

McLean Citizens Association
Resolution on Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment (S13-II-TY1)
March 10, 2017

Whereas, on June 22, 2010, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) approved the Tysons Comprehensive Plan Amendment that, *inter alia*, authorized the redevelopment of Tysons Corner into a dense urban area and established certain benchmarks and guidelines to guide development over at least the following 20 years, i.e., to 2030; and

Whereas, the approved Tysons Plan Amendment contains the following commitments to the residents of Fairfax County:

- To ensure that the construction of the required infrastructure proceeds in tandem with, and is in place prior to, development that yields major increases in intensity;
- To ensure that Tysons becomes a destination where residents and employees can live, work, and play; and
- To ensure that impacts on the surrounding communities, outside of Tysons, are mitigated and that Tysons growth does not come at the expense of their quality of life; and

Whereas, on March 5, 2013, the BOS tasked the Planning Commission (PC) to reconcile the approved 2010 Tysons Comprehensive Plan Amendment text and maps with the studies and planning activities that had been completed since Board approval of the 2010 Plan Amendment; and

Whereas, the draft Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment, dated January 25, 2017, extends the planning horizon and development requirements to 2050; and

Whereas, in a letter dated January 28, 2017 and subsequent testimony at the PC's February 8, 2017 public hearing on the draft Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment, the four standing committees and two liaison groups of MCA that reviewed the draft Plan expressed the following concerns:

- That language in the draft Plan, which states that some of Tysons athletic field needs could be met by adding or upgrading fields outside of the Tysons boundaries, contravenes the 2010 Plan commitments made to the public to place 20 athletic fields in Tysons and to mitigate impacts from Tysons development on surrounding communities, and would further encourage developers to seek to avoid the requirement to build 20 fields in Tysons;
- That the draft's proposal to eliminate the Initial Development Level (IDL) for office uses and associated criteria would threaten achievement of the balance between office and residential uses established in the 2010 Plan and would exacerbate traffic congestion;
- That there needs to be a more explicit linkage between achievement of Traffic Demand Management (TDM) goals and Tysons build-out to 84 Million Square Feet, which is the build-out goal for 2030;
- That, to mitigate impacts on the lower density areas in the Dranesville District that are adjacent to Tysons, additional language is required in the draft Plan to ensure that the de-

sign of the planned expansion of Magarity Road pay due consideration to the fact that it abuts a low-density residential neighborhood in the Dranesville District;

- That language in the draft Plan that called for consideration of moving the Tysons Pimmit Regional Library from the Dranesville District to Tysons Central District 7 in Providence District failed to consider the ongoing renovation of the library and, if implemented, would negatively impact Dranesville residents; and

Whereas on March 2, 2017, the PC incorporated changes to the January 25, 2017 draft Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment that resolved MCA's concerns with regard to Magarity Road and the Tysons-Pimmit Regional Library; and

Whereas, the MCA considers as an acceptable compromise on the IDL issue the PC's decisions on March 2, 2017 to (1) change the IDL of 45 Million square feet (MSF) to a Milestone Development Level (MDL) for office uses of 55 Million Square Feet (MSF), consistent with the Plan's extended planning horizon and the George Mason University 2050 high office use estimate, and (2) establish a Tysons Urban Center Development Monitoring Program, which would provide for strengthened and integrated monitoring of progress toward operational milestones and the goals imbedded in the draft Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment; and

Whereas, language added to the draft Plan regarding the need to monitor achievement of TDM goals and the above-mentioned Tysons Urban Center Development Monitoring Program begin to address MCA's concerns with regard to ensuring that development does not outpace improvements to the transportation network; and

Whereas, the above-mentioned Monitoring Program could serve as a more effective tool in ensuring that development does not outpace improvements to the transportation network, if it were: (1) developed with broad stakeholder input, (2) publically available, (3) used current technology for measurement, (4) regularly updated and (5) used in County decisions with respect to further development within Tysons; and

Whereas, on March 2, 2017, the PC removed from the draft Plan the language cited above that stated that Tysons athletic field needs could be met outside of Tysons' boundaries; and

Whereas, however, MCA remains concerned that the most recent Park Authority documents pertaining to Tysons (i.e., the 2010 Tysons Park System Concept Plan, the Tysons Athletic Field Needs Analysis, and the spreadsheet on Public Athletic Fields Near Tysons Corner) discount the possibility of building within Tysons all of the diamond fields that the Park Authority determined to be required to serve Tysons and strongly suggest that between 8-10 of the 11 required diamond athletic fields could be located outside of Tysons, potentially with lighting and active use after 11 pm; and

Whereas, Park Authority staff has not yet responded to MCA inquiries regarding the analyses underpinning the above-noted Park Authority documents, including the lack of reference to impacts on the surrounding communities, both today and in the future; and

Whereas, if these documents and the underpinning analyses are not revisited, the outcome could be that the full and necessary complement of 20 athletic fields is not built within Tysons' boundaries, which would be a wholesale reversal of a major commitment to the public to place 20 athletic fields in Tysons, undercut the ability to attract residents to Tysons, further stress athletic fields in surrounding communities which lack sufficient useable land to meet both Tysons needs and the needs of their communities, likely cause neighborhood concerns about lighted fields and post-11 pm use, and increase traffic congestion.

Now, therefore be it resolved that the McLean Citizens Association commends the Planning Commission and County staff for their consideration of the concerns expressed by the MCA regarding the draft Tysons Implementation Plan Amendment; and

Be it further resolved that the McLean Citizens Association urges the BOS to adopt a Follow-on Motion directing the Park Authority to conduct a study of how to achieve the Plan Amendment requirement for 20 athletic fields within Tysons, with input from stakeholders within and outside of Tysons, including the Tysons Partnership, the MCA, and the Town of Vienna, and to complete the study and report its results within 6 months; and

Be it further resolved that the McLean Citizens Association urges the BOS to direct that the Tysons Urban Center Development Monitoring Program ensures: 1) broad stakeholder input in the development of the program; (2) that program results are publically available; (3) that current technology is used for measurement; (4) that program results are regularly updated; and, (5) that the results are used in County decisions with respect to further development within Tysons.

Approved by the MCA Executive Committee on behalf of the Board of Directors

March 10, 2017

McLean Citizens Association, P.O. Box 273, McLean, Virginia 22101

cc: John Foust, Dranesville District Supervisor
Linda Smyth, Providence District Supervisor
Cathy Hudgins, Hunter Mill District Supervisor
John Ulfelder, Dranesville Planning Commissioner
Phillip Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence Planning Commissioner
Frank de la Fe, Hunter Mill Planning Commissioner
Benjamin Wiles, Dranesville Supervisor's Staff
Clerk, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Clerk, Fairfax County Planning Commission
Director, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning
Director, Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Executive Director, Fairfax County Park Authority
Director, Fairfax County Park Authority Park Planning Branch