

**Comment Response Matrix**

Little City Commons Special Exception Entitlement

Updated: 2/1/2019

	Verbal Staff Questions/Comments (Pre-Submission Meeting 1/23/19)	Applicant Responses (Pre-Submission Meeting)	Assigned Consultant Team
1	City Mgmt Speak a little bit about the office and senior building in Phase 1. What is the current thinking about their locations relative to Route 7 and Street A?	Submitted plan shows the office on Route 7 and the senior building at New Street A and Commons. Through notes on the plans, Applicant reserves flexibility to shift uses within blocks and within the project. Both options have pros and cons. The corner of Leesburg Pike and Commons Drive is a more typical office location providing great signage and visibility along the major auto road in the City. This is often crucial for tenants. This parcel also has more depth so that the building has a larger setback from the garage. The alternate plan places the senior housing building along Route 7 and the office building in board. This creates a nice intimate setting for the office building but it also means that the front door for the entire project along Route 7 is a senior housing project vs. a major economic development driver. Both options can work and the Applicant commits to working with the City and School Board at Site Plan.	N/A
2	City Mgmt What is on the ground floor of the senior housing finger extended in front of the garage?	Ground floor use is not yet determined. It could be retail, open space, bike storage, a lobby, etc. The use will be detailed at Site Plan.	N/A
3	City Mgmt What will the streetscape on Haycock and Route 7 look like?	Applicant has provided street sections in the SEE. Applicant will also provide an additional sheet in the SEE outlining the scope of the NVTA grant work, which directly relates to the streetscape sections in question. Applicant shall provide additional landscape details for the streetscape along Haycock and Route 7 prior to SEE approval.	WLP
4	Planning Understand building exterior materials won't be finalized at this stage but wondering about character and materials?	Architectural details are not recommended to be provided on the SEE checklist. If Staff desires, the Applicant will provide architectural character precedent images as part of the Placemaking and Amenity plan.	TGP

5	Planning	Is it possible to accommodate 6' bike lanes on the Commons? Does the biker have an escape route if a car approaches from the right? Consider materials of buffer to make it rideable. Consider rumble strip in between car lane and bike lane.	Applicant strongly believes that the Commons street section is sufficiently wide given the urban condition with a 4' hardscape buffer, 5' bike lane, 11' travel lane, and 8' parking lane in each direction. Applicant will paint the bike lane for identification and consider a visual or audio alert system (rumble strip, reflectors, etc.) as design progresses. Applicant will consider the biker in selecting a material for the buffer.	N/A
6	Planning	Please include a vertical separation in the 3' buffer on the cycle track on New Street B. Can you widen the cycle track and make the narrower buffer with vertical element included?	Applicant will provide additional information regarding bike lanes as part of the SEE. Applicant intends to provide a vertical separation element. Given the guidance provided by the Urban Bikeway Design Guide and the additional width provided in the buffer, applicant is confident that the cycle track has sufficient width for safe riding in an urban condition.	TGP
7	Planning	Please add a range of unit counts in addition to the square footages to the program summary. Please add a summary of all phases to the binding summary.	Applicant will add these to the "Program Summary" sheet in the SEE.	EYA
8	Planning	Is GSF set at the project scale or block scale? How can we give the Applicant necessary flexibility while ensuring City input on sensitive topics like the location of the senior housing and office on Block B1?	Applicant has presented the concept of a "Proposed Development Plan Program" and a "Binding Development Plan Program" on the Program Summary sheet of the SEE. It is anticipated that the binding aspects of the development program are in regards to project-wide densities. This provides the City with guarantees and comfort regarding density while reserving needed flexibility to shift uses and square footages across the blocks as tenants are acquired and final design is furthered at Site Plan.	N/A

9	Planning Will we have tie ins and backflow prevention infrastructure with the City's irrigation system? They are not visually appealing.	No, the Site is private property so that will be handled within the buildings, except where required in the Haycock/Route 7 streetscape where the City standards are required.	N/A
10	Planning Will you be committing to a min and max development in each phase? Will you be committing to the timing of each phase?	Applicant will begin to address these concerns in the CA negotiation. If deemed necessary by City staff, Applicant will add these details into the SEE prior to approval in May.	N/A
11	Planning Please add a note regarding TDM to come later onto the parking sheet.	Applicant will add the note.	WLP
12	Planning Can you provide an overview of how the utilities are working?	<p>Electric - the applicant will underground the existing utility poles and overhead lines in the vicinity of the street frontages of the project site. Applicant is working with and will continue to work with Dominion Energy and the school development team to coordinate the undergrounding path and proposed services in accordance with the NVTA grant.</p> <p>Gas - applicant is working with Washington Gas to determine relocation of the existing gas cabinets at the corner of Haycock Road and Route 7.</p> <p>Waterline - applicant is working with Fairfax Water and school development team to relocate an existing 20" water transmission line and 6" water main where it is currently in the path of the proposed development. The services to the site will be tapped from the relocated main.</p> <p>Sanitary - the project development will tap into the proposed sanitary main that will be constructed through the site and on Haycock Road.</p> <p>Stormwater - The stormwater management design will be met through a combination of measures. This could include bioretention basins/planters, green roof, permeable pavement, and underground filtering devices. Underground detention vaults will also be utilized to manage the rate of outfall from the property. The outfall will be distributed between connection points to the east and west from the high point on the site through a piped network.</p>	WLP

13	Planning	I like the landscape plan thus far, especially how it relates to the uses on either side of the Commons and the central lawn idea. What are the anticipated hours of usage for the Commons?	Hours of activity and where along the Commons they occur will ultimately depend on the retail merchandising mix. In our design, we anticipate opportunities for an 18-hour community. Applicant suggests adding an additional sheet to the SEE showing circulation during a large event where the entire Commons is blocked off.	WLP
14	Planning	Are there reasons for people to come here even if they're not coming to a specific store or an office tenant?	Yes, that's the intent. Applicant notes the importance of achieving view corridors from major access points, especially Route 7, to draw people into the project. The Applicant will also have a place-management program, regularly hosting events to bring the community to the project.	N/A
15	Planning	I believe there is an opportunity at the end of the Commons by Route 7 to provide a vertical placemaking element. This will draw people into the site.	Applicant agrees with the importance of intentional placemaking and signage design. The Applicant shall develop a Placemaking and Amenity Plan to be approved at SEE approval which identifies potential locations for art, sculpture and placemaking throughout the project and the style or types of elements to be considered. This will be further developed and updated at Site Plan.	N/A
16	Planning	Can we build a sportsplex on the pre-cast parking garage on Block B1 in the future?	The current plan is a pre-cast parking garage, which cannot structurally support a sportsplex use on the top level in a financially feasible way. Applicant is willing to change the structural design at the City's request and with financial support of the City. The SEE will contemplate the current deal, but Applicant is happy to continue the conversation.	N/A
17	Planning	It will be important to have even lighting throughout the entire length of the Commons.	Applicant will submit and seek to have approved by Site Plan a placemaking and design package, which will include specialty lighting concepts. The Applicant shall submit a photometric study as part of the Site Plan package describing the use and level of lighting along the Commons.	N/A
18	Planning	Are the bike lanes on Commons Drive one way?	Yes.	N/A

19	Planning	Can you provide examples of how Commons Drive functions? For instance, similar designs function well on Commonwealth Ave in Boston, Winchester, and Burlington.	Applicant will provide precedent images of similarly designed boulevards that promote multimodal transportation and slow moving cars as part of the Placemaking and Amenity plan.	TGP
20	Planning / CPEDS	Suggested that café zones and clear pedestrian zones be designated on the plan, understanding that door locations are TBD. Put a note on the plan sheet that ensures that café zones will not conflict with fire access. Put a note on the plan sheet that there will be sufficient clear space for pedestrians.	Applicant will add café zone information to the SEE.	TGP
21	CPEDS	Some of Regency's more interesting places have public art. Think about places to put that here.	Applicant agrees with the importance of intentional placemaking and has included a budget in the pro forma for such. Public art is a key aspect of placemaking. Applicant will submit and seek to have approved by Site Plan both a comprehensive signage package and a placemaking and design package to address these issues.	N/A
22	CPEDS	Will the intersection at Main & Main be tabletopped? Will there be 4 stop signs?	The goal is for this intersection to be tabletopped with 6 stop signs. Our civil engineer and planner shall study this during site plan to confirm that grading will work and that the condition will not create a ponding condition. Refer to "Transportation and Street Plan" sheet in the SEE.	N/A
23	CPEDS	Can you please show continuity of internal sidewalks in the Site Plan? Can you please show sidewalks off site like on Haycock?	Yes, applicant will show the continuation of sidewalks across loading areas, alleys, etc. The intent of the circulation of the site is to prioritize the pedestrian.	TGP
24	CPEDS	How does the project relate to Route 7 and Haycock? Would be useful to see pedestrian connectivity. Want more pedestrian connection along Haycock and east into the City.	Applicant understands the need for connectivity, which we have promoted through the design of a street grid that enables multimodal transportation. Applicant has proposed a full movement stop light and pedestrian HAWK signal on Haycock, and the streetscape section of Haycock provides for a generous sidewalk. Applicant will add a sheet to the SEE outlining the scope of the NVTA grant work and connections to neighboring properties, given its impact on the streetscape of Haycock.	WLP
25	CPEDS	Are we including a 19' area on our property on the VA Tech side? If so, why? Is there an alternate scheme that uses that land? Can we coordinate with VA Tech?	Applicant and City Mgmt have begun coordination with VA Tech. Applicant notes the challenges that the grade, utility connections, and VA Tech access road currently exist in that 19' area.	N/A

26	CPEDS	What is the limit on Assisted Living?	Applicant has agreed to 60% Independent Living as a minimum in the senior housing building.	N/A
27	CPEDS	Are you planning on incorporating garage technology into the pre-cast garage on Block B1 to tell people where to go and how many spaces are available?	Applicant notes that the current budget assumes some garage wayfinding investment, but has not yet designed to that level of detail.	N/A
28	CPEDS	How are you dealing with the outdoor public/private spaces here? Have you contemplated street furnishings and landscape? A small urban design manual?	Applicant will submit and seek to have approved by Site Plan a Placemaking and Amenity Plan which will address street furnishings.	N/A
29	CPEDS	Where are the projects that the landscape character images are from?	Applicant will caption the images with locations.	LD
30	CPEDS	Have you contemplated posted speed limits on the internal streets?	Applicant has not yet achieved that level of detail, but will address this at Site Plan. It is contemplated that the speed limit will be approximately 20 MPH.	N/A
31	FCCPS	I like the Main & Main intersection especially because it will serve to slow down cars as they approach the schools. Just want to make sure there's enough room for parent car drop off.	Applicant has indicated room for parent car drop off on the "Site Circulation School Hours" sheet in the SEE.	N/A
32	FCCPS	Will there be café zones on New Street A in between Block B1 and B2? Want to make sure there's sufficient pedestrian clear space to accommodate school children.	Yes, it is currently assumed that the corner retail locations on Blocks B1 and B2 will have restaurants that require the flexibility for outdoor seating. The streetscape design as indicated in the SEE provides sufficient room for pedestrian activity, and will be further detailed in the previously mentioned café zone sheet. Applicant intends to include a minimum of 6'0" clear pedestrian zone.	N/A

33	FCCPS	What is the interaction between the senior housing and the public space? Specifically the school plaza.	The senior housing will have its own private outdoor space within the footprint of the building. This is typically on level 2 for security of the residents. The building windows will front Street A and Commons Drive. There is no intentional interaction between the senior housing building and the school although there could be volunteer opportunities for students to care for the elderly.	N/A
34	FCCPS	Will the HAWK signal be at the south side of New Street B and Haycock? Will there be a sidewalk at the north and south sides of this intersection?	Applicant notes the challenges that the significant grade on the VA Tech site present in providing a handicap ramp on the north side of the street, and thus suggests the crosswalk remain on the south side of New Street B. Applicant will explore the possibility of separating the bike and pedestrian crossing activity at this intersection (bikes north, peds south) as Virginia Tech redevelops.	WLP
35	FCCPS	Do you have an exhibit showing the site area boundary?	Per Wyatt's guidance, Applicant will discuss with the School Board at the next CCC meeting and follow up.	EYA
36	FCCPS	Are the transformer locations set? Schools has concern regarding above grade transformers on Blocks B1 and B2.	Applicant notes that the current transformer locations are not set in stone, but that above grade transformers are assumed for Blocks B1, B2 & C.	N/A
37	FCCPS	What flexibility do you have regarding the height of the pre-cast garage on Block B1? Can you commit to a range of height?	Applicant will add a note indicating a commitment to a range of height.	TGP
38	FCCPS	Can you add a streetsection for the garage side of School Rd?	Applicant will add this streetsection.	TGP
39	FCCPS	What is the height of the senior housing finger? Does the height change if the senior housing building and the office flip positions?	Applicant will provide additional views similar to that on the current "Massing Diagram" sheet that allow the height of the senior housing finger in the proposed development plan to be more easily identified. The Applicant is willing to agree to a maximum height for this portion of the project	TGP
40	FCCPS	Will there be a shadow study? Need heights to be compatible with the school.	Applicant will include a note in the SEE set committing to addressing #6 on the SEE checklist which contemplates varied building heights and height compatibility. Applicant will include a shadow study for the buildings adjacent to the school.	TGP
41	Arborist	Have you thought about providing a dog walk area?	Applicant has provided designated dog relief stations on many projects of similar scale in thoughtfully designed locations that enable successful and sanitary environments to flourish. Applicant shall study ways to accommodate this demand.	N/A

42	Staff	Is this utility plan consistent with the green infrastructure plan described in your RFDP submission?	Applicant notes that the utility design is preliminary and will be refined during the Site Plan process. Applicant remains committed to sustainability through the commitment to LEED standards in the IA.	N/A
43	Staff	Have you talked to Dominion about these transformer locations yet?	Applicant has engaged Dominion, but notes that the current transformer locations are not set in stone.	N/A
<b>APPLICANT QUESTIONS</b>				
	Applicant	Infrastructure approvals and permitting process	Applicant would like to get smaller pieces of a larger infrastructure plan approved faster in the case of the gas cabinet relocation and the water line. Applicant will need undergrounding work to occur before Block A starts. Applicant will discuss these details at the Campus Infrastructure and Planning meeting Wednesday, Jan 30. Applicant will plan a separate meeting on the permitting process.	EYA
	Applicant	Alternate plan optionality	Applicant spoke with City Manager regarding an additional sheet with the alternate below-grade parking option should the above grade pre-cast deck not go forward. It was determined that this would be a change to the plan if needed later on rather than an alternate sheet.	TGP

	<b>Written Staff Comments (Post Pre-Submission Meeting 1/28/19)</b>	<b>Applicant Responses (Post Pre-Submission Meeting)</b>	<b>Assigned Consultant Team</b>
1	Comp. w/ IA There are discrepancies between the Interim Agreement (IA), the draft SEE application, and recently proposed amendments to the development program. Additionally, the land area and uses in Phase 2 have changed from the IA. These details are currently being discussed but ultimately the IA and SEE application will need to be consistent.	Applicant acknowledges the moving pieces and agrees that ultimately the CA and approved SEE need to be consistent. The Max GSF for residential in the SEE submission is now consistent with the IA.	N/A
2	Comp. w/ IA Program commitments included in Exhibit B "Material Terms" of the IA should be included as binding elements/voluntary concessions of the Special Exception Entitlement. Include maximum square footages for residential uses and minimum square footages for commercial uses for each phase.	Applicant will add information to the Program Summary Chart in the SEE.	TGP
3	Comp. w/ IA Provide anticipated alternative building use and layout scenarios. In addition to potential alternatives discussed for Blocks A, B1 and C, Block B2 of the January 23, 2019 depicts the hotel wrapping around the entertainment venue and facing the school plaza. This appears to be a new concept and would warrant greater discussion.	The SEE offers the Applicant needed flexibility with various alternative scenarios. Once feedback is received from the community and a direction selected by the Applicant, a specific design direction for each building and block layout shall be included in the SEE Site Plan application and approved by the City Council. For the sake of simplicity and given time constraints, the Applicant has chosen one particular site plan layout for submission. If Staff desires to see a few alternative plans as part of the submission, Applicant can work on those plans prior to the Council First Reading of the Application. Applicant has reviewed the hotel design from the current SEE submission relative to the RFDP submission. The ground level plan is almost identical. The upper level of the of hotel has been extended slightly towards Street B. Refer to the Appendix exhibit titled "Ground Level Land Use Plan".	N/A
4	Comp. w/ IA Include a square footage breakdown of retail use types (e.g. hotel, general retail, civic, etc.)	Further detail regarding the retail merchandising mix and ranges of associated retail use square footages will be provided as part of the CA negotiations but not included in the SEE.	Regency

5	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(1), SEE Required Elements</p>	<p><i>Planning Division Disclosure Form.</i> Form must be signed and notarized. [SEE Checklist #2]. Additionally, Sec. 48-486(c) states that written owner consent is required. Please plan to work with CFC and FCCPS staff to obtain the necessary documentation for this requirement.</p>	<p>Applicant connected with Carly 1/28 and she noted that Carol would work with FCCPS to create a one page legal document that would serve as "necessary documentation".</p>	<p>CFC / FCCPS</p>
6	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(1), SEE Required Elements</p>	<p><i>Density.</i> Provide a discussion of how the project densities would be consistent with guidance in the city's comprehensive plan, specifically the goals in "Special Revitalization District for Education and Economic Development".</p>	<p>Applicant will provide.</p>	<p>BJL</p>
7	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(1), SEE Required Elements</p>	<p><i>Uses.</i> Proposal subject to staff review and fiscal impact analysis to determine if significant commercial (retail, office or hotel) uses are included in the project and where the residential uses contribute significant positive net revenue benefits, build community, and help achieve the goals and strategies of the "special revitalization district for education and economic development" and related plans and policies. [Sec. 48-488(b)(1)b.] Please provide an updated Fiscal Impact Analysis Data Sheet with the SEE application.</p>	<p>Applicant will provide this detailed information at Site Plan.</p>	<p>EYA</p>
8	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(1), SEE Required Elements</p>	<p><i>Building height .</i> 1) Proposed building heights vary over the site, with tallest heights proposed along Haycock Road and decrease as the development approaches the school campus. Up to six stories are shown adjacent to school. A shadow study for the massing adjacent to the school campus should be included with SEE submission; 2) Per Sec. 48-488(b)(3)d1., approval of SESP includes consistency with criteria in Sec. 48-90 for consideration, and Sec. 48-90 talks about <i>size, bulk and scale</i>. As such, massing as related to height is subject to further staff review at SESP phase when more architectural details are available.</p>	<p>Applicant will include a note in the SEE set committing to addressing #6 on the SEE checklist which contemplates varied building heights and height compatibility. Applicant has included a shadow study for the site.</p>	<p>TGP</p>

9	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(1), SEE Required Elements</p> <p><i>Parking.</i> Per Sec. 48-488(b)(1)d., 1) provide parking analysis/tabulation based on Zoning Code requirements for each phase of development (this information may be provided as a range; 2) For the requested parking reduction, submit draft TDM with SEE subject to staff review and to be finalized at SESP; 4) Per Sec. 48-488(b)(1)d., above ground structured parking must be wrapped or otherwise screened from view. Information or plans regarding how this requirement is met should be provided at SEE.</p>	<p>1) Applicant has provided minimum and maximum parking ratios. Exact parking counts shall be determined at SEE Site Plan once the buildings are further designed and the parking design and operations are more detailed; 2) Applicant will provide a work plan outlining the TDM. A draft TDM is too detailed at this stage of design.; 4) Applicant will include conceptual images regarding the character of the screening envisioned on the B1 pre-cast deck. Applicant will include notes on the SEE plan indicating that the garages on Blocks A and B1 are naturally ventilated, and as such 50% of facade needs to be open for air venting purposes. Applicant will work with the City at Site Plan to ensure sufficient visual interest.</p>	TGP
10	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application</p> <p><i>Statement of justification.</i> The letter should provide an analysis on how the project achieves the applicable goals of the “Special Revitalization District for Education and Economic Development”, as well as any other relevant goals in the Comprehensive Plan. This should include, but not be limited to, a discussion of how the project could incorporate recommendations made in the site specific studies, such as the Urban Design Guidelines.</p>	Applicant will provide.	BJL
11	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application</p> <p><i>Proposed structures:</i> 1) Building heights are shown in stories. Per Sec. 48-488(b)(2)c.4., show it in feet as well; 2) Provide unit count by type for age-restricted housing, residential apartments, and condos; and provide the number of hotel rooms.</p>	1) Applicant will provide; 2) Applicant will provide a range.	TGP
12	<p>Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application</p> <p><i>Transportation and Street Plan:</i> Per Sec. 48-488(b)(2)c.6., 1) include dimensions for sidewalk along School Road West adjacent to the proposed shared garage; 2) show existing and proposed bus and transit facilities.</p>	1) Applicant will provide an additional street section; 2) Applicant will propose locations	WLP and TGP

13	Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application	<i>Open Space and Recreation:</i> since the school plaza is shown on the SEE layout plan, dimensions for the plaza should be provided per Sec. 48-488(b)(2)c.7 for reference.	The school plaza is on school property and part of their current Site Plan Application and as such is not detailed on this SEE. It is shown simply or reference.	N/A
14	Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application	<i>Phasing Plan:</i> Per Sec. 48-488(b)(2)e., provide the following elements on the conceptual development plan and in the Statement of Justification: 1) proposed timing of construction as related to construction of phases; 2) number of dwelling units (condo or residential) to be included in phase 2 and phasing plan for construction of parking; 3) parking shall be provided for each use at or prior to occupancy of each building.	1) Timing shall be negotiated as part of the CA; 2) Applicant has provided ranges; 3) Understood. Applicant will add a sheet to the SEE that provides additional phasing information as well as notes regarding interim conditions.	TGP
15	Sec. 48-488(b)(2), SEE Application	<i>Parking Reduction:</i> Per 48-488(b)(2)c.f., provide a narrative/justification for the requested parking reduction waiver.	Applicant is requesting the approval of parking ratios rather than a specific reduction calculated using a fixed number of spaces. Further information and calculations regarding the parking space count will be provided at SEE Site Plan. Applicant will add notes justifying the waiver at that time.	GS
16	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	<i>All applicable pages/sheets of site plan packet:</i> Campus site layout and the WFC layout plans do not seem to align, particularly where the two plans meet at Street B.	The school design build team is aware of the misalignment and intend to adjust as a future amendment to their Site Plan.	N/A
17	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	<i>All applicable pages/sheets:</i> overlapping and multiple lines shown around the garage entrance on School Road West. Please clean-up for submission.	Applicant will do so.	N/A
18	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	<i>Commons Drive, Page 9:</i> Bike lane width on Commons Drive is shown as 5'-0". Bike lane width should be increased to 6'0" in order to further minimize potential conflicts between bicyclists and motorists. Color paint within the bike lane should be maintained.	Applicant strongly believes that the Commons street section is sufficiently wide given the urban condition with a 4' hardscape buffer, 5' bike lane, 11' travel lane, and 8' parking lane in each direction. Applicant will paint the bike lane for identification and consider a visual or audio alert system (rumble strip, reflectors, etc.) as design progresses. Applicant will consider the biker in selecting a material for the buffer.	N/A

19	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	<i>Northern School Road (New Street B), Page 11</i> : Bike lane width in the two way cycle track is shown as 4'0" per lane, with 3'-0" buffer. Bike lane width should be increased to 6'-0" per lane and maintaining 3'-0" buffer, to increase bicyclist safety and encourage more trips made by bicycle in and around the West Falls Church Economic Development Project Site.	According to NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, the desirable bike lane width next to a curbface is 6'. The desired rideable surface adjacent to a street edge or longitudinal joint is 4 feet with a minimum width of 3 feet. The Applicant has provided a 5 foot bike lane next to a 4 foot hardscape buffer. This creates a 9 foot rideable surface which more than exceeds the recommendation from NACTO. Applicant will paint the bike lane for identification and consider a visual or audio alert system (rumble strip, reflectors, etc.) as design progresses. Applicant will consider the biker in selecting a material for the buffer.	N/A
20	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	Consider providing up to 15% green space. Green Space is defined as areas with plants growing in the ground excluding streetscapes and buffers, but a percentage of paved landscape area may be acceptable. While this is not an adopted policy it is an anticipated comment from the Tree Commission.	Applicant will perform calculations to determine provided green space.	WLP
21	Add'l Comments for SEE Review	Provide a landscape concept that includes actual elements (planter designs, lighting, benches, paving styles, etc.) that will be used throughout the development to hold the overall project together visually.	Applicant will provide these details as part of the Placemaking and Amenity plan.	LD
22	Considerations for SESP	Review Streetscape Design Standards for Commercial Streets for streetscape along Haycock Road, Route 7, and New Street B.	Applicant will do so.	WLP
23	Considerations for SESP	<i>Haycock Road and Route 7 Street Sections:</i> 12' and 13'-6" are proposed for sidewalk width. Consider some landscaping at the building edge if to be this width at SESP phase.	Building edge landscaping will be contemplated at Site Plan.	N/A
24	Considerations for SESP	Block A and Block B1 are over 300' long, and no mid-block pedestrian crossings are shown at this time. Consider mid-block crossings along New Street A and New Street B, particularly where these streets meet the Alley (through Block C) and at the garage entrance between Block B1 and B2.	Applicant will add pedestrian crosswalks.	WLP
25	Considerations for SESP	Consider landscaping around the garage entrance on School Road West	Applicant will consider.	N/A

26	Considerations for SESP	Will the transformers shown above ground be screened from view?	Transformers will be generally screened to a typical level.	N/A
27	Considerations for SESP	<i>Comprehensive Sign Package:</i> this can be submitted at SESP as part of site plan, subject to review and approval by the Architectural Advisory Board. Any sign variances identified at that time will be subject to BZA approval.	Noted.	N/A
28	Considerations for SESP	As the design and space planning elements are finalized for the Commons area, discussions regarding the ability for CFC and FCCPS to use the area for special events should be included as a binding element or voluntary concession.	The Commons area will be privately owned and operated by the Applicant or their successors or assigned, and serve as a central element to the success of the overall development. The Commons shall have a public access easement ensuring that the space is open to the public 24 hours per day 365 days per year. As part of the easement agreement, the Applicant will ensure that publicly sponsored events can take place within the commons with the approval of the Applicant who shall be responsible for ensuring that there are not scheduling or programmatic conflicts.	Dev Team
29	Considerations for SESP	The project should show that it can achieve at least a 15% canopy cover at 20 years, as a separate item from the green space (aerial cover vs. land cover). Estimate at 175 square feet each for large shade trees, and 100 square feet each for flowering trees. Falls Church has a strong preference for using predominantly native plants in the landscape.	Applicant will perform calculations to determine potential canopy cover. The current design shows approximately 5% coverage from street trees. The Applicant will work with staff to better understand methods to improve upon this coverage ratio.	LD
30	Considerations for SESP	Power, gas, water, sewer and communication lines can be routed under the sidewalk if necessary, but they must not be routed under tree planters.	Noted.	N/A
31	Considerations for SESP	Consider awnings when preparing architectural design. They protect the sidewalk from leaves, bug droppings, rain, snow and ice; preventing leaves, snow and ice keeps the sidewalk safe and relatively clean 24/7 without machinery or chemicals.	Applicant will consider and shall include as part of the placemaking and amenity plan.	N/A

**EYA WEST FALLS CHURCH****TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PLAN DRAFT****FEBRUARY 1, 2019****INTRODUCTION**

The proposed EYA West Falls Church mixed-use development is planned to be located at the intersection of Leesburg Pike and Haycock Road. The density and land use mix will continue to evolve throughout the Special Exception Entitlement (SEE) and Special Exception Site Plan (SESP) processes.

The development is situated in close proximity to two (2) major commuter corridors: I-66 and Route 7 (Leesburg Pike). The proposed development is located approximately 0.25 miles from the West Falls Church Metrorail Station (Silver and Orange Lines), as the crow flies. The walking distance to the Metro platform is approximately 0.30 miles. The site is currently served by two (2) WMATA Metrobus routes with five (5) bus stops within a quarter mile of the site.

**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)**

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is the establishment of measures to influence travel behavior by mode, frequency, time, route or trip length in order to achieve a maximally efficient use of transportation facilities. These strategies could be traditional or technology-based services to help people choose transit, ridesharing, walking, biking, etc. instead of solo driving.

The proposed mixed-use development will implement a variety of strategies in a formal TDM Plan for the site to align with the City's vision for the region. The full TDM Plan will be drafted during the SESP process.

TDM strategies to be included in the Plan may include any combination of the following strategies:

- Site Design, Infrastructure, and Options
  - Bicycle accommodations,
  - Car-share program
  - Pedestrian facilities
  - Electric vehicle charging stations
- Promotion, Education, and Incentives
  - Interactive, intra/internet resources for residents/customers/visitors
  - Rideshare matching
  - Infrastructure to support safer public transportation
  - Transit program incentives
  - Unbundling of residential parking with units and leases
  - Active marketing of transportation strategies