

ZOC Comments Chapter 2 – Zoning Districts April 18, 2022

ID	Section
#5791	Chapter 2: Zoning Districts
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	Taking a quick look at old and new districts - there were appx 41 old zoning districts and now there are appx 53. I am concerned that this makes the ordinance MORE complicated, not less and reduces the flexibility we are looking for. I did read that we are still considering combining districts, and I hope that we do so.
#6232	Chapter 2: Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mccconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#5894	Chapter 2: Zoning Districts
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	I have over reaching questions on the implementation of all new districts. How will they be implemented, what happens to all of the old district requirements, will differences be non conformities, will there be a remapping. I wonder after we complete our current review scheduled through February if we could get an update from the County Attorney in March on number of new ordinances, Rt. 28, implementation, etc.
Needs Followup	
#6159	Chapter 2: Zoning Districts
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	We have a scheduled meeting with the CAO to answer questions similar to this.
#5844	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Overall this is complex and shows disregard of market forces. While I comment below, this section really needs deep attention by a subcommittee.

#6161	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9676	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/14/2022	In general, these zoning district regulations are similar to the existing district regulations. The UE regulations are less regulatory that the PD-TREC district. The goals in the Place Types are typically achieved through proffer commitments, which means they could also be met through a similar regulation. In addition, the PD district allows a proposal different than the base district regulations. Otherwise, this is a very general statement that is difficult to respond to. Please identify specific regulations that you feel cannot be attained.
#5897	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	With so many pages of restrictions, will we really be achieving Urban?
Needs Followup	
#6160	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff continues to consider the best approach.
#9674	2.01 Urban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/14/2022	In general, these zoning district regulations are similar to the existing district regulations. The UE regulations are less regulatory that the PD-TREC district. The goals in the Place Types are typically achieved through proffer commitments, which means they could also be met through a similar regulation. In addition, the PD district allows a proposal different than the base district regulations. Otherwise, this is a very general statement that is difficult to respond to. Please identify specific regulations that you feel cannot be attained.
#5692	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:10/31/2021	Table 2.01.01-3 is confusing in that the math does not seem to add up relative to Residential, Nonresidential and Public/Civic. Or is Public/Civic (in this table) considered part of Nonresidential?

Needs Followup	
#5758	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will revisit to clarify.
#9477	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	I'm unsure of issue, but added a note that total square footage should = 100% of approved square footage. Hopefully this addresses the question.
#5737	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	M. On-Site Amenities - can these amenities be located to serve multiple buildings? (plaza or park next to two 50k SF buildings?)
Needs Followup	
#5753	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/1/2021	Noted. Staff will discuss and take under consideration.
#9476	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	I don't see any limitation except that each building must provide the 2 required amenities. I think the patio or plaza could be doubled if this is what you are asking.
#5691	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:10/31/2021	The Plan Map for the Urban Policy Areas correctly identifies the core at the Metro Stops and its surrounding subareas. Why is there a requirement for a 40 acre minimum district, when the map already identifies the district? Why not simply refer to the Plan Map. Projects will either be in the core or the fringe because of their locations relative to the Metro stops. The critical aspects are design of streets, sidewalks, relationships between them, etc.
Needs Followup	

#5759	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9475	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	If you do not have an area big enough to establish the street grid, then there is no way that this could be achieved.
#5738	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	Tree Canopy - Tree canopy should be district wide and not per site plan - these districts will be developed over time and its likely the canopy will be achieved in large groups somewhere on site which may not be a part of the individual site plans for each building, etc..... implementation of this requirement can happen but needs accommodation for how plans are reviewed and processed in the COunty.
Needs Followup	
#5752	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/1/2021	Noted. Staff will revisit and take this under consideration.
#9474	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	This is a development standard and is implemented as enabled by the state code.
#5736	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public RTBritt13@yahoo.com Date:11/1/2021	Min. FAR requirements needs to allow for phased development in which first phase falls below min. FAR
Needs Followup	
#5754	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#9472	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	As I interpret this, the minimum FAR is for the subarea. The CDP requirements in 7.09.06 require minimum and maximum FAR. However, if development is not meeting the minimum FAR from the initial development proposal, then it would not be meeting the intent of the Place Type and would likely be setting up a scenario where it makes it harder for other developers to achieve the minimum.
#5695	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	Table 2.01.01-1 UT/UM DISTRICT DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS: Is it necessary to specify Building Height Minimums? The Board of Supervisors has recognized that there may be a period of transition from today to the day of true high-rise buildings at Metro. Specifying buildings at 70' or higher requires concrete and steel construction, the highest cost construction there is. To allow for transition time and to allow for affordable housing during the transition time, would it be better to not specify building minimums, especially in the UT at this time?
Needs Followup	
#5757	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9468	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The minimum heights are consistent with the UT and UM Place Types in the GP.
Needs Followup	
#5730	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	Min district size doesn't work in the UTC area around Innovation Station Metro where multiple small parcels may not be able to be assembled. Modifications should be available or else development could be stalled.
Needs Followup	
#5755	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#5811	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/3/2021	additionally, many areas in Urban Policy Area are already zoned, and not likely to be rezoned to UT. so language stating "The initial district size must be 40 acres or more. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 7.08.x, the minimum district size is not modifiable." hinders any ability to apply these regulations to smaller unassembled parcels
Needs Followup	
#5834	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	Thank you, we will continue to discuss internally
Needs Followup	
#9467	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Understood, but also need to ensure grid of streets is established.
Needs Followup	
#6020	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.01.N Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM. While tree canopy standards in Section 5.06 may not be applicable for the density in this place type, shouldn't there be standards for trees to reduce the heat island effect and general benefits of trees in urban areas? Places with high density and high amount of impervious surfaces would receive tremendous benefits from tree standards. (LWC)
Needs Followup	
#6162	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider tree canopy standards appropriate for this place type.
#9466	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	This only applies to the 1st 1/4 mile around the metro station. Street trees and parks are required.

#6018	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM. Regarding: "Provide for pedestrian and bicycle facilities that connect land uses and link with bicycle and pedestrian systems within and adjacent to the district;" Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails (LPAT) Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly. (LWC)
Needs Followup	
#6164	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how to incorporate LPAT framework language.
#9465	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Please see Open Space Standards - LPAT should be addressed there.
#5980	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	2.01.01 M. Under the list of types of on-site amenities #6 & #8 are reasonable and positive amenities, but the footnote under this section states that the on-site amenities may be used to satisfy the minimum parks, civic, and open space requirements for the Inner and Outer Core subareas. Should these be used to satisfy parks or open space requirements?
Needs Followup	
#6165	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if this was the intention.
#9463	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Revised to indicate what can fulfill open space requirements.

#5906	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	1.5 If building heights are to be transitioned, they should be looked at as far as compatibility to the planning areas involved, not existing other communities. The new Urban areas must be allowed to meet their maximum potential per the General Plan's ultimate vision of the area, and an existing use shouldn't create extreme height limitations.
Needs Followup	
#6167	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider revised text to best implement the General Plan.
#9460	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The text is moved to Transition Standards and represents the language of the plan policies.
#5901	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	Table 2.01.01-3 Can Public/Civic meet the Open Space requirement? Parks = Open Space ?
Needs Followup	
#6169	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	It depends. We'll keep this comment open for follow-up after Development Standards (which includes Open Space) is reviewed by ZOC.
#9459	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Yes, they can meet the open space requirement.

#5903	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	The ranges in table 2.01.01-3 don't seem to work. For example in UT Inner Core with 15% Public & Open Space, a 40% Non Res Min yields only a 45% Res portion. Residential is probably needed in the 50% - 60% range to be viable. Residential is the key component of all of these mixed districts. The lower end of Non Res needs to be lowered to accommodate the needed Res portion. This applies to all three areas of UT and UM.
Needs Followup	
#6168	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9456	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Open Space is gross land area, not square footage. The mix is consistent with the Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use Place Types.
#5898	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	In E. I find the incentives for housing being tied to FAR difficult to administer and measure the success of meeting housing needs. As logical as it may be intended, increased floor are does not always increase number of units. We need units. Increased units properly sized to fill our demand should be incentivized.
Needs Followup	
#6170	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9454	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The UHNUs will have to be similar in size to other units provided (by bedroom count). If they want to provide smaller units they can. The number of units proposed is also be required to be provided on a CDP.

#5896	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	I suggest A.4 be moved under A. to be more the Goals of the UT/UM district, and not all listed as a "must".
Needs Followup	
#6171	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9452	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Agreed (if I have the right section), and moved.
#5861	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.1 -M On-site amenities. I like this. Add "outdoor-scaled sculpture." I'd also reduce the list so as to create a limited palette of what would be signature, consistent design elements.
Needs Followup	
#6172	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take the addition of sculptures and the reduction of the overall list under consideration.
#9449	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Added sculpture; limited amenities that can count toward open space or public/civic use.
#5860	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.1 -L.5. Tunnels over a certain length should be lighted.
Needs Followup	

#6173	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9448	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Revised in Ped/Bike Network Development Standards.
#5859	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01-5 I Land Use Arrangement. “When adjacent to smaller dwellings, larger buildings must step down in height...” This makes no sense at all. Also, where are the standards that define “stepping down”?
Needs Followup	
#6174	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9447	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Moved to Transition Standards where it is further described.
#5856	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01-3 G Vertical mix: What in the world are you trying to do? Let the market decide.
Needs Followup	
#6178	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.

#9446	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Community Planning is supportive of minimums. Letting the market decide has not resulted in mixed use buildings.
#5858	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	H Public gathering spaces. Does al fresco dining count? (It should.)
Needs Followup	
#6175	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9445	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	A scenario could be created where a restaurant has seating on a plaza. This would count. But, if the dining is on a sidewalk, then it would not count. The space has to be useable by all, not just the patrons of a restaurant or shop.
#5855	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01-3 Mix of Uses: Have you ever heard of “the market”? Here’s one example. In the Inner Core demanding 40-60% of use to be non-residential is totally impossible in today’s market. (There is no market in Loudoun for major office buildings.) Moreover, what are you attempting to accomplish? High-rise residential can be vibrant into the evening, while offices close at the end of the day.
Needs Followup	
#6179	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9444	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The use mix is consistent with the UT Place Type of the General Plan.

#5854	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01 It's unrealistic to expect building owners to get a zoning permit for changes in tenant occupancy. Tenant mixes change all the time. Instead provide for periodic audits by the county to ensure future compliance.
Needs Followup	
#6180	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9443	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	This would only be if there is a change in use, not a change in tenant occupancy.
#5853	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	FAR bonuses don't seem worth much except in Urban Mixed-Use.
Needs Followup	
#6181	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff - link to #5898.
#9442	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	FAR bonuses are only permitted in the Urban Mixed Use Subarea.
#5852	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01-2 ADUs. I suggest different minimums for subareas. ADUs will be hard to develop in high-rise structure in the core, and easier as projects move further from the core.

Needs Followup	
#6182	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9441	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Should be addressed in ADU requirements (Section 8.01).
#5851	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	#12 “Building Height” needs a careful definition. I’ve seen it handled many different ways in different markets. I suggest coordinating with NAIOP to learn what the practice is here.
Needs Followup	
#6183	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9439	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	How to measure building height is addressed in Section 5.01
#5849	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Building Requirements: #8 An FAR of 2.0 in the inner core will not allow high-rise residential, which will probably be the primary development type. A 3-acre site would only allow 130,000 sf, while a 15-story residential tower (as an example) would easily fit on 3 acres and would contain a minimum of 225,000 sq. ft.
Needs Followup	
#6185	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#9438	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	2.0 FAR is the minimum. There is no maximum.
#5848	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	One goal should be linkage to the Emerald Ribbons/LPAT trail network. (Such connections are given an FAR bonus but they should be mandatory.) This trail should be platted by staff and thus become something developers must address in their plans.
Needs Followup	
#6186	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9437	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	LPAT is addressed in the Open Space development standards.
#5847	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Why suggest a grid pattern for streets? Let developers and their engineers decide. Grids can be monotonous. This ain't New York.
Needs Followup	
#6187	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9436	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The requirement is consistent with the Urban Transit and Urban Mixed Use Place Types of the General Plan.

#5846	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Before writing text, there should be a discussion of just what we want this area to look like, and what is attainable. I suggest Reston as an example. Do we want to require a standard tree species, such as zelkova? Do we want to make outdoor sculpture a signature element? Etc.
Needs Followup	
#6188	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9435	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	This district is a revision of PD-TRC, which already exists near the Ashburn Station. The UT and UM Place Types envision what it will look like. Applicants may decide to provide public art. The FSM prescribes street tree species and would not allow only one type to ensure they are not decimated by disease.
#5845	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center This is written as if this area was a blank slate, without such constraints as floodplain, parcel ownership and existing buildings. While I'll comment on the various topics, this is a fanciful, fruitless exercise.
Needs Followup	
#6189	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9434	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	This district revises PD-TRC, which is already is applied around the Ashburn Station.
#5792	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/2/2021	Adjusted FAR table I think line 7 should refer to 2.01-01-1 Line 10 - if a developer provides 1/2 mile of LPAT trail do they get any FAR bump? Line 11 - the only PCRA in the Urban policy area is in Oak Grove. Seems to make this incentive unlikely to be used.

Needs Followup	
#6191	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9433	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Line 7 - revised Line 10 - revised to 0.025 per 1/2 mile, but you must provide a mile minimum unless there is less than that available on your property Line 11 - will revisit upon development of redevelopment standards (by consultant).
#5808	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	On-site amenities should also include green walls and encourage the use of green infrastructure style best management practices that also serve to manage stormwater.
Needs Followup	
#6190	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9432	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Included green roofs. Did not include green walls because these are not places people can gather or amenities that people can use.
#5790	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/2/2021	UT/UM district comments: Lines 4&5 - disagree with 100 feet. We can't afford that much land be open in the urban area unless it is open space. Line 5 sounds like the setback is zero unless it is a plaza. I'm ok with that approach but I suspect the setback is 25 feet and it must be a plaza or dining area. The wording is not clear. Line 11 - says max lot coverage but the columns say no minimum. Line 12 - suggest no maximum for the UM. We are solving a problem we don't have (and thanks for measuring height in feet). Lines 14&15 - how and should this apply to individual buildings on a single lot? Do landscaped setbacks, plazas, and yards count as open space in the urban area? We may want some flexibility in what constitutes open space, particularly for the small property development.
Needs Followup	

#6192	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9431	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Line 4 - only arterial road (greenway) has a setback. all others are exempt pursuant to Section 5.07.02 Line 5 - the maximum setback is 10 ft. If you provide a plaza, etc. it is 25 ft. Line 11 - fixed. Thanks. Line 12 - maxi height is consistent with the place type - also needs to transition to suburban development pattern Line 14 - Open Space development standards identify how to provide. Line 15 - deleted.
#6019	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.01.L Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM. In addition to the pedestrian and bicycle facilities mentioned, shouldn't LPAT connections also be mentioned? (LWC)
Needs Followup	
#6163	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how to incorporate LPAT.
#6264	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/19/2021	LPAT could certainly be noted among the objectives.
#9425	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	addressed in open space standards

#9426	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	should be addressed in open space standards
#5895	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	In A.2 why do we have a minimum district size that is non modifiable? Encouraging the use of the district that falls within the planning area shouldn't be limited because of smaller parcel ownership.
#6218	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	The district size is from the current zoning ordinance. The size represents that area needed to establish a full mixed-use district or TOD. At this point, the districts have been established and new rezonings would be incremental additions to the established districts.
#5905	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	I.4 Please verify that a true urban area can be viable and vibrant with these maximum block lengths. They seem short from Urban areas I've walked. I think the maximums should be increased for added flexibility and scale as compared to what seem more like a small suburban center.
#6216	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Block lengths are consistent with lengths in corresponding Place Types. Also, block length in Leesburg is 200 feet and recommended block length for successful pedestrian and vehicular movement is 250 feet. I think we are in the range.
#5907	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	L.3 Are the width's stated enough for a walkable mixed community? L.3 & L.4 lane dimensions should be in the FSM, not ZO.
#6215	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Widths are moved to Ped/Bike Network Development Standards and are wider than required widths in FSM, so retained here. Shared use path requirements are consistent with the CTP.

#5850	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	#12 Maximum height around the Gateway Metro needs to be coordinated with the FAA for potential conflicts with Dulles air traffic.
#6184	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	The superscript 5 references #5 in the footnotes of the table which is existing language. Additionally, MWAA will be a referral on the draft when it goes public.
#5857	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	H Public gathering spaces. Where are the development standards, esp. as to size?
#6177	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Chapter 5, Development Standards, scheduled for ZOC review in January.
Needs Followup	
#5979	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	2.01.01 A.1.d. This item is vague and intent could be clearer regarding the arrangement. Is it referencing type of land uses or mix that is safe?
Needs Followup	
#6166	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider clarifying revised text.
#5694	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	Packet P. 13. For general knowledge, why was the Final Development Plan (FDP) requirement removed? AND Table format for dimensional standards is excellent!

#5812	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	FDP procedure removed based on internal review and comment. The FDP is very similar to a site plan. Considering amount of information typically required during the rezoning process/on a CDP, as well as the specificity of district regulations for the urban policy area districts, the detailed FDP is redundant but also adds complication to the development process since it is not an engineered plan.
#5690	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:10/31/2021	Relative to Pedestrian Walkways, 'requiring' the shortest route should simply be 'encouraged'. I can easily imagine situations where the most direct path would be detrimental to the use of open space. This situation is referenced repeatedly and should be treated the same with 'encouraged' being the operative word.
#5760	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Revised, but to be reviewed.
#5696	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	Table 2.01.01-2. UM ADJUSTED BASE FLOOR AREA RATIO, Reference 1: It is not possible to comment on this line in the table until Section 8.01 is written and offered for review. Please hold open this table for comment until Section 8.01 is provided.
#5756	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted.
#5741	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	Min. height requirements needs to allow for phased development and interim uses as placeholders for ultimate high density development
Needs Followup	
#5751	2.01.01 Urban Transit Center and Urban Mixed Use – UT/UM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/1/2021	Noted. Staff will take this under consideration.

#5744	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	As above, Section G, Land Use Arrangement should recognize the flood plain as the major focal point around which developments are organized and to which they relate, as well as to each other.
Needs Followup	
#5761	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9414	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	added arrangement requirement.
#5743	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	As I mentioned earlier, the Broad Run flood plain is the major focal point of this district. Developers should organize their projects to relate to the Metro and this significant park. Thus, change District Subareas, B.1.d (focal point) to reflect this reality. I do not believe there is a need to create an artificial (or otherwise) focal point.
Needs Followup	
#5762	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9413	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Subareas removed. No longer a focal point requirement.
#5806	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	I agree with Kevin's comments regarding the Broad Run floodplain and making a specific reference to a linear park there as an objective. I believe this was discussed and agreed upon by the last board in an earlier iteration of the Urban Policy Area back during the Silver Line planning.

Needs Followup	
#6206	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9412	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Added reference in Purpose statement.
#5742	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Relative to minimum district size: Similar to my comment under Urban Transit Center, this district is defined on the Plan Map. I think this notion of a 40-acre minimum district size comes from the original ZOAG MUB language, where it is/was appropriate, because it could occur at many locations within the Suburban area. It is not needed or desirable here.
Needs Followup	
#5763	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9411	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Decreased to 20. We still want to be able to achieve a grid of streets. Smaller sizes would not result in this development pattern.
#5693	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:10/31/2021	Since the Broad Run floodplain is such a dominant feature of this district, could an appropriate large, regional park (or other means of preserving the continuity and park value of the floodplain) be referenced as a specific objective?
Needs Followup	

#5764	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9410	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Referenced
#5919	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/6/2021	I agree with Kevin and others that the Broad Run iOS a defining feature in ther UE policy area. The whole area is roughly 500 acres and it looks like 25% down the middle is Broad Run. The bulk of the area is under conditional rezonings as well so large minimum district sizes and large road setbacks seem counter productive. I also think a structured grid pattern does. Not reflect the nature of the area and would be environmentally damaging, contrary to plan policy.
Needs Followup	
#6199	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take this under consideration.
#9409	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	ID'd floodplain in the Purpose statement. Road setback is only required along the Greenway, all others are exempt if they are in the UE district. Road network requirements (apply to the block pattern) allow the block to be broken/more linear development form is obstacles do not allow it's completion . The floodplain would be an obstacle.
#5982	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	20.01.02 Same question as for the UT area onsite amenities question. Per the footnote under this section the amenities can be used to satisfy not just as civic but also park and open space requirements which seems odd for lockers, showers, changing rooms and restrooms.
Needs Followup	

#6197	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if this was the intent.
#9404	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Revised to limit which amenities could be used to satisfy the open space requirement (which should also have a public/civic component).
#6023	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.02.J Urban Employment – UE. While tree canopy standards in Section 5.06 may not be applicable for the density in this place type, shouldn't there be standards for trees to reduce the heat island effect and general benefits of trees in urban areas? Places with high density and high amount of impervious surfaces would receive tremendous benefits from tree standards.
Needs Followup	
#6193	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider tree canopy standards appropriate for this place type.
#9403	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Since removed Inner/Outer core designation, the tree canopy exemption has been removed. A 10% requirement now applies to the entire district, as well as a street tree requirement.
#6021	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly. (LWC)
Needs Followup	
#6195	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how to incorporate LPAT.

#9402	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Ped/Bike Network requirements, which have been moved to development standards, implement the GP and CTP policies and establish this infrastructure. LPAT should be incentivized in the Open Space standards.
#5862	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.02.02 Urban Employment - Objectives: “Ensure high quality design...” is goal of the General Plan but ZOC has not really worked on it. Here, “good design” seems to be all about site planning an development, when the focus should be on building design. When people look at a large project, whether One Loudoun or Reston, they first see the buildings and form an opinion. While they might appreciate land planning and landscaping, those impressions are less emphatic than the impressions made by the buildings. That said, site planning, landscaping etc. are critical, but building architecture more defines a project or area.
Needs Followup	
#6204	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9401	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Virginia Code does not allow zoning ordinances to require strict building design regulations. However, the current and proposed data center Use Specific Standards include some regulations. And, this set of regulations require some pedestrian-oriented building placement and first floor use requirements. Otherwise, the ZO is not going to strongly regulate building design.
#5863	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Objective - use a grid design. Why, oh why??
Needs Followup	
#6203	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#9400	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Consistent with Urban Employment Place Type. Also, this area is near a metro stop, so it should be walkable.
#5807	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	Under K. Onsite amenities, it would be useful to include green walls and natural, green infrastructure features that serve a dual purpose of stormwater management and green space using native plants.
Needs Followup	
#6205	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9399	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Added reference to green roofs in J.2. Current BOS direction is to not require SWM facilities in excess of state requirements. Since this is a requirement for certain development types (and not an incentive), did not include SWM requirement. Since green walls are not a place for people to gather or use, did not include this.
#5793	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/2/2021	UE District Line 4 - Disagree with the 100-foot setback from roads. Should be considerably smaller. Line 11 - don't understand the approach or the term occupied space in this context.
Needs Followup	
#6207	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9398	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	The 100 ft setback is only from arterial roads (Rt 267), otherwise the UE district is exempt from 5.07.02 Road Corridor Setbacks. Clarified occupied space requirement.

#5908	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	In A.2 why do we have a minimum district size that is non modifiable? Encouraging the use of the district that falls within the planning area shouldn't be limited because of smaller parcel ownership.
#6217	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. The district size is from the current zoning ordinance and represents that area needed to establish a full mixed-use district or TOD.
#9397	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Reduced since the Place Type does not anticipate a mix of uses, just compact development pattern. Still needs to be large enough to start this development pattern.
#5912	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	J.3 Are the width's stated enough for a walkable community? J.3 & J.4 lane dimensions should be in the FSM, not ZO.
#6219	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. We will revisit widths for all mixed use districts and ensure they are adequate and appropriate and/or consistent. Bike path/trail lane widths will likely be in FSM, just need to coordinate and ensure they are covered somewhere and adequate.
#9396	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Revised and placed in Ped/Bike Network Development Standard Section 5.09.03. These widths are wider than FSM requirements, so they will be retained in the ZO unless or until the FSM is updated to required these widths..
#6022	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.01.02.J Urban Employment – UE. In addition to the pedestrian and bicycle facilities mentioned, shouldn't LPAT connections also be mentioned?
Needs Followup	

#6194	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how to incorporate LPAT.
#6265	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/19/2021	Refer to Design Cabinet Charrette report on this gateway to see how trails can interconnect not only with the Broad Run north and south, but also how trails can connect to the west, enhancing pedestrian and bicycle circulation tying different districts together.
#9394	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/5/2022	Bike/Ped Network addresses infrastructure. LPAT should be incentivized in Open Space development standards.
#5911	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	G.4 & 5 Please verify that a true urban area can be viable and vibrant with the maximum block lengths. They seem short from Urban areas I've walked. I think the maximums should be increased for added flexibility and scale as compared to what seem more like a small suburban center.
#6220	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Please note that block lengths are consistent with lengths in corresponding Place Types. Also, block lengths in Leesburg are 200 feet, so 800 foot blocks are substantially longer.
#5864	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Lot and building standards #10. The table shows 100 SQUARE FEET as he maximum height of a building. That makes no sense.
#6202	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	The superscript 2 in the "Standard" column is a reference to footnote #2.

#5865	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
<p>By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021</p>	<p>Open space #12 and #13. Are these areas the same, can they overlap or must a developer do both? Needs clarification.</p>
#6201	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
<p>By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021</p>	<p>There is overlap, here is the definitions:</p> <p>Landscaped Open Space: An area which shall include appropriate grassing of the area, placement of shrubbery and trees, walkways, and appropriate grading such as to render the required open space area aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>Open Space: Areas of trees, shrubs, lawns, grass, pathways and other natural and man-made amenities not within individual building lots, (except in rural village and Countryside Village developments), set aside for the use and enjoyment of residents, visitors and other persons, unoccupied by buildings or facilities unless related to recreational activities and in the TR and JLMA districts HOA facilities, and accessible to and adequate for persons and functions it is designed to serve. Lot coverage in the open space shall be limited to 0.01 of the lot. Generally, open space is intended to provide light and air and is designed for either scenic or recreational purposes. For the purpose of this Ordinance, open space shall include and be qualified as active recreation space, common open space, and dedicated open space.</p> <p>a. Open space, active recreation: That open space that is designed for recreational purposes, to include, but not to, be limited to such uses as ballfields, multi-purpose courts, swimming pools, tennis courts, golf courses, play lots and playgrounds, camping, picnicking, boating, fishing, equestrian activities, walking and biking trails, and activities incidental and related to the foregoing. (In the TR and JLMA districts, these recreational facilities may include HOA facilities.) Recreational facilities may be open to the public for a fee, provided the intent of the open space requirements is maintained. Examples of acceptable for-fee facilities include golf courses and sports pavilions where such facilities are utilized and enjoyed by the development but that must secure outside users for economic viability.</p> <p>b. Open space, common: Land within, or related to, a development not individually owned or dedicated for public use which is designed or intended for the common use or enjoyment of the residents of the development and may include such complementary structures and improvements as are necessary and appropriate. In only the Planned Development Housing (PD-H) Zoning District, uses of common open space may also include a dog park provided that the following conditions are met: 1) the dog park is non-commercial in nature; and 2) the homeowners’ association (HOA) for such PD-H Zoning District owns and operates the dog park and owns the common open space upon which the dog park is located. Such dog park may be open to the public for a fee, provided the intent of the open space requirements is maintained.</p> <p>c. Open space, dedicated: All open space which is to be dedicated or conveyed to the County or an appropriate public agency, board, or body for public use as open space. For the purposes of this definition, twenty-five percent (25%) of all dedicated school sites shall be considered as dedicated open space.</p>

#5866	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.02.02-I -4 Pedestrian Oriented Building Placement - I appreciate these goals about ground floor uses, but leave this up to developers. Moreover, these standards would be impossible to enforce as they would require prior approval of any leases obtained by the developer.
#6200	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#5981	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	20.1.02 K. On-site amenities. Is the expectation that the density will be higher in the UE area, so the on-site amenities need to be provided at 25,000 square footages versus the 50,000 or more sf of gross floor area in the UT inner and outer core areas?
#6198	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	yes
#5983	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	Is the expectation that the density will be higher in the UE area, requiring on-site amenities need to be provided at 25,000 square foot threshold versus the 50,000 or more sf of gross floor area threshold in the UT inner and outer core areas? Or perhaps there's another reason?
#6196	2.01.02 Urban Employment – UE
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Yes, the intent is to have higher density in UE.
#5913	2.02 Suburban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Joe Paciulli Tags: public joepaciullizoc@gmail.com Date:11/5/2021	I have an over reaching concern that we wont reach the goal of the new Suburban place types from the General Plan with the mass of goals that are now cited as restrictions. So many Ordinance musts will add up to a mass of restrictions than can never be created around. It's the cumulative effect, not specifically one individual item. The new place types want flexibility to flourish. But a mass of restrictions won't create the community the Plan envisioned.

#6208	2.02 Suburban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9673	2.02 Suburban Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/14/2022	In general, the zoning district regulations are similar to the existing district regulations. The goals in the Place Types are typically achieved through proffer commitments, which means they could also be met through a similar regulation. In addition, the PD district allows a proposal different than the base district regulations. Otherwise, this is a very general statement that is difficult to respond to. Please identify specific regulations that you feel cannot be attained.
#5748	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Other Lot Requirements. Are not detached garages with apartments or simply detached accessory apartments desirable to help provide a greater variety of housing opportunities? If so, again, lots might need to be larger to accommodate them.
Needs Followup	
#5765	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9100	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The maximum lot size is nearly 1/4 acre. This should be able to accommodate detached garages. Also, there is no max lot size if each of the townhouses or -plex units are on their own lot.
#5747	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Variation of Lot Sizes. I think this is an issue identified in the Plan, to which I have objected. When lots are small, it is hard to vary the size in a meaningful manner. If we can allow larger lot sizes, then the variations are more easily achieved.
Needs Followup	
#5766	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#9099	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	There are no minimum lot sizes and we limit the max to nearly 1/4 acre lots (10,000 sf). There should be opportunity to vary lot sizes by 500 square feet or more.
#5746	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Table 2.02.01-1, given that much of suburban Loudoun is developed, infill lots, if there are any should conform with the existing conditions of adjoining lots as to size and yards. A home placed 15' from the front will look out of place among homes set farther back. Worth checking into.
Needs Followup	
#5767	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9098	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	This is a minimum yard setback; they could increase the setback. The requirements to qualify for SN-6 include designing a development that compliments existing, which should cover this concern.
#5745	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	In Table 2.02.01-1 must the lot size for SFD, SFA Duplex, Triplex, or Quadruplex be capped at 10,000 sf? Seems ok for SFD, but not so sure of the other configurations.
Needs Followup	
#5768	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9097	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	This would allow nearly 1/4 acre lot for a quadruplex, triplex, or duplex. This should be attainable. Also, we are trying to ensure more affordability, which can be attained through smaller lot sizes. A larger lot size could result in very large -plex units, which is contrary to the intent of allowing them.

#6072	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	I dislike garages that are the main feature of the house front, but I think requiring 10 feet set back is overly prescriptive
Needs Followup	
#6209	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9096	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	In a zoning district where 4 to 6 dwelling units per acre are permitted, this requirement should be attainable.
#6025	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.01.J.3&4 Suburban Neighborhood – SN. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.
Needs Followup	
#6210	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how the LPAT language can be incorporated.
#9095	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	Moved to Development Standards. Also, this network is more about infrastructure and is separate from LPAT.

#6024	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.01.G Suburban Neighborhood – SN. Siting of Open Space and Building Lots. How are requirements for open space being contiguous with neighboring open space lots going to be incorporated? (Per the 2019 General Plan NHR Policy 6 Strategy 6.2, especially Action A) Are the other elements of NHR Policy 6 going to be covered in Development Standards, or should some of them be required here to ensure protection of biodiversity? Proper siting of open space has an equally important ability to protect resources than just relying upon Development Standards. (LWC)
Needs Followup	
#6211	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Tabling this comment until ZOC reviews Development Standards (including Open Space) in January.
#9094	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	Comment should be addressed in open space standards.
#5985	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	2.02.01 H Other lot requirements 1.a. Exception to the requirement for garages to be set back at least 10 feet behind the front line of the buildings. I'm having trouble picturing this scenario--if not on a street would the houses be fronting on a driveway or pipestem? But in any case, what's the rationale for allowing the garage to be closer than 10 ft behind the front line of the buildings?
Needs Followup	
#6212	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9093	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The lots could be arranged so that the architectural front is on a park or open space, but are accessed by an alley-like road. We would not want to require the garage to be setback from the front of these buildings, they should be at the alley.

#6069	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	Although dispersion of lot sizes can be visually appealing, it can also be limiting to a developer trying to provide affordable units. They can often be more cost effective to be built as a group.
#6224	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#9092	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	dispersion of lot sizes includes a provision to not disperse if the Zoning Administrator finds that the intent of this district and of the Zoning Ordinance will be better served by a design that tends to group lots of similar sizes.
#5802	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/3/2021	Does F.2 mean that no more than 60% of a development may be of any one of those types?
#6230	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	It means that the lot variation requirement only applies to those unit types. It would not make sense to have it apply to larger multifamily buildings or townhouses where all lots need to be similar and are typically small.
#5810	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	F. Variation of Lot Sizes It's possible to have duplex, triplex and quadplex unit types that mimic the size and form of single family homes. Can different unit types be mixed in together on similar size lots?
#6227	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted and yes - I included lot widths for a full building as well as individual footprints of a - plex unit so they could be provided as a condo or on their own lots. The widths or total - plex footprint widths are the same as or close to SFD lot widths.

#6070	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	For minimum lot sizes/widths, can we go smaller? Might this encourage smaller, affordable units? Small doesn't have to mean that it won't be nice.
#6222	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	In drafting district standards, we applied the ADU development standards, including lot width, that are less than the current requirements and intended to build in more affordability. There are no minimum lot sizes.
#6071	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	Where does the 25 acre maximum for infill project size come from?
#6221	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	2019 GP definition of Infill Development and Table 1. Infill and Redevelopment Terms and Concepts.
#5867	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood. I will abstain from commenting on the SPA and TPA as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#6214	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#5984	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/12/2021	Table 2.02.01-2. Take another look at the footnotes on this. For Public/Civic uses there are two footnotes (#4 & #5), but at the bottom of the table those numbers are missing, there's only #1 and #2, with no reference to a #2 in the table.

#6213	2.02.01 Suburban Neighborhood – SN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Corrected.
#5750	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Maybe one answer to the problem of variation in lot sizes is to simply state that if there are 10 or more lots, they must include a variety of dwelling sizes/configurations with whatever lot size is needed to accommodate them. Also take note that expandability of dwellings may be desirable. If homes are jammed to tightly onto lots, there is no room for future expansion. The SCN perhaps should be seen as a potential as well as a reality from the outset. That also provides for variation.
Needs Followup	
#5769	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9279	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Posing question to subcommittee.
#5702	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.02.J SUBURBAN COMPACT NEIGHBORHOOD - SCN. SCN Alternative Location Criteria. What happens when a proposal meets 6 or 7 of the criteria, but not 8?
Needs Followup	
#5770	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	As written, each criteria must be met. Staff will review again and consider if this was the intent.

#9132	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The intent is that each criterion be met.
#5697	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood—SCN; J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria: SCN is supposed to be the place, within the SPA, where multi-family projects can be built and at densities sufficient to make significant contributions to the goal of 16,000 new attainable housing units. Therefore, how is it logical to significantly limit the possibility of using the SCN Place Type by imposing Location Criteria that are not supported by housing industry standards?
Needs Followup	
#5775	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9131	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The criteria are adopted as part of the 2019 GP and further clarified by the adoption of the Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan.
#6080	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	2.02.02 K. SCN Alternative Location Request. It's best for the county to designate the appropriate locations, and then the request show that the request is in the right location.
#6223	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9130	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The 2019 GP does not set up the application of the district this way. The project must meet the criteria.

#6079	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	2.02.02.J.8. SCN Alternative Location Criteria Can you be more specific as to other innovative design techniques besides just the perception of density being complementary to the surrounding built environment? Any images that you have would likely be helpful.
#6225	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider more specificity. We are currently listing everywhere that images and diagrams will be useful. we'll make sure this section is on the list.
#9129	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	Added to list
#6078	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	2.02.02.J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria The densities for SCN are within a wide range (particularly with affordable housing bonuses) that should be mapped and sites designated for the appropriate density within that range per county transportation plans and the other criteria on the list, particularly availability of and walkable distance to public facilities.
Needs Followup	
#6226	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9128	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	The criteria have been adopted by the BOS as part of the Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan and are also part of the 2019 GP.

#6073	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	I encourage the SCN alternative location criteria, however, there are far too many requirements. I would advocate that they might be able to apply SCN in SN if they provided housing as outlined in the Unmet Housing needs report (#1). Possibly, they could be required to meet some of the next several criteria, but not each. We will need SCN as infill housing and we should provide the flexibility to achieve it - or we will never achieve the goals of the Unmet Housing Needs Report.
Needs Followup	
#6231	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9127	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	These requirements have been adopted by the BOS as part of the Unmet Housing Needs Strategic Plan.
#6028	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.02.1 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.
Needs Followup	
#6233	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff will consider if and how the LPAT will be addressed here.
#9126	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	This section is moved to Development Standards. Since these requirements are related to infrastructure, they do not specifically address the LPAT.

#6027	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.02.F.3 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN. Siting of Open Space and Building Lots. What is the definition of "natural features"? Should this be aligned with, and explicitly mention, the preservation of natural resources listed in the 2019 General Plan NHR Policy 6 Strategy 6.2?
Needs Followup	
#6234	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff are considering how to best address natural features in the Urban and Suburban placetypes.
#9125	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	Revised to environmental, natural, and heritage resources, which is defined.
#6026	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.02.F Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN. Siting of Open Space and Building Lots. How are requirements for open space being contiguous with neighboring open space lots going to be incorporated? (Per the 2019 General Plan NHR Policy 6 Strategy 6.2, especially Action A)
Needs Followup	
#6235	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Tabling until ZOC reviews Development Standards in January.
#9124	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/16/2022	This should be addressed in Open Space Standards.
#6081	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	2.02.02 K. SCN Alternative Location Request. 4. Depiction of "how"...word is missing

#6240	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/17/2021	Corrected.
#5868	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.02.01 Suburban Compact Neighborhood. I will abstain from commenting on the SPA and TPA as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#6236	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted.
#6076	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	Purpose: Bullet #2--am I correct in understanding that when SCN is applied to SN or SM Place Types of the GP, the open space requirements for SCN and associated building heights apply?
#6229	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Yes, that is the intent.
#6077	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood-SCN Purpose: Under bullet 2, am I correct in understanding that when applied to SN or SM Place Types, the SCN open space and height requirements are required?
#6228	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Yes, that is the intent.

#5749	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/1/2021	Table 2.02.02-1, can a 3000 sf lot accommodate both a SFD and the desired 'accessory dwelling'? What sort of setbacks will apply to detached garages and accessory dwellings?
#5813	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	Noted, staff will further evaluate potential of accessory dwellings on smaller lots, as well as yards for detached garages and accessory dwellings. We are working with a consultant on yards so that missing middle unit types can be accommodated. Will address then. However, 3,000 unit maximum in a zoning district that anticipates a mix of unit types and between 16 du/acre is reasonable.
#5699	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood—SCN; J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria. 3.: Why must SCN be within ¼ of an existing or planned metro or bus line? The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has no such restriction on HUD supported housing? Virginia Housing has no such restriction for housing supported by Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). Transportation Policy of the Loudoun County Public School District states that middle school students can walk 1.0 miles and high school students can walk 1.25 miles before they are eligible to ride a school bus."
#5774	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	One of the purposes of this section is "Ensure public and civic amenities are provided or located within walking distance of each development." Providing reasonable walking distances encourages and implements this objective.
#5700	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood—SCN; J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria. 4.: Why must SCN be within ½ mile of employment options or neighborhood-serving retail and services? The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has no such restriction on HUD supported housing? Virginia Housing has no such restriction for housing supported by Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). Transportation Policy of the Loudoun County Public School District states that middle school students can walk 1.0 miles and high school students can walk 1.25 miles before they are eligible to ride a school bus."
#5773	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	One of the purposes of this section is "Ensure public and civic amenities are provided or located within walking distance of each development." Providing reasonable walking distances encourages and implements this objective.

#5701	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood—SCN; J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria. 5.: Why must SCN be within ½ mile of public facilities with existing or planned capacity to serve the proposed development? The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has no such restriction on HUD supported housing? Virginia Housing has no such restriction for housing supported by Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). Transportation Policy of the Loudoun County Public School District states that middle school students can walk 1.0 miles and high school students can walk 1.25 miles before they are eligible to ride a school bus."
#5772	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	One of the purposes of this section is "Ensure public and civic amenities are provided or located within walking distance of each development." Providing reasonable walking distances encourages and implements this objective.
#5698	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood—SCN; J. SCN Alternative Location Criteria. 2.: Why must SCN be within ½ mile of a mixed use development or along a transit corridor? The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has no such restriction on HUD supported housing? Virginia Housing has no such restriction for housing supported by Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). Transportation Policy of the Loudoun County Public School District states that middle school students can walk 1.0 miles and high school students can walk 1.25 miles before they are eligible to ride a school bus."
#5771	2.02.02 Suburban Compact Neighborhood – SCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	One of the purposes of this section is "Ensure public and civic amenities are provided or located within walking distance of each development." Providing reasonable walking distances encourages and implements this objective.
#5703	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.03 SUBURBAN MIXED USE. Purpose. Although the Purpose and objective list is helpful, they should not include highly subjective criteria that is more "opinion," such as: "An attractive environment in which to live, work and play" and "high-quality design and construction." The concepts are fine, but how would they be evaluated during review of an application?
Needs Followup	

#5778	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#9276	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Deleted "live, work, play" purpose; retained high quality design, as this type of language has been in the ZO for many years. The purpose statement can be more subjective to show intent of regulations.
#6083	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	<p>2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM Purpose: For the bullet referencing location of office, multifamily buildings, and store entrances being along streets designed "primarily for pedestrians"...the reference to primarily for pedestrians is a conundrum. More clarity would be useful referencing a walkable streetscape or complete streets, but there has always been a vehicular component to a street in Loudoun. Does this mean that the county is encouraging some places within a development that have shrunken streets (in width) that would allow for limited vehicular access but the primary focus really is the pedestrian as in some European settings? That would be great!</p> <p>Under Specific objectives: The idea of really narrow streets that are clearly focused on the pedestrian would allow, per the bullet in this section, for enhanced open space plazas, greens and would constitute uniquely innovative design.</p>
Needs Followup	
#6241	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/17/2021	Noted. Staff continues to contemplate how to successfully implement the Comp Plan in terms of this place type.
Needs Followup	
#9140	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	Brian Mabry - could you please take the comment above about narrower streets into consideration when working on the specific mixed use district regulations? We should have a discussion about this, as streets will either have to meet VDOT standards if public, or County standards if private.
#9275	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Sidewalk widths in Section 5.15 and open space requirements as more gathering/park space, as well as expressly allowing private streets in this district (rather than making it a modification request to not provide public roads that must meet VDOT standards) should address this.

#5705	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.03.B SUBURBAN MIXED USE. District Subareas. For the UPA "inner core" and "outer core" were defined by distance (1/4 mi, and 1/2mi). Are there similar distances (vs. acres, setbacks) to describe "Mixed use Center Core" and "Mixed use Center Fringe?"
Needs Followup	
#5776	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	There are not currently. Staff will take under consideration.
#9150	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	No, because this is not necessarily a transit oriented development, so there would be nothing to base the radius on (no transit station). The fringe has be outside and adjacent to the core. The core has size limitations.
#5975	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/12/2021	Applicability, Size, and Location: since the core is the only mandatory district component, shouldn't the minimum district size be 10 acres (the minimum core size)? I also believe the district sizes are too large given the stature of development in the suburban policy area.
#5976	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/12/2021	There seems to be a lot of reliance on or reference to approved concept plans. I don't recall the current ordinance referring to a CDP or rezoning to establish a standard. I would think the district stands on its own and not rely on a CDP. What happens in a situation where only a site plan is needed?
#9147	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	I'm not sure I understand the concern, but I revised the 2.02.03C. to clarify that there are additional requirements when requesting a rezoning to SM. I agree that we do not need to state that in this case the development is controlled by a CDP when we don't say this in other districts and revised this section to remove this statement as well.
#5977	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/12/2021	This is one of those districts where I would hope we could minimize the standards and rely on a review process to evaluate proposals against the criteria in the Purpose section. This would allow some creativity on the part of the developer.

#9146	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	The new PD District will allow a developer to make a proposal that differs from the regulations if desired.
#6029	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.03.M Suburban Mixed Use – SM. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#9145	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	The Zoning Ordinance implements the Comprehensive Plan (CTP and GP). However, the LPAT is referenced in the Open Space Standards.
#6085	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	TABLE 2.02.03-2. SM ADJUSTED BASE FLOOR AREA RATIO Interest in higher FARs likely only for residential, not commercial; are bonus densities for both? FAR and units/acre are apples and oranges--can you provide a way to cross-reference or understand how to understand density under FAR scenario?
#9144	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	While FAR will regulate MF residential buildings, the applicant will also be required to commit a maximum number of dwelling units as part of a rezoning.
#6086	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	H. Vertical Mix.3. Does this allow for drive-thru retail use in the mixed use center core? If so, doesn't seem appropriate.
#9143	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	This requirement is based on the Design Characteristics of the Suburban Mixed Use Place Type.

#6093	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	J.Publicly Accessible Gathering Spaces: 4.g.1 Open space greens and plazas should incorporate green infrastructure and appropriate urban stormwater bmps as a co-benefit of the public space and plantings (f) between the curb and sidewalks.
Needs Followup	
#6237	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Table this until ZOC reviews Development Standards (Open Space) in January.
#9142	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	This should be addressed in Development Standards. However, note that we can only incentivize LIDs as suggested considering current BOS direction, which is to meet minimum standards implemented by the state.
#6087	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	TABLE 2.02.03-4. MINIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAZA OR GREEN Same comment as before; major floodplain should be dedicated to county for linear parks and trails.
Needs Followup	
#6238	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/16/2021	Noted. Staff is contemplating if and how to incorporate natural resources and LPAT into this language.
#9141	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	The plaza or green should be centrally located useable public gathering space. FOD would not be appropriate in this case.

#6084	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	TABLE 2.02.03-1. SM DISTRICT DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS Open Space Requirements 17 2 thoughts: *Should indicate that major floodplains are to donated to the county fee simple for linear parklands and trails. *Building requirements should include LID/BMPs for stormwater management, i.e. green roofs/green walls, incorporation of green infrastructure.
Needs Followup	
#6242	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/17/2021	Noted. Staff continues to consider if and how to address natural resource and LPAT language into the districts.
#9138	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/17/2022	Open space regulations address FOD. Will consider SWM/LID and green roofs/walls for FAR incentives.
#6266	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/19/2021	Regarding building height: with pedestal construction (concrete pedestal 1-3 stories and 5 stories of light framing above) now an increasingly popular and economic building form, we might want to better accommodate it by increasing the height limit to 80' or more.
#8534	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/14/2022	Height is based on Place Type - "up to 5 stories." We considered 1 story = 12 feet (also in GP), so a 5 story building would be 60 ft tall.
#5704	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	Table 2.02.03-2. SUBURBAN MIXED USE. Adjusted Base Floor Area Ratio. Reference 1: It is not possible to comment on this line in the table until Section 8.01 is written and offered for review. Please hold open this table for comment until Section 8.01 is provided.

#5777	2.02.03 Suburban Mixed Use – SM
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted.
#5973	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/11/2021	Building Requirement-7-FAR: I don't understand the need for an FAR limitation if we have lot coverage and floor area limits. Won't the parking requirements and floor area limits serve to limit the FAR? I also don't understand the need for footnote #5, which seems to require a rezoning that limits the FAR to the district max. Are none of the existing commercial sites going to be zoned SC(NC)?
#9273	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	I don't understand the question, but the FAR limitations are consistent with the current regulations. They allow an individual property to exceed the 1.0 FAR max (up to 2.0) provided the entire district is still limited to 1.0 FAR total. Also, max 1.0 total FAR is consistent with the Place Type.
#6030	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.04.G Suburban Commercial – SC. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.
#9272	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Ped/Bike Network moved to Development Standards and implement the 2019 GP and CTP.
#5974	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: John merrithew Tags: public Date:11/11/2021	The open space requirement of 20% seems steep for an individual lot.
#9271	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Reduced to 5% to ensure not all open space is landscaped open space.

#5801	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/3/2021	I suggest we go back to the use table and allow multi family, second floor residential as a use and include residential standards in the district.
#6074	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	I agree with John here. I hate to see this district exclude residential. Shouldn't we want many of our commercial areas to trend toward mix use?
#9270	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/28/2022	Residential is not consistent with the uses in the Place Type.
#5972	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: John Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/11/2021	Yards-Adjacent to Roads (max)the difference between districts (30 ft and 40 ft seems insignificant. Suggest they be the same.
#5706	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.04-1. SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL. Dimensional Standards. Why was the "adjacent to Residential Districts or Res uses" changed from PD-CC 100' yard down to 50' yard?
#5814	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	A general intent of the 2019 General Plan is to achieve more compact, walkable development pattern. Additionally, the smaller commercial development sizes and more pedestrian oriented development pattern is intended to be integrated into residential districts, rather than separated with large swaths of land. Transition standards to be provided in development standards will regulate the transition between commercial and residential uses to minimize impacts.
#5794	2.02.04 Suburban Commercial – SC
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	I note that the yards adjacent to other nonres. districts is 35' in SC, but 15' in SE. Suggest making them the same--15'.

#6246	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/17/2021	E. Road Network 1 & 2; This language is a challenge to enforce/review. "Blocks where feasible" - who is the judge on "feasible"?
#9490	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/6/2022	Addressed in Road Network development standards
#5795	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	Line 8 in the dimensional standards says 25' or greater if req. for fire protection. Since 25' is a minimum, any building code requirement that necessitates a greater separation need not be mentioned here. Suggest removing the unneeded language.
#9250	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/24/2022	Retaining to ensure the potential conflict is acknowledged and reduce potential for push back if the larger setback is required.
#5869	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	2.02.01 Suburban Employment area. I will abstain from commenting on the SPA and TPA as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there. I am surprised that comments on this area were made only by two residents of the RPA.
#9248	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/24/2022	acknowledged
#6031	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.05.F Suburban Employment – SE. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.

#9247	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/24/2022	Bike/ped Network moved to Development Standards. Regardless, the ZO implements the GP and the CTP. The LPAT should be incentivized, but not required, in the Development Standards.
#6245	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/17/2021	Applicability Section - "Place Type": This precludes this district from any other place types then what is listed. While that is consistent with Comp Plan, this should not be in the ZO, it is Comp Plan language. Its precludes BOS ability to evaluate applications on case by case basis.
#9246	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/24/2022	The place types where this district is located are expansive and cover the location where the majority of employment uses in the SPA are located.
#5707	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.05-1 SUBURBAN EMPLOYMENT. Dimensional Standards. Why was the "adjacent to Ag and Res districts or Res uses" changed from PD-IP 75' to 50'?
#5815	2.02.05 Suburban Employment – SE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	Suburban Employment consolidates PD-IP and PD-OP. The yard requirement for PD-OP is 50'. Since not all uses in the SE district would have the impact of the uses permitted in PD-IP, the lesser yard is applied. Staff will further evaluate an increased yard adjacent to residential districts for uses with greater impacts on residential uses, such as data centers and include this requirement in the Use-Specific Standards as appropriate.
#6032	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.06.D Suburban Industrial – SI. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#9234	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/24/2022	Bik/Ped network moved to development standards; however, the ZO implements the GP and the CTP. The ZO should include regulations that incentivize the LPAT.

#6082	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/15/2021	For sidewalks or shared use paths - it reads that they must be provided, but should there be guidance as to which one? Is that guidance covered by CTP, FSM, or elsewhere?
#9031	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/10/2022	Addressed in Bike/Ped development standards.
#5708	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.02.06-1 SUBURBAN INDUSTRIAL Dimensional Standards. Generally, why was the yard standard "Adjacent to Roads" changed from 35' to 30'?
#5816	2.02.06 Suburban Industrial – SI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	A yard adjacent to roads that includes a 25 foot parking setback and a 35 foot building setback is a typical requirement in PD districts. The 2019 GP does not support parking between a building and the road. To align with the Plan, staff eliminated the differentiation between the building and parking setbacks since it allows parking to be closer to the road than the associated building and made a general 30 foot yard along roads requirement. Note that this yard would not apply if a greater setback is required by the Road Corridor Setbacks in 5.07.02 (currently Table 5-1403(B)).
#5713	2.02.07 Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	for all Mineral Extraction districts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open space min of 50% not appropriate/confusing for mineral extraction. o Does ultimate reclamation plan count towards the ultimate open space requirement? Ultimately these uses all are turned into 100% open space lakes etc.. after mining is complete o Despite language in the comprehensive plan, we need to be encouraging efficient use of these sites, maximizing yield, if open space means 50% must remain un-disturbed, that is in conflict with how these sites should be treated.
Needs Followup	
#5779	2.02.07 Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.

#9057	2.02.07 Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	Open space requirement is 30% in SPA; 20% in JLMA. Only in the TPA, where open space is a principal part of the development pattern is the requirement 50%. Since it is critical to the development pattern and could be provided to screen use from the road, the requirement continues to apply. Other comments should be addressed in open space standards.
#6033	2.02.07 Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.02.07.F Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.
#9056	2.02.07 Suburban Mineral Extraction - SME
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	Moved Ped/Bike Network to Development Standards. LPAT is referenced.
#5711	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.03.01.F. TRANSITION LARGE LOT NEIGHBORHOOD. Siting of Open Space. Is there a way to make it more clear in F that the open space "provided on lots in the subdivision" must be contiguous?
Needs Followup	
#5781	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take this under consideration.
#9048	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	Requiring contiguous open space should be addressed in the open space development standards.

#5796	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	The map provided to us for the Transition Policy area does not clearly identify where these different districts go. For example is all of the Lower Sycolin and Middle Goose to be TLN-10?
#8896	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	The zoning map in WebLOGIS shows the subdistricts. They will not change.
#5809	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	I. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network 4.a Why start with "If" since it's later followed by ...All development plans must provide? Trail connections for LPAT would more likely be along streams than roads, so that should be mentioned as another connection point to consider.
#8895	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	Moved to 5.15 in Development Standards. LPAT referenced.
#5872	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8894	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	acknowledged.

#6034	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.01.F Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1. Siting of the Open Space and Building Lots. How are requirements for open space being contiguous with neighboring open space lots going to be incorporated? (Per the 2019 General Plan NHR Policy 6 Strategy 6.2, especially Action A). Proper siting of open space has an equally important ability to protect resources than just relying upon Development Standards. Are the other elements of NHR Policy 6 going to be covered in Development Standards, or should some of them be required here to ensure protection of biodiversity? (LWC)
#8893	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	Open Space and Natural and Environmental Resource Development Standards, as well as overlay districts address contiguity and protection of resources.
#6035	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.01.I Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan? It alludes to that being covered, but it isn't mentioned explicitly.
#8892	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	Moved to 5.15 Development Standards. LPAT addressed.
#6134	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	Typo--denigration should be degradation. It's found in E.2.b.2 as well as 3.a noted previously.
#6133	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/15/2021	E. Lot Standards 3. Number of Groups. a. Typo--denigration should be degradation

#5710	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.03.01-1. TRANSITION LARGE LOT NEIGHBORHOOD. Dimensional Standards. Why were yard setbacks ""adjacent to Roads"" changed from 35' to 30'? TR-10, TR-3 and TR-1 has yard standards of ""no building shall be located within 25 feet of any property line."" How does that now compare with the Front (20/12/10) Side (10/7/5) and Rear yard (25/25/25) dimensional standards?"
#5817	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	Staff added the Yards adjacent to Roads dimensional standard because it did not exist in the current district requirements. Therefore, if a road was not subject to the Road Corridor Setbacks in Table 5-103(B), then the front yard requirement of 10-20 feet (depending on district) would apply. The 30 ft yard along roads (unless a greater setback is required by Section 5-.07.02) addresses this missing regulation. The general 25 foot yard from any property line vs the front/side/rear yard standards depends on when the lot came into existence. The 25 foot yard applies only to lots that existed on January 7, 2003. The front/side/rear yard requirements apply to new, subdivided lots created after this date and implement the TR (to become TLN) development pattern.
#5709	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.03.01 TRANSITION LARGE LOT. Purpose. Bullet #9 "Nieghborhood-3" misspelling.
#5782	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Revised. Thank you.
#5739	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	I do not think figures and sketches should be included in the ZO for lot layouts unless it is clear they are illustrative only.
#5780	2.03.01 Transition Large Lot Neighborhood – TLN-10, TLN-3, TLN-1
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. If and when they are added, staff will ensure it is clearly for illustrative purposes only.

#5712	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.03.02.I TRANSITION SMALL LOT NEIGHBORHOOD. Siting of Open Space. Is there a way to make it more clear in I. that the open space "provided on lots in the subdivision" must be contiguous?
Needs Followup	
#5783	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take this under consideration.
#9049	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	Requiring contiguous open space should be addressed in the open space development standards. Also, the 2019 GP policies do not indicate that require contiguous open space should be achieved through regulation.
#5797	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	Perimeter setback for TSN may be too large. Consider context and consider reducing.
#9008	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	Setback is based on Transition Small Lot Neighborhood Place Type PT intent of "significant perimeter and environmental buffers" and "The community is to be surrounded by extensive wooded buffers maintaining the rural appearance of surrounding roads." and "Transition Small Lot Neighborhood projects should be surrounded by natural buffers that visually screen them from view of surrounding roads and from other developments."
#5870	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	I will abstain from commenting on TPA Small Lot as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8944	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/7/2022	Acknowledged.

#5873	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8943	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/7/2022	Acknowledged.
#6036	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.02.I Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN. Siting of the Open Space and Building Lots. How are requirements for open space being contiguous with neighboring open space lots going to be incorporated? (Per the 2019 General Plan NHR Policy 6 Strategy 6.2, especially Action A). Proper siting of open space has an equally important ability to protect resources than just relying upon Development Standards. Are the other elements of NHR Policy 6 going to be covered in Development Standards, or should some of them be required here to ensure protection of biodiversity?
#8942	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/7/2022	Open space connectivity addressed in Open Space Development Standards.
#6037	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.02.L Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8941	2.03.02 Transition Small Lot Neighborhood – TSN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/7/2022	Moved to Ped/Bike Networks Development Standards. LPAT referenced.

#6038	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.03.F.3 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN. Siting of the Open Space and Building Lots. Just because a place type is more densely populated doesn't mean that wildlife and natural resources wouldn't benefit from these same requirements. This place type includes language to require contiguous habitats and protect natural and cultural resources. Why don't the other place types do the same?
#9051	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	The requirement that open space be contiguous should be addressed in the Open Space Development Standards.
#5714	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.03.03.F. TRANSITION COMPACT NEIGHBORHOOD. Siting of Open Space. Is there a way to make it more clear in F that the open space "provided on lots in the subdivision" must be contiguous?
Needs Followup	
#5784	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take this under consideration.
#9050	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/14/2022	Requiring contiguous open space should be addressed in the open space development standards. Also, the 2019 GP policies do not indicate that require contiguous open space should be achieved through regulation.
#5799	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	Perimeter setback may be too large. It also may conflict with optimal placement of open space. i.e. it may direct open space to the district perimeter which may or may not be the best location for any number of reasons.

#9017	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	Perimeter setback will ultimately only apply along roads and where the TCN district adjoins another Place Type or fully developed parcel. The PT is to have "significant perimeter and environmental buffers" and "The community is to be surrounded by extensive wooded buffers maintaining the rural appearance of surrounding roads." and "Transition Small Lot Neighborhood projects should be surrounded by natural buffers that visually screen them from view of surrounding roads and from other developments."
#5798	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	It is hard to distinguish between TCN & TSN on the map provided.
#8990	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	acknowledged
#5871	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	I will abstain from commenting on the TPA small lot as I'm not familiar with it, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8989	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	acknowledged
#5874	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8988	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	acknowledged

#6039	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.03.I Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8987	2.03.03 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	Moved to Development Standards; LPAT referenced.
#5800	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Kevin Ruedisueli Tags: public kevinruedisueliZOC@gmail.com Date:11/2/2021	Perimeter setback is too large
#9014	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/9/2022	Revised based on Place Type, which states, "A substantial part of the required open space should provide perimeter screening such as a park or recreation area against other communities and adjacent roads. Transitions should be gradual, particularly where natural or man-made buffers are not available. Appropriate transitional techniques include variations in building orientation, height step down, and creative and extensive use of landscaping and natural features."
#5875	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8982	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	acknowledged

#6040	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.04.H Transition Community Center – TCC. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8981	2.03.04 Transition Community Center – TCC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	Moved to Development Standards; LPAT referenced.
#6041	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI. This section has a purpose to "Establish sufficient open space to ensure environmental protection on the site." yet there are no requirement for siting open space. Why is that?
#8974	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	This district requires 50% of the site to be open space. Siting of required open space is regulated in the Open Space Development Standards.
#5876	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there. I am shocked that there is only one comment on the TPA Light Industrial as it includes data centers, a use that in some ways can be controversial.
#8973	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	The 2019 GP intentionally included the area subject to the Transition Light Industrial Place Type as a place that would be appropriate for data center development.

#5715	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	2.03.05-1. TRANSITION LIGHT INDUSTRIAL. As this district contains data centers, is 75' "adjacent to ag and residential districts or res uses" sufficient based on feedback from public input?
#5818	2.03.05 Transition Light Industrial – TLI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	The 75 foot yard is the same as the PD-IP zoning district requirement. In addition to this yard, when data centers are adjacent to certain zoning districts including residential uses, the buffer must be a Buffer Yard Type C with required plantings located on an earthen berm that has a minimum height of six (6) feet and shall not have a grade steeper than 2:1 (Section 5-664(E)(1) to become Section 3.06.06.02.F.1). Regardless, staff will evaluate additional yard requirements considering the location in the Transition Policy Area.
#6017	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/14/2021	No reason to change setback from roads away from current standard (below). The proposed increase is from 35' to 100' (I assume for both building & parking?). Except where a greater setback is required by Section 5-1403(B), no building shall be permitted closer than thirty-five (35) feet to any road and no parking shall be permitted closer than twenty-five (25) feet to the right-of-way from any road. No outdoor storage, areas for collection of refuse, or loading space shall be permitted in such setbacks.
#8969	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	This district is in the TPA, where setbacks, buffering, and natural open space are to be used to reduce impacts of the development on the surrounding development pattern. This development pattern is also setback from roads and is intended to provide a transition from the rural to suburban policy areas.
#5877	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there. I am surprised that there are no comments on this area.
#8968	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	acknowledged.

#6042	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.05.E Transition Light Industrial – TLI. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8967	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	Moved to Development Standards; LPAT referenced.
#6043	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.06.E Transition Industrial – TI. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8966	2.03.06 Transition Industrial – TI
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	Moved to Development Standards; LPAT referenced.
#5878	2.03.07 Transition Mineral Extraction - TME
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/4/2021	Transition Compact Neighborhood, Transition Community Center, Transition Light Industrial, Transition Industrial and Transition and Transition Mineral Extraction as I'm not familiar with them, have no stake in those areas, and trust the judgment of ZOC members who know those areas and have stakes there.
#8964	2.03.07 Transition Mineral Extraction - TME
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	acknowledged
#6044	2.03.07 Transition Mineral Extraction - TME
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.03.07.F Transition Mineral Extraction - TME. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?

#8963	2.03.07 Transition Mineral Extraction - TME
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/8/2022	Section moved to Development Standards. LPAT referenced.
#6485	2.04 Rural Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:12/13/2021	Seeing no CR districts mentioned, will they be addressed via VCOD?
#9677	2.04 Rural Policy Area Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/14/2022	CR is renamed VR.
#5883	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01 - C What is he logic of the principal-subordinate option? Can't it be eliminated?
#9317	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	We are not eliminating the Principal/Subordinate option. This option allows an opportunity not to subdivide all at one time.
#5879	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North. Note the words “Agricultural” and “Rural,” which seem to be ignored when uses, density and standards were written.
#9314	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/31/2022	As previously indicated, the ZO rewrite will not be changing permitted densities.

#5880	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	Purpose #3 “Support the use of land for rural economy uses ...with residential uses allowed...” Sacrilege! The economy uses are meant as adjuncts to residences and this statement has it backwards, Does this indicate a troubling mindset?
#9313	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/31/2022	Revised to be more consistent with place type description.
#5881	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	Purpose #5 This suggests lower densities, but I see no change in densities from the existing ZO, and it’s these densities which have crippled the ARN.
#9297	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Decision has been made not to revise densities.
#5882	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	Purpose #6 Yes, economy uses should be compatible with residential, but in many existing cases they are intrusive, not compatible. I suggest requiring a SPEX for most economy uses above certain thresholds. Western Loudoun should not become a drink-and-drive destination.
#9296	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	This concern should be addressed in the use list.
#5886	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01-1 #6 There must be significant variation in front yard setbacks to avoid having all the houses lined up in a row. Varying setbacks will improve cluster design. I suggest a mix of setbacks from 25 feet to 50 feet, with at least a 5-foot difference between adjacent houses, and with 25% of houses having setbacks of 30 feet or less and 25% of the houses having setbacks of 40 feet or more.

#9295	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.
#5884	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01-1 3 Dimensional standards. Reduce the maximum size of a cluster lot from 4 acres to 2 acres. It seems that the rears of cluster lots is generally not developed and often not maintained. Reducing the maximum lot size will increase the open space. While this might require hat some lots use alternative septic systems, the added cost would be passed along to the homebuyer.
#9294	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.
#5885	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01-1 #3. Change the length-width ratio of economy lots from 3:1 to 2:1. This will make economy lots much more suitable for agriculture.
#9293	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.
#5887	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	.04.01-1 #9. I'm tilting at windmills on this one, but residents of the west really want density of cluster lots to be decreased to 10 acres per house.
#9292	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.

#5888	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01 - J It is critical to limit the permitted uses on rural economy lots. For example, inns would be fine but breweries would not be.
#9291	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.
#5889	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.01 - J 2 b. The variation in lot sizes should be 5,000 sq. ft. The 1,500 sq. ft. variation is too small to have any impact on the appearance of cluster subdivisions.
#9290	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations.
#6045	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.04.01.K Agricultural Rural North – ARN. Common Open Space. Open space should be contiguous within the parcel, but also contiguous to adjacent lands to protect wildlife corridors and other natural resources. This could also include considerations for potential LPAT connections. Shouldn't the Common Open Space include requirements for siting and resource protection such as the ones included in 2.03.03.F.3 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN?
#9289	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/29/2022	Open space requirements are located in Open Space Development Standards and should address contiguity. LPAT should be addressed through incentives since the Zoning Ordinance implements the Comp Plan (GP and CTP).

#5716	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.04.01. AGRICULTURAL RURAL NORTH. Purpose. The following bullet points confirm the requirement to review uses and use-specific standards for consistency, compatibility and mitigation of impacts: -- Allow for a broad range of rural economy uses, including (agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry), agriculture support and services associated with ongoing agricultural activities, and other uses that can be developed in ways consistent with the rural character of the ARN district through mitigation or other standards; -- Promote consistency between residential development and rural economy uses through lower density residential development or clustering of residential development; -- Ensure that the rural economy uses are compatible with any existing permitted residential development; How and when will review for consistency, compatibility and mitigation be performed?"
#5785	2.04.01 Agricultural Rural North – ARN
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Staff are continuing to draft new sections and revisit old sections while reviewing for consistency, compatibility and mitigation. It is an iterative process.
#5890	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	My comments on ARN apply to ARS with the exception of density of cluster lots
#9323	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	See responses to ARN comments.
#6046	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.04.02.K Agricultural Rural South – ARS. Common Open Space. Open space should be contiguous within the parcel, but also contiguous to adjacent lands to protect wildlife corridors and other natural resources. This could also include considerations for potential LPAT connections. Shouldn't the Common Open Space include requirements for siting and resource protection such as the ones included in 2.03.03.F.3 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN?
#9321	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations. Also, Open Space Development Standards should address this.

#9322	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	Cluster Subdivision regulations will be amended with ZOAM-2020-0002, Cluster Subdivision Regulations. Also, should be addressed in Open Space Development Standards.
#5717	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	"2.04.02. AGRICULTURAL RURAL SOUTH. Purpose. The following bullet points confirm the requirement to review uses and use-specific standards for consistency, compatibility and mitigation of impacts: -- Allow for a broad range of rural economy uses, including traditional and new agricultural uses (agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry), agriculture support and basic services directly associated with ongoing agricultural activities, and other uses that can be developed in ways that are consistent with the rural character of the RS District through mitigation or other standards; -- Promote consistency between residential development and rural economy uses through lower density residential development or clustering of residential development; -- Ensure that the rural economy uses are compatible with any existing permitted residential development. How and when will review for consistency, compatibility and mitigation be performed?"
#5786	2.04.02 Agricultural Rural South – ARS
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Staff are continuing to draft new sections and revisit old sections while reviewing for consistency, compatibility and mitigation. It is an iterative process.
#5788	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: John Merrithew Tags: public John.merrithew@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	The VR district is intended to complement the Historic Rural Villages but it offers a one size fits all solution, which seems contrary to the objective.It also seems the district is working on the assumption that the HRV's will be seeing larger projects that need a street network. I would suggest offering some context sensitive standards for existing lots and restrict the fixed setback and building standard numbers to new subdivision that has no context/existing development on which to base their standards.
#9337	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	At this time, we are carrying over current regulations. The regulations will be aligned with villages upon completion of small area plans. VCOD also applies in villages with this zoning which does respond to context.

#5789	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: John. Merrithew Tags: public Date:11/2/2021	I would like to know if connecting to existing village utilities is an option or if those utilities are limited to just the existing, built properties. I recall these utilities have little excess capacity. If this is the case, what policy or regulation changes are needed to allow expansion of the utilities to new development?
#9336	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	Properties in the respective service district are allowed to connect. Allowing other properties to connect would require a CMPT to expand the service district, which would be initiated by Loudoun Water and the County. The 2019 GP supports establishing or expanding service districts to address public health.
#5804	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	The villages need more variation between VR1, VR2, VR3 and VR4. Some of these zoning districts are unique to a single village, i.e. VR3-St. Louis, and VR4-Lucketts. Waterford has alleys but St. Louis doesn't, and their historic development patterns are quite different. Even if more detail comes later, these guidelines will result in outcomes that may not be suitable in the meantime.
#9335	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	At this time, we are carrying over current regulations. The regulations will be aligned with villages upon completion of small area plans. I did revise the alley requirement to only apply when it is the prevailing road network pattern of a village.
#5805	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Gem Bingol Tags: public gbingol@pecva.org Date:11/3/2021	2.04.04 Village Residential VR1, VR2, VR3,and VR4 are set up too generically, as if the villages have the same development patterns. Also, some of these--VR3 (St. Louis) and VR4 (Lucketts) are each unique to one village. Waterford's development pattern with alleys is very different from that in St. Louis, where there are none. New development has already started to change the look and feel in St. Louis. Care should be taken with these guidelines prior to the additional detail that will come later with community planning.
#9334	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	At this time, we are carrying over current regulations. The regulations will be aligned with villages upon completion of small area plans. I did revise the alley requirement to only apply when it is the prevailing road network pattern of a village.

#5892	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.04 - 1 I don't have a detailed zoning map, so are the Village districts identical to the boundaries of the Historic District, or are they more expansive?
#9333	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	The limits of VCOD, RHV, and VR zoning all vary by village.
#5893	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/5/2021	2.04.04 - 1. Village Residential. Have these provisions been aligned with the design guidelines for the various historic villages?
#9332	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	The 2019 GP calls for developing small area plans for the villages. Until this time, the regulations cannot address specific village development patterns and remain as currently required by the ZO.
#6048	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.04.04.D Village Residential – VR. Open Space. "Open space must be preserved by means of a permanent open space easement acceptable to the Board of Supervisors." This should be subject to similar requirements noted in 2.03.03.F.3 to protect contiguous habitat and natural and cultural resources. Should this be a conservation easement in order to protect conservation values?
#9331	2.04.03 Village Residential – VR
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	Open Space is addressed in Development Standards, Section 5.04.
#6147	2.04.05 Village Commercial – VC
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	Good job.

#9350	2.04.05 Village Commercial – VC
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:4/1/2022	Thank you.
#5740	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Rich Brittingham Tags: public rbrittingham@dewberry.com Date:11/1/2021	Avoidance of Certain Street Types: - this is not written like ZO code, this is written like policy. - remove or state that these are street types are precluded. (I vote to remove)
Needs Followup	
#5787	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Ryan Reed Tags: public,staff ryan.reed@loudoun.gov Date:11/2/2021	Noted. Staff will take under consideration.
#8860	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Revised language of existing regulation to be more clear about when culs-de sac and P-loops will be allowed.
#6049	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.05.01.D.4 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3 Neighborhood Development Standards. Civic and Open Space. This section seems rather vague with the use of "variety" multiple times. This could be a place to include connection to LPAT, and an opportunity to require contiguous habitats for the protection of natural and cultural resources. Why are there not siting standards for open space?
#8859	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Largely proposed for deletion since the requirements are now in the Open Space Standards.
#6148	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	Philosophically, why do we even have JLMAs?

#8858	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	The JLMAs are consistent with the 2019 General Plan.
#6149	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	Residential densities are too high.
#8855	2.05.01 Joint Land Management Area Neighborhood – JLMA-1, JLMA-2, JLMA-3
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	The residential densities are consistent with the 2019 General Plan.
#6050	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.05.02.G Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood. Siting of Open Space and Building Lots. Open space should be contiguous to protect wildlife corridors and other natural resources. This could also include considerations for potential LPAT connections. Shouldn't this include requirements for siting and resource protection such as the ones included in 2.03.03.F.3 Transition Compact Neighborhood – TCN?
#8864	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Open Space requirements are moved/addressed in Open Space Standards (5.04). Bike/Ped moved to Development Standards and addresses LPAT.
#6150	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	Let the Leesburg town limits be a hard edge. Do not allow such high density in County areas.

#8863	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	This district will only be applied in the Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood Place Type and, therefore, is consistent with the 2019 GP.
#6051	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.05.02.J Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8862	2.05.02 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Residential Neighborhood – JLMA-LN
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Bike/Ped Network moved to Development Standards.
#6151	2.05.03 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Employment – JLMA-LE
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	Why should streets form grids? (In this and other sections.) I'd prefer curvilinear patterns, which are more appropriate for our terrain.
#8877	2.05.03 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Employment – JLMA-LE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Street pattern is based on corresponding Place Type in 2019 GP.
#6052	2.05.03 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Employment – JLMA-LE
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public mwalshcopeland@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	2.05.03.F Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg Employment – JLMA-LE. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8874	2.05.03 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Employment – JLMA-LE
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:2/28/2022	Ped/Bike has been moved to Development Standards. LPAT is referenced.

#6053	2.05.04 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Industrial/Mineral Extraction – JLMA-LME
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/14/2021	2.05.04.F Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg Industrial/Mineral Extraction – JLMA-LME. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network. Again, Shouldn't this include specific language to include the Linear Parks and Trails Framework Plan?
#8886	2.05.04 Joint Land Management Area – Leesburg JLMA Industrial/Mineral Extraction – JLMA-LME
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/1/2022	Bike/Ped regs consolidated under Development Standards. LPAT is referenced.
#6152	2.06 Planned Development Zoning District
By: Charles Houston Tags: public CharlesHouston3@yahoo.com Date:11/16/2021	When will we see a draft zoning map?
#8917	2.06 Planned Development Zoning District
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/3/2022	This district would not be mapped unless utilized and applied through an approved rezoning request after adoption of the draft ZO; therefore, this district would not be depicted on a draft zoning map.
#6075	2.06 Planned Development Zoning District
By: Jean Ault Tags: public jean.ault@gmail.com Date:11/14/2021	Modification of Attainable Housing Regs are not permitted, but I would like to revisit this once we see those regs. It is possible that the PD product might be even better than the Attainable Housing regs (as far as providing affordable/attainable housing).
#8916	2.06 Planned Development Zoning District
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/3/2022	You can only modify the number of ADUs required and the timing of ADU delivery. Anything that would be better (but still meet the minimum requirements) would not necessitate a modification. The County would not anticipate a proposal that achieves a lesser requirement without an approved modification.

#5720	2.07 Legacy Zoning Districts
By: Maura Walsh-Copeland Tags: public Maura@Walsh-CopelandConsulting.com Date:11/1/2021	In general, are there no changes for Legacy Districts? If not, can you highlight (red-line text) any changes?
#5820	2.07 Legacy Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:11/3/2021	In general, revisions to Legacy Districts include reformatting to new district format, moving dimensional standards to tables, updating district and other internal references, consolidating similar districts (e.g., R-1, -2, -3 and JLMA-1, -2, -3) into one set of regulations, and revising shall to must or other mandatory language. Considering that not all revisions would be captured in track changes (e.g., reformatting and moving requirements to tables) and others would become overly complicated and difficult to follow, we did not track changes in Legacy Districts similar to other draft districts.
#8914	2.07 Legacy Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/3/2022	All revisions are provided as a comparison to the original text.
#5803	2.07 Legacy Zoning Districts
By: John merrihew Tags: public Date:11/3/2021	Please explain the role of the legacy districts, particularly in the Transition, rural, and JLMA Areas.
#8913	2.07 Legacy Zoning Districts
By: Kate McConnell Tags: public,staff kate.mcconnell@loudoun.gov Date:3/3/2022	Legacy Zoning Districts are defined in Chapter 11.