

Notes from the Belmont Bay Development Plans

Updated August 20, 2021

By Former Fairfax County Planning Commissioner at Large
Rob Hartwell

1390 New Units in Belmont Bay which doubles the resident population.

Special Use Permit SUP2022-

General Notes

- Applicant has a 10% land bay increase factor built in which includes increasing density to match. Is their hidden density increases built in? - Item 5
- 5 Acre or great residue parcels can be subdivided and consolidated without review by the county. What is the impact of this or possible abuse – Item 13
- Even though the County Board of Supervisors approved burying the power lines along the Route One widening and improvement project, the Carruthers are choosing not to bury any power lines, to have the right to move them as needed and state that those “utility lines will remain aerial.” This does not conform to the design of the new Woodbridge corridor. – Item 15
- The Marina Office and the Osprey’s Club House will be demolished under the plan. Item 21

Land bay Consolidation

- Marina District Land bays combined into a 15.79 acre land bay designed for high density apartments (where none currently exist) and many new apartments just opened across Route One).
- This will produce 473 units with reduced parking standards and 100 foot tall buildings. Only 1 parking space for each apartment unit.

Transportation and Utility Plan

- No immediate concerns other than not burying any utilities

Analysis and Narrative Statement

- North Woodbridge Area Plan was approved without input from Belmont Bay residents other than an organization owned by the Carruthers selling themselves as the Belmont Bay residents and the Association – Page 2 on Oct. 8, 2019. This reversed the promise and previous proffers to keep the golf course properties as open space.

Parks and Open Space

- Page 2-3 leaves the impression of increased open spaces when in fact it reduces open space and wildlife habitat areas by approximately 50%. (?)
- Page 4 applicant states they are preserving “some” of the resource protection areas on site where they previously promised in proffers to preserve them all.
- Page 4 discussed preserving parks and open space while the plan reduces such by approximately 50%. (?)

Transportation

- The traffic study concludes that increasing the number of residents by about 100% will reduce overall trips which is impossible. Page 6
- The so called Road Diet is a perverse attempt to obtain parking credits elsewhere by narrowing the road coming in to two lanes and provide helter skelter parking in what used to be two lanes. They call the two lane reduction with cars now lining the road as “traffic calming.” What incredible bravado and again this will increase the likelihood of accidents and pedestrians at risk.

Modifications and Waivers

- Application has requested at least 64 Waivers for this planned development, including:
- Eliminates time and type restraints for commercial activity permits. What is the impact on noise, crime, and traffic with this waiver? Page 8
- The applicant seeks to be able to minimize the influence of existing residents not under their control by creating a new “umbrella” association and other “multi tiered” associations. Its basically a take over by doubling the number of residents and keeping those residents under the control of the developer’s interests. Page 10
- They also seek to place any design guidelines or proposed changes under an ARB or Umbrella Association controlled by them. Page 10
- Reduced setbacks for multi family units (or stacking) from 20’ to 15’. Page 11
- Eliminating minimum numbers of courtyards or plaza areas in the multifamily areas (creating new slum housing with no amenities or open space) while reducing open space outside these areas by half. Page 11
- Reducing setbacks for townhomes to less than 30’ for rear yards; allowing more than 10 townhomes to a group (packing them in) and separation between buildings from 20’ to 5’, creating a fire hazard and packing in density. All these waivers are to increase density, profit and to reduce amenities and open areas. Packing and Stacking! Page 12
- Reducing yard widths from the 50’ minimum to increase density and providing notice to future owners they can’t build decks or have sheds etc. Page 13
- Reducing setbacks for garages or utility rooms to 2’. Page 13
- Allowing encroachment of setbacks into yards, in some cases to within 2’ of lot lines. Architecture, roofing, chimney’s, walkways etc. Page 14
- Allowing pipestem lots with up to three homes on each driveway. Page 15 (packing)
- To move parking to within 10 feet of multi family apartments (creating a narrow buffer from autos and possible fires or pollution from such. Page 16
- Expands the number of cojoined townhomes from 6 to 20. (Packing) Page 16
- Eliminates to 20’ wide rear service area access requirement for emergencies and refuse removal. Page 16
- Waiver to allow residential use on more than 35% of the gross land. Page 17
- Eliminates requirements for shared access driveways, loading areas etc. from the town center plan. Page 17
- Eliminates buffer and setback requirements for the Marina and Transit areas and claims to have enough tree cover and open space despite eliminating about 50% overall. Page 20
- Reduces setbacks and buffers between differing housing types. Page 21

- Reduces tree plantings on single family lots because they are smaller and have smaller setbacks (as they want to pack them in for higher density). Page 22
- Reduces utility easements from 15' to 10'
- We believe the waivers eliminate new storm water retention ponds and that the developer in many cases wants to rely on existing ponds maintained by the current HOAs. The developer should not be able to shift costs of their increased maintenance on to the existing HOAs. Page 23
- Eliminates parking setbacks and landscaping requirements. Page 23
- Reduces required number of parking spaces and links them to a previous exemption and parking study. Page 24
- Eliminate turnarounds on roads longer than 150 feet. Developers claim this would decrease buffers and plantings but it would really decrease their ability to increase density.
- Single family homes will be allowed on detached private streets thus creating a new association with assessment capabilities for those homes to maintain streets. Page 25
- To allow Course View Way to be a private street with on street parking if traffic gets out of hand (exceeding 1,000 vehicles per day). Why is this needed if their own study says trips will be reduced)? Page 26
- Eliminate of cul de sac requirements on private travel ways would reduce acreage for higher density although they argue it would reduce buffers and plantings. Page 26
- Allows garages to be counted as parking spaces for single family homes. Page 26
- Allows for smaller sidewalks (to gain more density and building area, not as they argue, more plantings and less impervious areas). Page 27
- Decreasing parking space sizes in driveways by 2'. Page 27
- Allows angled parking on two-way travel ways (such as Express Drive to Belmont Bay Drive). Page 27
- Reduces parking space size for parallel parking to 7'. Page 28
- Reduces minimum driveway widths. Page 28
- Reduces width and length for driveways accessing alleyways (more packing). Page 29
- On one hand they claim reduced driveway and parking footprints will reduce impervious areas and allow increased vegetation, but then they argue that small lot sizes should allow them exemption to allow driveways to be more than 35% or 720 sq ft for front yards. Trying to have it both ways. Page 29
- Driveways of over 50' in length more will not have to have turnarounds. Page 29