Special GLUP Study Purpose

• The GLUP is Arlington’s regionally and nationally recognized land use policy guide.

• Changes to the GLUP should not be made lightly.

• The purpose of a Special GLUP Study is to allow for high-level review of the land use separate from any site plan/use permit review.

• Special GLUP Studies evaluate the appropriateness of the requested GLUP change and what GLUP category or categories may be appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Revision Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff proposes to refine the existing process to achieve greater:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Predictability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost Recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues to be Addressed

- Currently no dedicated Special GLUP Study fee and the County needs to recoup its costs.
- Currently no mechanism for the County to determine whether the requested Special GLUP Study is the appropriate tool.
- Special GLUP Studies are an important element of the annual Work Plan. It is important that the County has a defined process to effectively address these applications.
Alternatives Initially Explored

Staff analyzed several different ways to respond to the identified issues and goals:

1) returning to the pre-2008 process in which site plans are filed and reviewed concurrently with rezoning and GLUP amendment requests;

2) staying the course with the current process format;

3) revising the current process in a strategic manner by instituting one application window and a two-phase review process.

Staff initially recommended option #3.
Two-Tier Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff recommends a two-tier review process which would provide:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For staff and the LRPC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vetting process to assess appropriate review process/merit of application prior to initiating a full study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More comprehensive review of and prioritization of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More effective scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater predictability vis-à-vis timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For applicants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial review by staff and the LRPC in 90-120 days for a low cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater predictability vis-à-vis timing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Alternatives to be Explored

Staff has analyzed several different ways to respond to the identified goals/issues and is looking for input:

- **Rolling Review**
  - January – December
  - LRPC meetings schedule as applications are received

- **Biannual Review**
  - February - July
  - August - January

- **Annual Review**
  - September - May
  - June - August
  - Fall Staff Review with LRPC – Winter Work Plan Consideration with CMO
  - Review Point Oct/Nov LRPC
  - Review Point March/April LRPC
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Initial Review to Full Study

• After the initial LPRC meeting, applicants would receive a letter from the Director recommending/not recommending a Special GLUP Study.

• Applications recommended for study could then file a full Special GLUP Study application.

• Applications not recommended for study could choose to file a GLUP Amendment at their own risk.
  • The GLUP Amendment would be heard by:
    • the Planning Commission; and
    • the County Board.

• The County Board will make the final decision.
Criteria

Criteria for selection as a study to undertake would include:

1. Would the amendment possibly advance broader County goals?
2. Is there already an existing adopted plan or district designation on the GLUP for the subject area and/or adjacent area? If there is an existing plan or district recommendation for a specific area, a change to the GLUP may be less likely. What conditions have changed to warrant revisiting the adopted policy?
3. Is the area currently under study?
4. Is this a larger site? Would it be more appropriate to address the area through a small area plan?
5. Is there a Phased Development Site Plan (PDSP)? Would it be more appropriate to undertake a PDSP review as opposed to a Special GLUP Study?
1. Staff recommends amending the “Policy for Consideration of GLUP Amendments Unanticipated by Previous Planning Efforts” to formally establish the key elements of the proposed new process. Does the LRPC have any additions?
   1. Two-tier review
   2. Application window
   3. Other elements?

2. Are there LRPC considerations regarding the use of consultants for Special GLUP Studies, as well as Special GLUP Study Plus projects?

3. Does the LRPC concur with staff’s biannual review process recommendation?

4. Does the LRPC agree with the initial review close out process described earlier in the presentation?

5. Any further LRPC input on the criteria?
Associated Actions for March PC/April CB

• Fee schedule changes for new and/or revised fees achieve cost recovery for Special GLUP Studies

• Zoning Ordinance amendment to allow for reimbursement of fees in instances where a full Special GLUP Study application has been submitted but no staff review work has yet commenced

• GLUP Booklet description of the Special GLUP Study process
County Board Action on 3/23

• The County Board authorized advertisement of the aforementioned amendments.

• The County Board directed the County Manager to allow the filing of applications for Special GLUP Studies but defer the assessment of fees until such time as the revised Special GLUP Study process and the new and revised Special GLUP Study fees have been considered by the Board and either adopted or rejected.
Schedule

- 11/14 LRPC Meeting
- 1/22 LRPC Meeting
- 1/23 NAIOP Meeting
- 2/21 Chamber of Commerce Meeting
- 2/23 RTA for action on associated GLUP booklet and Zoning Ordinance amendments and new/revised fees
- 2/27 NAIOP Meeting
- 2/28 LRPC Meeting
- 3/4 Planning Commission Meeting
- 3/12 EDC Meeting
- 4/23 County Board Meeting
Conclusion