New Comprehensive Plan Review Committee

Envisioning Loudoun - 2040

PUBLIC COMMENT Talking Points
“We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.”
HOW YOU CAN HELP

**LEARN**
Key issues with Draft and Actions to Improve
Summaries posted on
www.LoudounCoalition.org/compplan

**PREPARE**
Organization-specific Comments
Monitor BOS Worksessions:
www.Loudoun.gov/4957/ Loudoun-2040-Comprehensive-Plan

**CONTACT**
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
www.Loudoun.gov/bos-contact
EMAIL: BOS@Loudoun.gov

**ATTEND**
PUBLIC HEARINGS
Register April 5th:
703-777-0115
DATES:
Wed. April 24th 6pm
Sat. April 27th, 9am
Public Input Summary – 6,500 comments
Defined: WHERE TO FOCUS COMP PLAN

- Cap on Housing/Capacity
- Grow in UPA
- Don’t suburbanize TPA
- Make RPA Permanent

Manage Growth

Keep Loudoun Unique & Desirable
- Protect Environment & Heritage Assets
  - Protect network, parks & trails
  - (Emerald Ribbons)
  - County-Wide Watershed Plan

Improve Public Facilities & Services
- Improve safety
- Traffic calming, not road widening
- Focus on funding capacity for public facilities & services

Fiscal Management & Accountability
- Transparency
- Fiscal prudence
- Measurable objectives

Manage Growth

County-Wide Watershed Plan

Transparency

Fiscal prudence

Measurable objectives
Preliminary Coding results:

- **GOOD NEWS:**
  - ~67% Policies, Strategies & Actions rated as “Good” or “Benign”

- **Other input thus far:**
  - ~20% - requesting *Strengthen* and/or minor language changes
  - ~3% - requesting to *Delete*
  - ~10% - requesting to *Add* (missing or removed in prior versions)

- **In Progress:** Finalizing text/language comments. (Goal: 1st April work session)
PRIMARY CONCERNS with 2040 Plan Draft Require Corrective Modifications

Fiscal & Physical RISKS of Growth

Damage To QUALITY OF LIFE
CONCLUSIONS UP FRONT:

Fiscal & Physical RISKS in Current Draft

1. **Manage Housing Growth** to Regional Demand Levels;
2. **Urban Policy Area** metro requires specific area plans;
3. **Suburban Policy Area** requires Small Area Plans to avoid physical facility deficits and less reliance on Mixed Use;
4. **Transition Policy Area** requires original area plan be maintained: Limit density, reduce data centers and commercial, no additions from Rural Policy Area;
5. **Rural Policy Area** requires commitment to conservation tools and residential growth and rural economy compatible with rural surroundings.

Damage To Current QUALITY OF LIFE

6. **Natural and Historic Assets** require greater protections; restore “Green Infrastructure” concept to current text;
7. **Parks and Trails** require clearer focus on community requests;
8. **Fiscal Analysis “Reality check”:** Transportation integration with land use decisions and long-term economic health; **Sustainable Fiscal Revenue Policy.**
HOW MUCH & WHERE we grow determines our QUALITY OF LIFE

➢ Roads and Traffic

➢ Schools
  • Quantity & crowding
  • Boundary line adjustments

➢ Public Facilities & Services
  • Health, Fire/Rescue
  • Parks & Trails

➢ Fiscal/Tax burden

➢ Preservation of Natural & Heritage Resources
  • Clean Air & water quality
  • Farms for food & recreation
MANAGE HOUSING GROWTH FOR QUALITY OF LIFE
Regional Demand Levels

Housing Growth @ Regional Levels

Current Draft Issues
- Demand ‘Myths’
- Assertions in Plan
- Fiscal Risks
- Quality of Life Impacts (e.g., Schools, traffic)

ACTION 1:
Re-focus Housing Chapter 4 to reflect Managed Growth to Regional Demand Levels, with Quality of Life a Priority
POPULATION GROWTH in Perspective:

Loudoun absorbing more than its fair share of REGIONAL GROWTH:

Five times US growth rate; Three times the DC area

Growth rate is not sustainable.

Annual Average % Growth in Population, 2000 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>DC Metro Region</th>
<th>Loudoun County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Growth</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Population density comparison to Fairfax and Montgomery counties to Suburban & Transition Planning areas in Loudoun.
### Countywide Forecast through 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Add'l Res Units</th>
<th>POPULATION GROWTH</th>
<th>2040 POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Built 7/17</td>
<td>134,783</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised General Plan</td>
<td>29,470</td>
<td>88,410</td>
<td>488,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Recommended Plan</td>
<td>38,190</td>
<td>114,570</td>
<td>514,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun 2040 March 13 Draft (*Oct.23,2018)</td>
<td>56,370*</td>
<td>170,880</td>
<td>570,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Demand&quot; (Kimley-Horn Market Analysis)</td>
<td>60,120</td>
<td>180,360</td>
<td>580,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Medium Scenario</td>
<td>78,066</td>
<td>234,198</td>
<td>634,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How Much can Loudoun Afford to Grow?

- **Existing 7/17**: 134,783 units
- **Revised General Plan**: 29,470 units
- **Stakeholders Recommended Plan**: 38,190 units
- **Loudoun 2040 March 13 Draft**: 56,370 units
- **"Demand" (Kimley-Horn Market Analysis)**: 60,120 units
- **Planning Commission Medium Scenario**: 78,066 units

(Images of bar graphs and tables showing population and housing growth forecasts.)
Workforce & Affordable Housing

Meeting the Needs

Current Draft Issues

• Long discussion of Need, but Vague on Solutions
• Text fails to acknowledge as National/Regional issue – County has limited options

ACTION 1a:

a. Increase support for existing county programs
b. Work with Non-Profit Affordable Housing providers
c. Avoid weakening zoning regulations and committing to “incentives without analysis of impacts and affordability.”
For

• Insufficient attention on urban growth in plan (timelines/design detail)
• Insufficient walking/biking plans—disconnect with goals
• Financial disaster if not properly designed and implemented.
• County lacks experts on urban areas and this is not addressed in plan
• Interim development not tied directly to ultimate vision

Current Draft Issues

Focus Growth @ Metro

ACTION 2:

a. Add specific detailed small area plans for each Metro Area
b. Add outside experts in urban planning to effort
c. CTP must ensure separate lanes for Bikes, Pedestrians & cars on all streets near stations, not just shared car lanes.
Avoid Further Public Facility Deficits

Current Draft Issues

• Too much retail with not enough demand

• SPA Small Area Plans needed to avoid public facility deficits required before opening up higher density/mixed use projects.

ACTION 3:

a. Reduce Mixed use in SPA
b. Add implementation requirements for Small Area Plans to Chapter 2 SPA text
**Transition Policy Area:**

**Keep the Original TPA Vision**

![Photo Credit: Renss Greene](image)

**Current Draft Issues**

- Converts Transition Area to Suburban Area
- Creates structural deficits
- Impacts Environment
- Negative impact on Quality of Life of existing residents

**ACTION 4**

a. Limit increased density in TPA to 20% of the existing base density
b. Add new place type which adds density for unmet housing needs
c. No switching of RPA to TPA
d. Cut back on Data Centers and maintain residential clusters
e. Eliminate or dramatically reduce Rt 50 commercial
f. Require road be in place or proffered before increase in density
g. Meet SPA needs for schools, parks & tails.
Rural Policy Area:

**Make Permanent!**

**Current Draft Issues**

- Does not speak strongly enough to the protections of Rural Policy Area

**ACTION 5**

a. Identify range of Land Management tools future consideration.
b. Maintain rural roads policy
c. Limit residential growth and make it more compatible with rural surroundings
d. Require Open Space plans for cluster and other development
e. Require performance standards for rural tourism
f. Require road be in place or proffered before increase in density
Retain “Green Infrastructure”

Current Draft Issues

• Inadequate protections of Environment, and Natural and Historic Assets
• Poor coordinated focus and strategy on clearly stated community requests for Parks and Trails
• Weak protections for Historic Assets

ACTION 6

a. Retain current RGP Green Infrastructure policies;
b. Update/strengthen sustainability, land acquisition, stream buffers, and integrated management strategy.
c. Re-set Green Infrastructure name and strategy from RGP to 2040 plan with Watershed Management as guiding approach.
d. Strengthen protections of historic assets and resources
Quality of Life: Citizen Requests for Parks & Trails

Integrate Parks & Trails in Plan

Current Draft Issues

- Parks & Trails hidden Chapter 6 (Fiscal & Facility Management)
- Parks & Trails treated as a proffer only
- Parks & Trails not treated as part of Green Infrastructure

ACTION 7

a. Move/Incorporate Parks & Trails Policies, Strategies and Actions in Quality Development/Land Use Chapter 2
b. Reference Parks & Trails in Chapter 3, Natural & Historic Assets / Green Infrastructure Chapter.
Fiscal Analysis: “Transportation costs included in analysis do not reflect an increase in transportation capital needs proportionate to the increase in development and population.” (p. 4)

Short term economic focus – Data Center “sprawl,” overreliance, fiscal risk for future.

a. Integrate transportation costs and impacts with land use decisions, and correct fundamental omission of transportation impacts to fiscal analysis.
b. Establish long-term plans for data centers: placement, fiscal impacts
c. Implement Sustainable Fiscal Revenue Policy vs. equalized tax rate for long-term fiscal viability.
MESSAGE: Support Coalition Contributions to 2040 Plan Discussions

Coalition Activities

March

MEET
With Staff & Supervisors

April

REVIEW
With Staff & BOS

May-June

FINALIZE
Revisions & Agreements

Deliverables:
1. Revised Vision statements
2. Analysis/requested changes for Policies, Strategies, Actions
3. 2040 Plan Text/language changes as needed
4. Housing Analysis Report
5. Analysis of TischlerBise Fiscal Impact Report
6. 20-Year Budget and Financial Analysis of 2040 Plan Growth Proposal

Request BOS authorization & Support to work with Staff Aides & Department of Planning Staff to provide critical information and feedback during 2040 Plan review and adoption.
FISCAL RISKS
Summary & Supporting Data
Revised General Plan (2002 amended) to Medium Loudoun 2040 - Planning Commission Plan

### Summary of Cumulative Fiscal Impact (2017-2040) (In $millions)

<p>| LOUDOUN COUNTY FISCAL IMPACT MODEL COUNTYWIDE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO 1: Revised General Plan Baseline Forecast</th>
<th>SCENARIO 3: Loudoun 2040 Proposed Plan Medium</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES ($mil)</strong></td>
<td>$15,326</td>
<td>$20,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES ($mil)</strong></td>
<td>$13,123</td>
<td>$18,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET FISCAL IMPACT ($mil)</strong></td>
<td>$2,202</td>
<td>$2,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION:** **NET RETURN OF 3.8% OVER 23 YEARS**

Equate to: $5,000 investment in a stock in hopes of receiving a capital gain of $194 at the end of 23 years.
## Fiscal Impact Analysis: What Do Citizens Get for their Investment?

### Figure 1. Summary of Countywide Cumulative Growth

Cumulative Growth Projection Detail. Loudoun County Fiscal Impact Model Countywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Years (2017-2040)</th>
<th>SCENARIO 1: Revised General Plan Baseline Forecast</th>
<th>SCENARIO 3: Loudoun 2040 Proposed Plan Medium</th>
<th>DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Units</td>
<td>45,292</td>
<td>73,788</td>
<td>28,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>122,113 (522,113 Total)</td>
<td>208,084 (608,084 Total)</td>
<td>85,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Residential Sq.Ft.</td>
<td>55,719,895</td>
<td>66,361,260</td>
<td>10,641,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>87,079</td>
<td>103,620</td>
<td>16,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment</td>
<td>22,948</td>
<td>41,755</td>
<td>18,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Buildings, Sq.ft.</td>
<td>170,363</td>
<td>258,562</td>
<td>88,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Sq.ft.</td>
<td>73,268</td>
<td>124,851</td>
<td>51,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Land Acres Needed (Fig.10)</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- New cars on roads
- Primarily Retail & Public
- Hundreds of school boundary changes
- Sufficient for existing & new facilities?
Fiscal Impact Analysis
Non-Res Square Feet: What Kind of Jobs?

➢ Non-Res SQFT the same for High Density Office, Office Urban, Low Density Office, Heavy Industrial, Flex Industrial & Data Centers. Loudoun gets growth in high value jobs in both scenarios.

➢ Where are the differences?

Figure 1. Summary of Countywide Cumulative Growth

| Cumulative Growth Projection Detail. Loudoun County Fiscal Impact Model Countywide |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Cumulative Years                               | SCENARIO 1: Revised General Plan Baseline Forecast | SCENARIO 3: Loudoun 2040 Proposed Medium | DIFFERENCE |
| (2017-2040)                                    |                                               |                                               |            |
| Retail                                         | 5,317,762                                      | 9,000,309                                     | 3,682,547  |
| Retail Urban                                   | 294,040                                        | 328,293                                       | 34,253     |
| Other Non-Public                               | 4,925,538                                      | 7,953,974                                     | 3,028,436  |
| Other Public                                   | 3,817,756                                      | 7,713,886                                     | 3,896,130  |
| Total Non-Residential Sq.Ft.                   | 55,719,895                                     | 66,361,260                                    | 10,641,365 |

INDICATES:

Non-res growth created by New Housing
Create mostly service jobs needed to service New Housing
Spending Per Resident on Life Quality Declined
Crowded out by capital improvement requirements

Spending per resident on “Quality of Life”:
FY 2000 - $290
FY 2019 - $252
In 2000 US $

“Quality of Life” Service Spending
defined as LC Depts:
- Health Services
- Mental Health
- Substance Abuse
- Family Services
- Develop. Services
- Extension Services
- Library Services
- Parks and Trails
- Recreation
- Culture

Quality of Life

Tax Funded Capital Improvements

Real Growth
Real Growth per Resident

Annual Average County Budget Real Growth Rates, Selected Categories, FY 2000. - 2019

Source: Loudoun County FY2010 – FY2019 Adopted Budgets
EXISTING RGP DEFICITS/NEEDS by 2021

Adopted Capital Needs Assessment 2021-2030*
PUBLIC FACILITY NEEDS

“SPIKE in first year projects represent:
1. demand for capital facilities triggered due to population growth,
2. projects with funding delayed beyond end of 6-year CIP planning period.

DELAYS due to
1. fiscal constraints,
2. County’s debt cap limitations, and
3. County’s debt ratio policies to preserve County’s AAA Bond Rating.” (p.2)

* Most current posted on Loudoun.gov
### Understanding the Numbers: JULY, 2017 Snapshot

#### Residential Units at Build Out by Revised General Plan (RGP) Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Existing/Built</th>
<th>Approved Pipeline*</th>
<th>Zoned / Not Approved</th>
<th>Sub-Total =B+C</th>
<th>TOTAL =A+D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>88502</td>
<td>22346</td>
<td>3242</td>
<td>25588</td>
<td>114090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>6296</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>2483</td>
<td>5086</td>
<td>11382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>14505</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>10706</td>
<td>11896</td>
<td>26401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLMA</td>
<td>5091</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns/Airport</td>
<td>20389</td>
<td>2215</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3789</td>
<td>24178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>134,783</td>
<td>29,163</td>
<td>19,176</td>
<td><strong>48,339</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,122</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approved pipeline = Approved lots + By-Right Zoning Approved

RGP Snapshot: ~50K Houses approved, by-right & zoned = ~150,000 additional population

Source: BOS Staff Report and PPT, July 19, 2018
Loudoun’s Traffic Glut Partly Self-Inflicted by Growth Policies

New Residents = New vehicles
Nearly tripled in 18 years

Vehicles registered in Loudoun County between 2000-2017

- FY2000: 160,000
- FY2017: 382,996

New = Increased Daily Miles
Vehicles = Traffic Congestion

Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (DVMT)
In Loudoun County between 2000-2017

- 2000: 3,615,377
- 2017: 6,578,622

Workers LIVING in Loudoun COMMUTING OUT:
50-69%*

Workers EMPLOYED in Loudoun COMMUTING IN:
61%*

* 2015

Source: Commissioner of Revenue, Bob Wertz
Final Comments: LOUDOUN 2040

Fiscal & Physical Risk

&

Quality of Life

“Manage Growth for Quality of Life”