifespan is not going to get another 10 to 20 years without something happening.

[02:24:00] Thank you for that. Mr. Sutphin, a question about parking. First of all, for anybody in the room, I'm just going to throw this out. Has anyone heard of the book Paved Paradise? Okay, so I heard about this book today, and I'm going to read this book because apparently it explains America.

[02:24:18] So parking, we talk about that a lot. There has been legislation proposed regarding parking. Thinking about Scout on the Circle and the lofts at university, which obviously they met certain parking requirements.

[02:24:35] Do we ever circle back around to find out, because I drive past the lofts and do not see a full parking lot. And my understanding is it's not a full residential lot at Scout on the Circle. Is that your understanding?

[02:24:54] Thanks. Yeah, we have looked at a number of properties. The Capstone Collegiate property being one of them when we just recently went through the parking study for Old Town to look at where we are numbers-wise.

[02:25:12] And it's a little different that between a Scout project and an Old Town project, like this project benefits from the transition or overlay district reduction, whereas Scout had to request that exception to get down to 1.6.

[02:25:28] We do see I think in some heavy retail or heavy restaurant and retail spaces a heavy demand for parking at certain hours of the day and you may you know know if you go to popular restaurants You're circling around and having a hard time finding that's user specific versus use specific In this case This applicants one of the few that is proposing to exceed the ordinance requirements and underground parking obviously is very expensive as we start talking about i'm sure you could tell me what the cost

[02:26:04] per parking space is it's mind-blowing um but you've got two two levels of underground parking which ends up yes it is for you've got commercial and you've got retail in those buildings so some of that parking is going to be for those you know employees i would imagine and retail is that correct so it's not all the residence parking so when people come in and they we've provided this underground parking which is going to be different from the parking that is there now it ends up benefiting the the businesses and everything around it as well and something else

[02:26:43] i would point out because this was brought up about uh fairfax corner the mosaic and fairfax corner are successful because of high density housing those those shops and the movie theater and the restaurants that all of us here in the city drive over to take advantage of work because there are people that live there all the time. And so we can't take this out of the equation to think that we can have more restaurants and more retail without building high-density housing of people who don't drive there and park. It's people who walk there. And so aside from the feasibility

[02:27:19] of making this project pencil and the density being what it is and the six stories being what they are, I think to understand, and now it can go back to our economic development director, about how you build the vibrancy, particularly of our old town, is that you put people there who live there and don't drive to patronize our businesses.

[02:27:42] There's absolutely a connection between retail and residential and the office component. They go hand in hand. What I would caution is, and I've said this before, is we are looking at all of these as bookends, right? So each individual project has its site challenges, its balance between residential, commercial, retail.

[02:28:00] Obviously, as an economic developer, I want to see as much commercial space, good, usable commercial space as we can get. But on the other end, we do have to be very conscious about the total loss of commercial in the city, and that goes to my earlier comments. So we do need density to support quality retail, and Office helps support that.

[02:28:19] That's your lunchtime traffic. That's what goes into your restaurant and retail during the day, not just your peak hours. But we do have to look at this other end. And so I don't want to not say that on the record, is that there are several projects. So when you take them all into consideration and the net loss or the lack of gain of commercial while we're dealing with the aging office building, that does give me pause.

[02:28:43] And something we do have to consider is the big scope and then the individual project. I think 29,000 square feet in this project, after running the numbers and seeing the average size of the tenants in the existing building, the makeup of those tenants. I feel comfortable with our ability to both place those tenants either in the new building or elsewhere in the city. But that's a timing issue too. That's a timing issue to when other projects develop and when other buildings get redeveloped. So yes, but we're still watching very, very cautiously the total amount of commercial that the city is expected to gain or lose within the timeframe

[02:29:20] of all these development projects that is excellent because I do believe that mixed-use development for a city this size builds in flexibility 50 years down the road and the lifespan of a building is about 50 years or less so um council member Peterson I'm not sure we've had a chance to hear your assessment of the impact and it's both positive and negative impact of the build-out that's happening by Fairfax County and the judicial area there but it's I'm sure

[02:30:00] has a substantial impact and I would be curious to know more and if it's not something we can do this evening it's okay we can take our time and do that when necessary but I think it's important and in terms of how we understand this project and other things in the area because it helps us misunderstand things like, for instance, what kind of commercial supply will go there, and where does that leave us in terms of the kind of commercial supply response that makes the most sense here.

[02:30:32] I don't know, for instance, whether the commercial office space in the judicial area is going to satisfy the demand for legal services, and as a consequence, the commercial areas that we have would maybe be more better oriented towards other industries that you've alluded to before in terms of us being able to find very strong niche markets in.

[02:30:58] So that would kind of decouple this whole concept of relying upon the judicial commercial development as a way of determining what we do on this site here. They very well could be separable issues. I think that's an important thing, and I'd certainly like to hear more about that.

[02:31:15] Also, I'm mindful of the fact that this site is a stone's throw from George Mason University. And in terms of people who live nearby, near enough to use it, I would be curious to know whether this area, if it was thought a little bit more intensively as an activity area that could serve and support the student body, and for that matter faculty body at George Mason University who are already residing very nearby, whether that is actually something also that would revise the strategy and the structure of this development because going to retail,

[02:31:54] it may be you have a very big retail demand sitting right there already and you don't need to build more captive retail demand on site, which of course frees this up to the niche commercial stuff that you have earlier said is the future of the city where we need to go.

[02:32:11] It would just seem to me there are some real open questions here that we need a little bit more information about. It would be helpful on these points in particular if we could hear back from you on that and think a little bit more about the impact that that has on what we do in this area. The intention here, I think, has generally been this is an activity corridor.

[02:32:30] What that means requires a lot of translation, but the fact that we're proximate to this very major new commercial development at the judicial area, WE'RE NEXT TO THE BIGGEST UNIVERSITY POPULATION AROUND, YOU KNOW, RIGHT NEXT DOOR. I'M NOT SURE I'M HEARING THAT THOSE WERE ACTUALLY INCORPORATED INTO THE DESIGN DECISIONS HERE.

[02:32:48] SO I'D LOVE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT THAT, IF WE MIGHT. ABSOLUTELY. I WILL HAVE TO GET BACK TO YOU ON THE COUNTY PROJECT AND THE MIX OF USE. AND, YOU KNOW, LISTENING TO THE APPLICANT AND TALK ABOUT THE IMPACT OF THAT PROJECT ON THEIRS, THAT IS -- IT IS OBVIOUSLY GOING TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON ALL OF OUR PROJECTS AND EVERYTHING IN THAT CORRIDOR.

[02:33:10] But when I look at it, it's separating it out also because anything that goes on that county side, we don't get the economic impact of it. So we won't know that until after the fact, unfortunately, what that makeup is because that's not something we will be able to control.

[02:33:25] We can see what they plan. I do think that whatever commercial goes on that will be specifically to serve the judicial complex. That would make the most sense. So we might get that opportunity, but that also will come down to the quality of the space of this project and all of the others, and the layout, which is actually as important to the types of business we attract as others.

[02:33:48] We've spoken about this, that our region and our city sees a lot of interest from government contractors, some of whom need specific spaces, some of whom who don't. That comes after a project has been approved and the layout rather than whether or not the commercial space is there.

[02:34:06] So that comes down to the actual owner being willing to work with us on how those commercial units are laid out, on what the lease looks like, what the rate is. That will help us determine the types of businesses that have the highest potential impact in that space.

[02:34:22] As for those niche commercial uses and other uses, I think we do have to look at that across the whole city. We have to be open to commercial uses that are not retail, commercial uses that have a higher employee count or a higher revenue amount that we do not have as much space for right now.

[02:34:42] Whether or not this project is appropriate for that, I'd have to dig into it a little bit more to understand. And can you comment at all about the proximity of Mason? I think that the proximity to Mason is a benefit to most of our buildings. And as we've continued to build out our relationship with Mason, it's hard to say if that would be.

[02:35:02] I think there's certainly been conversation about if there was an opportunity to partner, if there was a project that maybe could go into any one of the potential projects in Old Town, that I think all parties would be open to that. Is there anything on the table? Not that I'm aware of, but potential for sure.

[02:35:20] Yeah, I think whether there's an agreement or not, I think the immediate question that comes to mind is just simply the proximity and presence. You have a population there, and in terms of seeking out retail, for instance, a concern has been that they seek it out currently somewhere other than the city of Fairfax.

[02:35:38] And yet they're right next door. This may be a wonderful opportunity to contribute to that solution, and it's been a longstanding one. And, again, without any agreement with the university, that may be something that could enhance and possibly, you know, help enable that.

[02:35:56] But still, I think there's a simple proximity issue. The fact of the matter is students are going somewhere else. Yeah, and I think we have to look at the mix of retail, restaurant versus retail versus a place you go in to shop. And that is not going to be solved on any one property because the places that have been referenced that people go to to shop are very large developed plans.

[02:36:22] And so I think there are limits to what we can do, but certainly updating projects such as this help us in that overarching discussion. We're not looking at a project of one owner and one developer across a scale where we could change the retail environment.

[02:36:40] but additional people will support the existing retail as well. Thank you. Council Member Hall? Didn't she have her hand up? It's fine. I was just going to dispute some of the points that you had gotten against the things that I'd said, but I realize it's probably not worth it in this venue.

[02:37:03] Thank you. Okay. Maybe we'll get a bookstore. Maybe we'll get a bookstore in our new retail space because it's amazing that a city next to a university doesn't have one. Any further comments? Council Member Bates. So certainly this is a really exciting project, and I think it has a lot of potential and is certainly headed in the right direction.

[02:37:28] And I do want to point out that it is one story above not only the small area plan recommended at maximum height, but also what's currently on the site right there. It's just one story above what's there right now.

[02:37:45] You know, one story is one story, and I do believe that we need to justify that additional story in terms of the benefit to the community. And I know that you all are still having discussions and hope that you will continue to see how you can respond to feedback from local homeowners, the staff, the planning commission, and what we've said to you as well.

[02:38:11] But I think it's definitely headed in the right direction. And I also do want to perhaps take a step back and think about, you know, and I believe that this was back when I was little, when the townhouses across the street were first built, so not really something I remember real clearly.

[02:38:32] But, you know, at the time, you had a three to four store, including the top terrace level townhouses built basically right across the bike trail from one-story single-family homes, and those are first built, there may have been similar concerns about the step up in height that those represented. But now, I mean, I barely remember them not being there, and I think most people probably don't really give it a second thought. So now we have a similar conversation

[02:39:08] around the height on at this project six stories and or you know six stories on chambridge road stepping down four stories and so i think that it's important to put that into context thank you anything else council member mcquillen i thank you i i just wanted to clarify i think some of the residents i've heard from the concerns regarding setback and height are because as you've

[02:39:46] seen this evening in this presentation that whenever council makes a special exception the developers coming in then use those special exceptions to then um use that as as reasoning for asking for their special exception so what becomes six floors or or more in our we have a small area plan for a reason we had residents and we had boards commissions put information into that and time into that. And so I just think that we need to respect the fact that that work was done as well, and that there's a reason we have a small area plan. And so the concerns that I've been

[02:40:24] hearing from residents in relation to those things are because it sets a precedent for the next developer coming in to then ask for more and greater exception. So I just think it's important to acknowledge that thank you council member bates i do also want to point to a specific provision from the small area plan section lastly the old town study area may consider unique and special projects within the downtown area such as institutional uses a boutique hotel and a performing arts center these unique uses have special public merit and civic and economic

[02:41:04] development benefits may require exceptions to the height limits depicted here and are subject to further review by city staff so you know in other words depending on the use and the civic benefit those maximum heights are not necessarily the end-all be-all but you know again we need to see something from the developer to justify that additional height and again also I was comparing this to the buildings that are currently there on the site and have been for many decades that are five stories so you know again just additional story beyond that thanks

[02:41:39] councilmember Peterson and just to follow up on the part of the community feedback on this and first the there's been a lot of kind of indexing what I think I've heard this evening is indexing the size scale and the structure of what happens here based on what happened next door at the Davies property. You're probably aware that resulted in quite a bit of concern by the community. So the idea that that is precedent setting and should be the basis upon and the template upon which we do

[02:42:18] other developments is I don't hear that that's accepted in the community. And so I think we need to be thinking a little bit more independently about this rather than kind of benchmarking what we're doing here against that project. In this case, part of what's going on that I think is creating concerns it's not just height it's density and height combined and the two of those things put together result in something that feels overwhelming and that is the one word that really the trigger word that comes out of this when people look at it it feels overwhelming and there's concern about that and we've

[02:42:57] heard a lot of other specific concerns this evening but if there's one thing that I think would be very helpful to address fundamentally going forward it's how to approach this in a way that is not quite so overwhelming to the people who live in this area and the people who use this area. Thank you.

[02:43:13] Council Member Bates. And one more point I had meant to bring up. Looking at the parking lot, you know, I certainly understand perhaps that, you know, this is the way that it's been done, where you try to have the parking spots as close to the retail and commercial uses as possible.

[02:43:39] But, you know, given that, you know, this is an old town, we're trying to perhaps be a bit less car centric. Would it be possible to consider perhaps moving those top parking spots in that lot down to be directly accessed from the street and then perhaps turn around the couple of the spots on the side?

[02:44:01] You may have to sacrifice a few spots there. But as was mentioned, you know, the site overall anyway is a bit over parked and you could perhaps fit those in elsewhere. But that would allow you a bit more room for additional public open space and or building coverage, which, you know, and again, we're way below the maximum building coverage here, to perhaps do a bit more of what we'd like to see from the project or, you know, perhaps what you'd like to see from the project.

[02:44:35] So if that's something that you could consider and yeah, so any response to that? yeah i mean this is a feedback session we're going to go ahead and take all these comments and collaborate as a team and figure out how we move forward so it's been a lot of feedback and thank you for that also i'd like to add this to it too again going back to the issue of the

[02:45:07] height density etc i don't know how many of you all are real familiar if you will with the Annandale area, but the Annandale has had a comprehensive plan for a long period of time. And Christopher Company has actually just finished up fairly recently a townhouse project over in Annandale. It had broad-based support, et cetera. But there's a lot of other areas

[02:45:39] in Annandale that the county would really like to see developed. The problem, though, is when you actually do, again, the math of just taking a look of existing structures and what those values are, and is it economically viable to go in to buy those properties, to tear them down, to get to the ground, to build.

[02:46:04] That's the reason what is driving the density, again, is the pure aspect of economics. So because with the general market forces, since this is not any kind of a public process, The numbers have to be there for it, or otherwise it doesn't get developed.

[02:46:25] And maybe that's the decision that is made, is we would prefer to have what we have now versus something new. I mean, that's certainly, ultimately, your all's decision of the vote. We have no vote on that. It's only you all.

[02:46:42] We only know from our standpoint that it has to pencil out or otherwise. It's just, I mean, there is no decision about it. It's very simple. It's either it works or it doesn't. And to drop that height to the amount that is being requested, it just doesn't work.

[02:47:07] Council Member Peterson. One thing I forgot to ask, and I may have missed it. It may be built into what you've done, bikes. So we talked a lot about mode shift and alternatives and George Mason and an activity corridor and all that.

[02:47:23] I don't remember seeing how bike access and a bike path gets incorporated into this. And, of course, that's separate from the pedestrian greenway that's in there. You don't want to be using that for bike travel.

[02:47:38] What is the plan on biking for this area? Well, we do have built in, in terms of our facility, bike racks. We don't have specific separate bike lanes, if you will, that is there.

[02:47:57] I mean, it is realistically utilizing the street system that is there. I'm unaware of any separate elements. Yeah, there are protected bike lanes. Sorry, we're not protected, but there are bike lanes that are currently on university that exist there.

[02:48:13] And then the city's plan is actually to continue to extend it. So we would really anticipate most of the cycling activity would come off of university. And then the new street that will run through the site is meant to be shared. So I'm not exactly sure where the bike room is in the project, but that would be accessed off of that.

[02:48:34] Just, if I might, just to be clear, so there's no plan to expand, enhance, upgrade, et cetera, the bike path, which is currently a bike lane. Is that correct?

[02:48:51] There's a lane, at least it's being described as that, on the street, and that's the plan is simply to continue to use that in an as-is condition? That is, I mean, there are currently those facilities exist. The facility I'm referring to is the actual, either the street or something that is next to the street that's actually used for biking, for bike access back and forth between George Mason, between Old Town, between George Mason and Old Town and this particular development.

[02:49:20] That's what I'm really referring to. Yes, there are striped bike lanes on University. And then the plan that the city has is to continue to extend those where they don't exist today. But immediately adjacent to the site on University, there are striped bike lanes. Okay.

[02:49:37] That'd be a great thing to just think a little bit more about because if you're really anticipating alternatives to automobile use and you've got 392 residences there, et cetera, et cetera, it may be worth looking at kind of enhancing your approach to making bike use a little bit more effective.

[02:50:00] Thanks. I appreciate the comment. Thank you. Council Member Bates. so i the uh 10 foot wide pass on either side of the project along chambers road university drive that's we required by the city and i believe the rationale behind that is so that those paths themselves would be up to shared use path with specifications is that right yes there's a couple of things that go into the 10 foot sidewalk requirement in old town one of which is for shared

[02:50:33] use uh at least before we started building bike lanes and things in the in the mid 2000s um so yes those could be used and would connect to where they currently exist or would be widened now the entire frontage along that mega block is not 10 feet so even if they build their section it would be an encumbrance for the rider because they would hit a four or six foot sidewalk at that point yeah yeah but at least we have it there um you know if this is built and uh i do also want to

[02:51:08] um you know going back to the question of uh height and density um you know other than perhaps at fairfax circle i would think that this is um from an economic perspective environmental perspective perhaps one place in the city where we'd like to see uh additional density um given that it's right between the bus routes right near you know q bus routes and then right near metro bus routes as opposed to perhaps seeing those potential residents a bit more you know dispersed wherever

[02:51:42] also closer to shopping dining amenities necessities that are right there in old town and additionally seeing those residents clustered within a development that is planning on pursuing LEED certification um you know i think is another important point um yeah so again you know and then even from the traffic perspective you know uh the um yes you know there would be more trips overall

[02:52:18] you know throughout the day on this from the site um to and from the site but it's to my mind really the peak hours that we want to look at more closely and those perhaps going down a bit um Even with the overall trips going up, I think to me is very preferable.

[02:52:38] So in terms of the density, you know, I'm kind of trying to think through what the issue with it is, you know, from the traffic perspective, from perhaps the neighborhood character perspective.

[02:52:55] We're looking at a site that is to a very significant degree made up of a lot of barren parking lots and very old, frankly, in my opinion, ugly office buildings.

[02:53:11] And I think that the new project, and granted it could certainly perhaps be further modified in terms of facade and the overall aesthetic in some way, but would represent a major step up in terms of the, you know, the contribution to the streetscape and the aesthetic of the area.

[02:53:33] And then from the additional housing perspective, I know that, you know, there are perhaps some people out there who don't want to see a lot of new neighbors in our, in the city, but this would represent a significant contribution to housing, including affordable housing. You know, That 6%, I believe, 24 units is not insignificant.

[02:53:56] And even market rate housing, the effect on housing availability and affordability, you know, is an additional benefit. So, yeah, thank you. All right. Are we good? Do you have feedback?

[02:54:11] The only final comment I would make is that it does have to math. And we understand that if we can't pass a project that maths, then we end up with asphalt parking lots and old office buildings. because that's how it works so 17 million dollars is a lot of money as your baseline to build anything so I understand that this has to be financially feasible and I hope the residents of the city understand that it has to be financially feasible or you're not going to build it because that's just how development works so thank you very much for the presentation

[02:54:50] and we look forward to your resubmission on August 1st and to seeing you again. Thank you all very much. Ms. Shinneberry, what do we have next? Our last item is a discussion on translation services for city council meetings. I'm going to recognize Matthew Kaiser, our

[02:55:08] communications and marketing director for the presentation. Welcome communications team. Hello,

[02:56:09] hello. Should we wait for Mr. Peterson before we proceed or should we just jump in? We can wait a second. We can wait a second. We've all brought up our URL link. Hooray. It's just sitting there like not impressing us so we're kind of waiting for you to tell us what happens next what's next

[02:56:32] oh fantastic oh it's like a surprise inside okay okay english if you know another language you can

[02:56:49] select another language okay meet media scribe the person oh okay oh okay okay let's

[02:57:26] All right. So I'm just going to jump in. First of all, thank you. I'm here with Dave Welch. He's our executive video producer. And Giles Abalos, if you haven't met her, she's our web content manager. She's also a fluent Spanish speaker. You'll be hearing from her shortly. So we were

[02:58:00] We're here in April to present a solution that we found for making these meetings more accessible for people who don't speak English as their first language. And we reviewed a few of those

options with you at that time and mentioned that we were going to proceed with MediaScribe, which is really just an upgrade on the service we have in the back room already.

[02:58:20] So it was pretty easy for us to move in that direction using the cable grant funding from the franchise fees. So Dave actually managed that whole process, working with our vendor to install the unit and the software that goes with it.

[02:58:37] And we've tested it extensively. We had two police officers in here, one who speaks Vietnamese, one who speaks Korean. And they both signed off on the translation capability. Jail has tested it in Spanish. And so we wanted to share it with you and the community to see how it works.

[02:59:00] I think to start, we're just going to show this really brief tutorial video that we created that we already have online. We're going to be pushing this out on Channel 12 as well as social media, just so people will understand how it works. There will be a Spanish voiceover version as well, probably by the end of the week.

[02:59:18] But here we go. Meet MediaScribe, a simple way to help everyone stay connected during city meetings. with real-time captions and translations in over 70 languages for meetings held in the council chambers and the work session room at City Hall. Residents can follow along right on their own

[02:59:40] phones. Here's how it works. Scan the QR code. Very dramatic. Tap the icon. Select a language from over 70 options. If selecting the audio option, please wear headphones. Select your

[03:00:10] preferences, including font size, line spacing, font style, and dyslexia and high contrast options. Read, listen, and understand. Fairfax City and MediaScribe, making local government accessible to all. So that's how it works. Pretty straightforward. This is a very, very new product. To our knowledge, nobody else in the region is using it yet. So thank you for, you

[03:00:49] know supporting something cutting-edge and and different and important the capabilities of the product are still evolving and maturing so right now the best way to use it is if is if you speak a language other than English and you want to participate in these meetings it's really from a passive perspective so you could come to a city council meeting a work session meeting and hear the discussions about a development you know the one you guys just talked about about someone could sit and read that or listen to that in their own language.

[03:01:25] The two-way capability where you guys can actually have a conversation with somebody is being developed. They're expecting that within 12 months, but there is a bit of a workaround that we're going to demonstrate for you right now that is kind of cool. It only works with Spanish, and basically the key is you have to speak into the microphone, right?

[03:01:45] That's where your language is being captured. So right now, the functionality is set knowing that English is the language to look for. And then that's how anybody with the app can translate it to their selected language out of the 70 options. For the two-way conversation part to work, you have to tell it which language you're going to be using first.

[03:02:07] So we're going to tell it to look for Spanish. And it should translate for you in English. And so that's all it took was a couple taps on the iPad to make the switch.

[03:02:28] It just resets the system to look for Spanish. And so now, is your mic on? Yes. Hello. Okay, so I will say a few phrases in Spanish, and it should translate for you.

[03:02:50] Buenas noches. Gracias por hacer que estas reuniones sean accesibles para los residentes que no hablan inglés como su primer idioma. Hoy es martes 7 de julio del 2026.

[03:03:09] La ciudad de Fairfax fue fundada en 1805 como el pueblo de Providence. El número de teléfono principal de la alcaldía es 703-385-7855.

[03:03:28] La dirección de la alcaldía es 104-55, calle Armstrong, Fairfax, Virginia. La Casa Radcliffe Allison Poser, construida en 1812, es la residencia más antigua dentro de la ciudad de Fairfax.

[03:03:51] Y hoy alberga un museo abierto al público. So, you can imagine if J.L. were to show up for her three minutes during a regular council meeting to share her thoughts with you, it would be that easy.

[03:04:07] She would be able to speak in her native language and you would be able to understand what she was asking, requesting, commenting on. Now, here's the fun part. So if you would like to talk to Jayel, we have to switch it back so the system is looking for English from your side.

[03:04:28] This takes a second. This is the functionality that would be much more seamless within the year. This is just brand new. This is new stuff here. So now, if you would like, and also, it's helpful to follow Robert's rules and announce who's going to speak so that the transcription will capture that.

[03:04:51] And she'll know if she were reading. But anyway, so if you'd like to announce someone or if you'd like to speak to Jala directly. Sure. I'm going to recognize Council Member Anthony Amos. Council Member Amos, would you like to speak to us in whichever language you would like to choose?

[03:05:10] This is Council Member Amos. I suppose I shall. I guess I can't say voluntold. That's not a word. But no, this looks like a fantastic system, and I'm very excited to see how this is implemented, especially for our growingly diverse population.

[03:05:28] I think this is going to be extremely exciting, and I can't wait to see its full depth of implementation. So it doesn't make for good TV, but the way it would work is she would have had the app scanned, possibly wearing earbuds, and possibly hearing that in Spanish as you were talking, if not reading it.

[03:05:47] but we can facilitate a two-way conversation. If anybody's interested, if you select Spanish as the language and tap the radio button for audio, as any of us speak into the microphone, you should hear the Spanish version of that translation being spoken through your phone speaker.

[03:06:12] Because when we first talked about this, my understanding was they didn't have the audio. So now you actually can listen to it. So to me, that's a step up from when we originally talked about how this would work. And now you're saying six months out or something.

[03:06:28] It would be even more seamless than that. That's the hope. They're anticipating 12 months to finish that. They call it origination language, what the system is looking for, where it can auto-detect the language and then be able to spit out the translation that you choose.

[03:06:44] So, yeah, when we first spoke about this, they had Spanish as a spoken audio option, but they weren't committing to it because it was beta. And since then, now they have, there's a list of languages that will do spoken audio.

[03:07:01] I have the list. It's more than a dozen at this point. So they're continuing to modify and improve the language models. Yeah, I mean, I think this is just really the cutting edge of what's going to be, again,

and I'm sure AI has a lot to do with the speed at which we're going to figure out, like auto-detecting, if you're speaking Urdu, I have a feeling that it's just going to be a lot more seamless, and all of us will have devices or apps on our phone everywhere, which will make life better for our residents.

[03:07:38] It'll make life better when we travel abroad. I mean, there's a lot of benefit to figuring out the immediate real-time translation of multiple languages, and I've always felt like that was like we were there. It just had not been operationalized into something that regular people can use out in the wild.

[03:07:58] Council Member Amos? Two things. One, how does it work for when we're attending virtually, for example, Council Member McQuillan and Council Member Hall? Hopefully they're able to experience the same thing you did because it's just a website. So with that URL or scanning the code that takes you to that URL, it should be the same experience.

[03:08:19] And it's not tied to specific microphones, so even when they speak, it'll also get transcribed? Good question. That's what I was wondering if they speak so this computer is basically another microphone for this room that is routed through our broadcast system so if they're speaking they should it should detect them and translate so that sounds like a test run a test run I see uh council member mcquillan that's right council member mcquillan would you like to say something yes it's working really well on my end this is just really cool it was neat because I could mute my microphone but then still

[03:08:59] have you speaking to me in Spanish on my phone. So that was, it's working well. It's really impressive. Thank you. Wonderful. Remote testing. Who knew? Anything else? Questions? Oh, go Council Member Hall. Thank you. Yes. Ditto to exactly what Rachel said. Very, very cool. And I'm happy to see how the technology has expanded since we discussed this just a few short months ago.

[03:09:27] And I'm sure it will just continue to explode in a very rapid period of time. So thank you so much the work that went into this for finding this and I'm I'm really really excited about this is this going to work like for all the meetings not just city council meetings what about when the planning commission or bar or anybody who uses the chamber it's it's the microphones in these two rooms so yes right so so so it's not just for city council meetings or work sessions it's any board or advisory board that is in the chamber or the workroom the one thing the one um

[03:10:04] thing that we have to consider is is there video support for it so for like the BAR meetings that's kind of a press record and walk away so but the planning commission the school board and your meetings those are all facilitated by video staff so someone needs to punch it over or just if there's something that arises a problem there's someone here to address it okay well that's good to know I mean it's still a lot of meetings yeah I mean we're broadcasting those meetings and I would think especially with the school board meetings too it might people might tune in more often if they can understand in their native language what's being discussed

[03:10:39] I would imagine. Council Member Peterson? If two people are speaking Spanish, is this set up so that somebody who's not a Spanish speaker will read that dialogue in English? Yes. That's where it's not tricky, but we have to stop the transcription, change the preset in the system to Spanish, and then when they speak Spanish it's looking for Spanish as the input language and then it will translate to English or another language that you choose

[03:11:19] So you're looking at an input that will designate language and then you're also designating an output language and that's how the specs get set up Essentially, it all goes out to a cloud and then back So

it's looking for a language that we set as the preset So we tell it, look for Spanish or look for English as the input language and translate from there and that's where down the line the auto detect when they when they get that fixed or not fixed but when that when that's implemented and it can auto detect languages we won't have to do as much

[03:11:58] swap over for our preset okay yeah the goal is a more flowing conversation back and forth without the cutovers and the weights but it's coming there's a market for it it's market driven and we're excited that the city is on the leading edge of it, to be honest.

[03:12:20] There's a little bit of a delay function, I think, right now. I don't know whether that's going to speed up or we just need to adjust to it. Do you have a sense? I don't have a sense on the delay and improving the delay.

[03:12:36] Something I can ask the company and see if they have an answer. Does this require Wi-Fi? This would also function over your data plan. Okay, very helpful. But potentially slower, right?

[03:12:54] your Wi-Fi is going to be faster. Bueno. Any other questions or comments from anyone? Okay. Yes? Can I just make a plug? JL built a website today that has the video and the steps for how to do this.

[03:13:15] So it's already available. We plan on including the QR code on printed agendas on the table before these meetings. So anyone who arrives can pick one up. We also created a step-by-step flyer with the code.

[03:13:31] The code's not going to change. So these will be available as well, possibly posted on a wall nearby. So people see them and know that the service exists and take advantage of it. So will you send out something citywide, text, email, and will this be making an appearance in the city scene at some point to kind of explain it?

[03:13:52] Yes. Fantastic. I think everyone in the city should be really, really excited. and maybe they'll show up and want to participate. Councilmember Hall? Yeah, I just wanted to say from my perspective, not being in the building, I know sometimes the Wi-Fi there is a little sluggish.

[03:14:08] I'm only about two words behind in what I'm reading versus what you're actually saying. So I'm not seeing any lag time, and I'm clear across the country right now. That's good info. That's fantastic. Another great remote testing that we didn't plan for but worked out exceedingly well.

[03:14:25] You can be across the country and tune into our meetings and listen to our meetings in the language of your choice. It doesn't get much better than that. Any other questions and comments from anyone? Thank you so much. This is really, really exciting. We are so excited about this.

[03:14:42] And with that, I am now going to adjourn this meeting at 10.14 p.m. on Tuesday.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com