Comprehensive Plan Updates

Prince William County Planning Office

7/7/2021
Agenda

- Project Scope Revisions
- Stakeholder & Community Engagement
- Community Poll Summary
- Long Range Land Use Change Request Applications
- Web Portal updates
- Land Use & Affordable Housing Concepts & Policies
- Next Steps
Project Scope Expansion

✓ Directives & Resolutions from the Board of County Supervisors
  ✓ Board Directive 20-82: Look at the County holistically (Rural & Development areas)
  ✓ Board Directive 20-25 Affordable Housing Program
  ✓ Board Resolution 21-290: Update Sewer Chapter
  ✓ Board Resolution 21-284: Deny CPA Rural Preservation (Rural Area Plan)
  ✓ Board Resolution 21-285: Remand ZTA for TDR
  ✓ Board Resolution 21-286: Remand ZTA for CR
Summary of Expanded Scope of Work
Comprehensive Plan Update and Code Changes

• Comprehensive Plan Update
  • Sewer Chapter (CPA)
  • Housing Chapter (CPA)
  • Replan for the Rural Area along with the Development Area including expansion of Transfer of Development Rights areas (CPA)
  • Mobility Countywide

• Supporting ZTA
  • Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance
  • Conservation Residential (including analyzing Rural Cluster ordinance flexibility and utility)
Supervisor & PC Interviews Overview

- Meet with each Supervisor and their Planning Commissioner to discuss Land Use, Housing and Mobility.

- Land Use and Housing interviews Jan. 25 - Feb 4.

Common Themes from Supervisors’ meetings

• COG Activity Centers and mixed-use developments around public transit.
• Strong Sense of Place.
• Revitalization is needed along several commercial corridors.
• Affordable & Workforce Housing needs to be defined.
• Senior housing, transition and missing middle are important.
• Agrotourism was a common theme for creating opportunity in the rural area.
• Strong support for walkable communities and trails connectivity.
Overview of Activities Complete
Community Engagement Meeting

✓ Held three Introductory Community Meetings on the Comp Plan Update:
  ✓ Eastern PWC on March 23, 2021: 164 registrations
  ✓ Central PWC on March 24, 2021: 141 registrations
  ✓ Western PWC on March 25, 2021: 245 registrations

✓ Held two Mobility Meetings:
  ✓ Roads & Transit on May 26, 2021: 75 registrations
  ✓ Trails & Connectivity on June 9, 2021: 103 registrations

✓ Two Civic meetings presentation & update
  ✓ MIDCO on March 18, 2021
  ✓ LOCCA-PELT on April 29, 2021
Stakeholder Focus Group Interviews

- Total of 73 stakeholders to be interviewed in 7 groups.
  - Housing (11)
  - Building & Development (12)
  - Economic Development (8)
  - Environmental (15)
  - Trails & Blueways (11)
  - Jurisdictional (12)
  - Adjacent Counties (4)
Community Poll Summary

✓ Poll open from February 22, 2021 through April 19, 2021.
✓ Poll asked residents a series of three questions
  ✓ Land Use
  ✓ Housing,
✓ There were 1,979 total responses.
Question 1: Land Use Priorities (Countywide)

Other Key Findings

- **71%** of all respondents selected “preserving rural areas of the county” as one of their three land use priorities.
- **41%** of all respondents selected “tree / forest preservation” as one of their three land use priorities.

All other multiple-choice options were selected by a smaller percentage of respondents.
Question 1: Land Use Priorities (District level)

- **NEABSCO**
  - 19% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 13% Preserve Forests/Trees
  - 12% Parks

- **GAINESVILLE**
  - 26% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 15% Preserve Forests/Trees
  - 10% Parks

- **COLES**
  - 27% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 16% Preserve Forests/Trees
  - 11% Parks

- **BRENTSVILLE**
  - 30% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 14% Preserve Forests/Trees
  - 12% Preserve History

- **WOODBRIDGE**
  - 16% Parks
  - 16% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 12% Safety

- **POTOMAC**
  - 16% Parks
  - 16% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 12% Preserve Forests/Trees

- **OCCOQUAN**
  - 20% Preserve Rural Areas
  - 15% Parks
  - 14% Preserve Forests/Trees
Question 2: Housing Priorities (Countywide)

Other Key Findings

53% of all respondents selected “the quality and types of housing” as one of their three housing priorities.

47% of all respondents selected “the cost / affordability of housing” as one of their three housing priorities.

All other multiple-choice options were selected by a smaller percentage of respondents.
### Question 2: Housing Priorities (District)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Affordability/Cost</th>
<th>Quality &amp; Types</th>
<th>Senior Housing</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neabsco</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentsville</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occoquan</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: Housing Priorities (Countywide)

Other Key Findings

72% of all respondents selected “traffic congestion / commute times” as one of their three mobility priorities.

41% of all respondents selected “trails and greenways” as one of their three mobility priorities.

All other multiple-choice options were selected by a smaller percentage of respondents.
District-level results reflect some geographic variation:
Updates to the Pathway to 2040 Web Portal

- Links to Interactive Mobility Maps in development
  - Parks, Recreation & Tourism trails map.
  - Transportation Department Roads and facilities.

Web address: [Pathway to 2040: Project Overview (pwcva.gov)](http://pwcva.gov)
Project email: [pathwayto2040@pwcgov.org](mailto:pathwayto2040@pwcgov.org)
Land Use Updates

4 Mini-Charrettes complete
- 5/20/2021
- 5/27/2021
- 6/3/2021
- 6/23/2021

- REC, RCC, CEC
- Redevelopment corridors
- Areas outside RPC
- Reconciliation session
Long Range Land Use Map Change Request Application

- Long-Range Land Use Map change request applications added into mapping system.
  - 35 applications consist of 78 parcels and 1,870 acres to review.
  - Include 725 acres in the development area and 1,145 acres in the rural area.
  - Include 530 acres of Long-Range Land Use change to accommodate Data Centers.

Pathway to 2040 – Review of the Long-Range Land Use Layer interactive map
Land Use Policy – Activity Centers/Redevelopment Areas Observations

- Land use designations are outdated and lack flexibility
- Land uses are often separated, rather than integrated and lacks pedestrian connectivity
- Numerous properties are underutilized or vacant
- Need to respond to market realities
- Placemaking challenges: Many areas lack a distinct identity, sense of place, and narrative
- Lack of gateway amenities/features at entrance areas to the county along key corridors
Land Use Policy – Activity Centers/Redevelopment Areas Considerations

- Accommodating historic context regarding land uses, scale, and density.
- Better connectivity and mobility considerations related to land use.
- Incorporate community design that creates sense of place.
- Consideration of traffic and multimodal options in planning access to activity centers.
Land Use Policy – Activity Centers/Redevelopment Areas Opportunities/General Policies

- Revisit land use classifications in light of post-pandemic realities
- Implement transect analyses to create functional transitions between land uses and densities
- Promote placemaking and destination-oriented places
- Develop/densify areas around transportation hubs with good access to transit
- Promote nodes of development including higher and better uses within existing commercial areas and better transitions to surrounding communities
- Adopt common definitions for several land use terminologies
- Promote walkable and bikeable access to recreational areas, schools, commercial areas from residential neighborhoods
Housing Analysis Findings

- The analysis broke the county into four separate submarkets.
- Northwest Submarket is Driving Growth in Prince William County
- I-95 Submarket is the County’s Largest Population Submarket
- Prince William is Predominantly a Single-Family Housing Market, but There has Been Growth in the Number of Renter Occupied Units.

Source: RKG Associates, Inc. 2021
Note: The analysis does not include Quantico Marine Base
Housing Tenure & Age of Structure

• **Prince William is Predominantly a Single-Family Housing Market, but There has Been Growth in the Number of Renter Occupied Units**
  • Owner-occupied households (73.0%), the MSA (63.6%), Virginia (66.3%) in 2019.

• **Ownership and Rental Housing is not Evenly Dispersed Throughout the County**
  • Route 28 submarket had the largest share of owner households (89.2%)
  • Greater Manassas submarket had proportionally more renter households (43.2%) than other submarkets in 2019.

• **The Greater Manassas Submarket has Lagged Behind Other Submarkets in Terms of New Housing Development**
  • The Greater Manassas submarket has the lowest percentage of new housing units built since 2000 (18.5%)
Residential Units

- **Single Family is the County’s Dominant Housing Type (155,401 units)**
  - Single Family Detached, accounting for 54.0% (83,857 units)
  - Townhouse (22.8%, 35,483 units)
  - Apartment Low Density (12.9%, 19,988 units)
  - Condo Low Density (7.0%, 10,857 units).

- **Single Family Homes Average Almost 2,300 Square Feet in PWC**

- **Roughly 40% of the County’s Housing Stock has been Developed Since 2000, but the Rate of New Construction has Slowed Since 2010**

- **Condominiums and Multi-family Units are Increasing in the County**
Affordable Housing Policy Recommendations

Goal: Encourage a Broader Distribution of Renter-Occupied Housing Throughout the County

The Manassas and I-95 submarkets are largely supplying the county with its renter-occupied housing supply. The County has a disproportionately small supply of renter-occupied housing (27% of total units), but the Route 28 (10.8%) and Northwest (12.6%) and submarkets are underserved in this housing product.

Policy No. 1: Seek a more equitable distribution of renter-occupied housing throughout the County, particularly in the Route 28 and the Northwest submarkets. These housing types are in demand and should be located: (1) near employment centers; (2) convenient to major transportation/transit routes; (3) near community services, schools, and other community amenities.
Affordable Housing Policy Recommendations

**Goal: Focus Redevelopment in Older Areas of the County to Spur New Investment in Affordable Housing Development**

Parts of Manassas/Manassas Park and the I-95 submarkets have older housing stock and have not attracted as much new residential/population growth since 2000. Prince William County is experiencing higher levels of housing cost-burdening than the region.

**Policy No. 2:** Redevelopment activities should be focused in areas of the County that have an older housing stock and are experiencing slow housing development. Nearly 40% of the Manassas submarket’s housing is over 40 years old and only 18% of the housing stock is new since 2000. Where possible, affordable housing should be introduced into these new developments.
Affordable Housing Policy Recommendations

Goal: Create a Source of Public Subsidy Funds to Incentivize Affordable Housing Development

The greatest need for affordable housing in Prince William County is clustered in the 30% AMI level and below. This includes ownership housing priced less than $168,000 and apartments priced less than $820/mo. in contract rent. In addition, the County has a lack of housing priced to meet the needs of households making above 100% AMI. This is forcing higher income households to compete for housing priced below their ability to pay, which is squeezing lower income households in a very competitive housing market.

Policy No. 3: Link the County’s affordable housing goals over the next decade to a suite of financial incentives and programs to subsidize affordable housing in areas of greatest need.

Policy No. 4: Create and adopt development policies to allow greater development densities in activity centers and along major corridors linked to employment centers and community services.
Affordable Housing Policy Recommendations

Goal: Expand the Supply of Land for New Residential Development to Reduce Market Pressures Which are Driving up Land Values

The lack of land area for new residential development is placing artificial constraints on future growth and driving up land prices. Rising land prices, which account for 20% to 33% of new home prices and higher rents, are making local housing prices less affordable in Prince William County.

Policy No. 5: Adopt new development policies in the Rural Crescent to allow different tiers and types of development to occur in rural villages or hamlets cluster future growth.
Sustainability

Sustainability: the principle to create and maintain conditions under which humans and nature can existing in productive harmony through the incorporation of the economic, social, and environmental needs of present and future generations.

Sustainable Growth: Incorporation of the principles of sustainability into the plans, practices, policies, and partnerships of the County to ensure the harmonious growth of present and future generations.
Next Steps

• Present revised contract based on BOCS directives & resolutions.
• Feedback to applicants on Long-Range Land Use Change Applications.
• Prepare & coordinate materials for second round of community engagement.
  • New polls/surveys online
  • Virtual Meetings
• Conduct second round of community engagement.
Contact Information

- Parag Agrawal, AICP, Planning Director
  - Email: pagrawal@pwcgov.org
- David McGettigan, AICP, Long-Range Planning Manager
  - Email: dmcgettigan@pwcgov.org
- Alex Vanegas, CPM, Principal Planner
  - Email: avanegas@pwcgov.org
- Justin Patton, MAA, RPA, County Archaeologist
  - Email: jspatton@pwcgov.org