REF#	ı	PRIORITY			PRIORITY			PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		Article	Section/ Figure	Topic	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
1	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		ADUs	Allow Accessory Dwelling Units		This topic was part of discussions early in the Code Create process. The Council opted to defer this discussion until after the code update was adopted. This topic will require research, follow-up work session(s) and policy development prior to development of a draft for public hearings. This effort could also be combined with the new Council priority on Housing Diversity.	Policy decision														
2	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	Chapter 4		BAR	Changes to Board of Architectural Review (BAR) Structure and Rules	Public Comments	This request came as one testimony submission during the Code Create public hearing. It is not part of the zoning or subdivision code and was not part of the review. It would require policy discussion and decision from Council.	Policy decision														
3	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8	Sect 18-821(2)	BAR	Consider updating the criteria in Section 4-15 for the issuance of Board of Architectural Review (BAR) Certificates of Approval, so as to be more specific about which standards applies for which application types.	ZoneCo	Chapter 4, which establishes and defines the BAR, was not included in the Code Create update. Any amendments to Chapter 4 would require development of proposed changes and a public hearing.	Policy decision														
4	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4B/5A/5B		Bicycle Parking	Revise Paragraph 4(C) to require a minimum of 7' of opening clearance for bicycle lockers (instead of the 5' that was adopted)	_	Minor edit that could be made and brought forward for approval process without additional study.	Minor edit														
5	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8	Sect 18-173.15	Blighted property a nuisance	Bring back language that was not included in the new code, permitting the Town Council to declare a property as blighted.	Staff	Very early in the Code Create process, this language was not brought forward based on the understanding that the provision is an action of the building official (Fairfax County). However, it did remove a potential power of the Town Council. Minor edit that could be made and brought forward without additional study	Minor edit														
6	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A/5B		Buffers	"Increase buffer between non residential use and residential use to 20ft. Mandate Native Trees and Shrubs be used."	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision														
7	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Building Height	Increase maximum permitted heights in certain zones or districts.	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision														
8	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Building Height	Reduce maximum permitted heights in Corporate Park (CP) or Mill District (M)	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision														
9	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-212.1	Building Height	Suggest flexibility regarding architectural features above the height maximum on buildings		Policy discussion is needed. Clarification on what qualifies as a parapet or whether a decorative roof is allowed even if not screening equipment.	Policy decision														
10	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-236(3)	Church Street Vision	The incentive bonuses described for the Church Street Overlay (CS-O) district are not fully articulated in the section referenced. Consider moving the language in Section 18-236(5) ahead of the design standards to promote clarity.		The new code brought forward, unchanged, the language from the prior code. During the BAR discussion of Code Create, the BAR and staff discussed the possibility of reworking this section as part of a general Church Street review, 25 years after it was originally adopted. (The code requires that the BAR be part of that review.)	Policy decision														

REV 02.06.24 1 of 6

REF#	PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		Section/ Figure	Topic	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
11	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-236(5)	Church Street	This "bonus modification" subsection is the core operative language of the Church Street Overlay (CS-O) district that a developer will need to understand, but it is hidden at the end. Consider moving higher in the section, before the design guidelines, so that the average reader will better understand how the CS-O district's bonus incentives work.	ZoneCo	The new code brought forward, unchanged, the language from the prior code. During the BAR discussion of Code Create, the BAR and staff discussed the possibility of reworking this section as part of a general Church Street review, 25 years after it was originally adopted. (The code requires that the BAR be part of that review.)			
12	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4		Driveways	Require a five (5) foot minimum radius for driveways.	Planning Commission	Minor edit that could be made and brought forward for approval process without additional study.	Minor edit		
13	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-220		Duplexes: Units per gross area is set at 20 per acre, which is much more than the 10 per acre allowed for townhouses and cottage houses. Should this be set to 10 per acre?	Town Council	Minor edit that could be made and brought forward for approval process without additional study. Staff recommends revising the Two-unit Attached development site from 10,000 sf to 8,000 sf min and the units per gross acre from 20 to 10.	Minor edit		
14	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sections 18-222, 18-223, 18-224, and 18-226	Façade Breaks	Language regarding façade breaks is ambiguous when describing width and depth, such that the average person could not understand the requirement.	ZoneCo	Staff recommends reviewing this language and potentially updating it for clarity. This topic may require more discussion at work session(s).	Policy decision		
15	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A		Fences	Increase max. fence height above 6' because of deer	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
16	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Housing Affordability	Make changes to zoning to promote affordable housing	Public Comments	This topic is broad and could take many pathways. Research and work sessions would be appropriate for the Council to define goals, and then to develop policy. This effort could be combined with the Council's Housing Diversity priority.	Research needed / Policy Decisions		
17	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8	Sect 18-854	Inoperative Motor	The new language regarding inoperative motor vehicles is the same as Section 18-153.1 of the prior code and could use clarification.	ZoneCo	Staff agrees that the section is unclear and could use updating.	Minor edit		
18	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5B	Sect 18-561	Landscaping	Add required planting buffer table that was inadvertently left out.	Staff	Minor edit that could be made and brought forward for approval process without additional study.	Minor edit		
19	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A/4B/5A/ 5B			Revise lighting standards and consider engaging a lighting consultant	Planning Commission	Staff recommends working with an expert consultant on lighting to assist in developing lighting standards. Any revision will require work session(s) and and policy development. Collaboration with the Board of Architectural Review, which also seeks better guidance on lighting for its own work, may be useful.	Research needed		
20	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-213.1	Lot Coverage	Residential lot coverage: Should patios made of permeable materials, no larger than a certain size/area, be exempted from lot coverage calculations?	Town Council	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
21	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Lot Coverage	Allow all or a portion of permeable paving materials not to count towards lot coverage	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		

REV 02.06.24 2 of 6

REF#	PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		Section/ Figure	Topic	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
22	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2	Sect 18-211	Lot Deviation	There are some who say that the 3-foot deviation has led to builders taking the full 3 feet and that doing so may also be contributing to tree canopy loss, as builders decide to regrade the whole property. Because there is an exception clause for instances when staying within the limits creates construction problems, should the range be reduced to 1 ½'?		Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
23	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4		Mechanical & Utility	Add standard as follows: "[m]echanical equipment located on the ground floor should be screened, whenever possible, with fencing, walls, mural wraps and/or landscaping. Such equipment shall not be permitted in Open Space required pursuant to this Article."	Planning Commission	Minor edit that could be made and brought forward for approval process without additional study.	Minor edit		
24	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Open Space	Increase the percentage of open space required in commercial districts beyond what was newly adopted (for the first time) in the new code.	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
25	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8	Sect 18-835(10)	Park Zone	What is the standard of review for a Park Zone application? The ordinance should state expressly what test is being applied.	ZoneCo	Requirement for site plan approval in Park zones was brought forward from Section 18-126.10 of the prior code. Staff work with Parks and Recreation, and a work session, may be needed.	Research needed / Policy decision		
26	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A/5B		Parking	Reevaluate parking standards and evaluate use of drive- throughs in different zones	Planning Commission	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Research needed / Policy decision		
27	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A		Parking	Parking standards for restaurants		Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process. The current standard is 1 space per 4 seats. Required for both indoor and outdoor seating. Should it be based on square footage instead? Should outdoor seating continue to count towards parking?	Research needed / Policy decision		
28	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Parks	Rezone Beulah Property from RS-12.5 to Parks and Recreation Zone (PR)	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
29	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Pergolas	Include "non-enclosed shade structures" as permitted architectural feature allowed to exceed building height	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
30	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	2		Pergolas	Allow "non-enclosed shade structures" to exceed building height only after BAR recommendation and Council approval	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision		
31	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A/4B/5A/ 5B		Public Art	Include requirement for public art in commercial development	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process. Research of other jurisdictions would be helpful.	Policy decision		

REV 02.06.24 3 of 6

REF#	PRIORITY		Y	Article	Section/ Figure	Topic	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
32	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A	Sect 18-538	Satellite antennae	Consider updating the standards for satellite antennae, as the language from this section is several decades old. The technology has likely changed and this language is generally ambiguous. Among other things, subsection 1(A) allows for one attenna per building under fourteen feet, but subsection 2(A) allows for one roof-mounted antenna per building under foor feet.	ZoneCo and staff	This topic will require more information and conference session(s) prior to having text ready for public hearing. The Comprehensive Plan should have updated language, as well.	Research needed
33	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4B/5A/5B		Setbacks	Increase setbacks and required wall height when parking lot abuts residential	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
34	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A	Sect 18-402	Sidewalks	The Town's legal counsel should review the sidewalk dedication requirement, as this presents a potential constitutional issue. See <i>Knight v. Metro Gov't of Nashville & Davidson Cty.</i> , 67 F.4th 816 (6th Cir. 2023).	ZoneCo	The new adopted language was from the subdivisions section of the prior code (17-67.1) and was adopted in 2015.	Research needed
35	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A/4B/5A/ 5B		Signs	Overall review of and revisions to sign regulations	Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require research, policy deveopment, and more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
36	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A/5B		Signs	Restrict number of signs allowed without permit or review by BAR (1.5 sf or less in area)	Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
37	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A/5B		Signs	Add restrictions and/or clarifying language for signs on mansard roofs	Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
38	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A/5B		Signs	Adopt Church St standards for perpendicular signs as standards in other zones	Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
39	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	5A		Signs		Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
40	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	4A/4B/5A/ 5B		Signs	Reinstitute a permit requirement for temporary signs	Public (BAR) Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
41	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	6	Sect 18-626		Review lot shape factor standard to determine if it limits irregularly shaped lots as intended, or determine if there is a better option that the Town should adopt.	Planning Commission	The lot shape factor was created to provide a standard to limit irregularly shaped lots and lots referred to as "pipe stem" or "flag lots". Recent applications have brought into question how effective this metric is in achieving that goal. Staff recommends researching how this issue is addressed in other jurisdictions and bringing the matter to a work session for discussion.	Research needed

REV 02.06.24 4 of 6

REF#	PRIORITY		PRIORITY		Section/ Figure	Topic	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
42	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	6		Subdivisions - Process	Discuss review process for subdivisions, including public notification	Town Council	Currently, all subdivision plans are reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by Town Council. State Code specifically refers to the Planning Commission or "an agent designated by the governing body" as the authority to approve subdivision plats. Letters to neighbors are not required notification, however, they could be added as a Town requirement if Council desires.	Policy decision
43	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor			Trees	Change tree canopy requirements	Public Comments	Being addressed currently as a separate ordinance.	Policy decision
44	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Change grocery stores from permitted to conditional use in Avenue Center (AC)	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
45	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Change brewpubs from permitted to conditional use in Avenue Center (AC)	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
46	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Add "Indoor Storage" as a principal use (conditional) in commercial districts	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
47	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Make drive-throughs not permitted . (AE, AW, AC, and GS). Drive-Through Facilities do not contribute to walkability and pedestrian safety.	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
48	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Add upper story residential as a permitted use in Mill and Corporate Park Districts	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
49	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Make commercial parking lots/garages as a standalone use not permitted. (AE, AW, AC, GS, and CS) Large parking garages are not compatible with a walkable community for the simple reason that they attract cars and traffic.	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
50	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Allow for more than one farmers market	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
51	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Expand ability to install EV charging stations	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
52	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Redraft outdoor dining to allow Simply Social to add more tables	Public Comments	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
53	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Outdoor Dining - remove the 8-seat limitation within 60 to 75 feet of residential	Planning Commission	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision
54	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Add to Conditional Uses in Transition Zone (T), to include General Services; Personal Services; Child Care Center; Shared Kitchen	Planning Commission	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision

REV 02.06.24 5 of 6

REF#	PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		PRIORITY		IORITY HICE Section/ I		Section/ Figure	on/ Figure Topic Sugge	Suggested Code Amendments	Source of Suggestion	Staff Comments	STATUS
55	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Creating standards for Food Trucks. Where are they allowed? Should they be allowed?	Staff discussion with Council	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Policy decision										
56	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Potentially add use standards for Continuing Care Facilities and potentially work with Fairfax County's advisory board.	Town Council	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Research Needed / Policy decision										
57	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Adopt standards for wireless facilities	Staff	This topic will require more information and conference session(s) prior to having text ready for public hearing. The Comprehensive Plan should have updated language, as well.	Research needed										
58	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	3		Uses	Seasonal Outdoor Dining - Staff has heard from businesses that the process is onerous.	Staff	Staff from Planning and Zoning and Economic Development recommend researching how seasonal outdoor dining has been addressed in other jurisdictions and working with the Board of Architectural Review to develop uniform design guidelines for outdoor dining to simplify and clarify the process for businesses. This topic will require future work session(s) prior to approval process.	Research Needed / Policy decision										
59	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8		Violations and Penalties	Review and potentially revise fines for penalties.	Planning Commission	Policy decision that would require more discussion through work session(s) prior to approval process.	Research needed										
60	High Interest	Low Interest	Not in Favor	8	Sect 18-839(3)	WHBR	The standard of review for the Windover Heights Board of Review Certificate of Appropriateness is ambiguous. Are all the factors given equal weight? Is any one factor dispositive or required? What is the overall test to which these factors weigh?	ZoneCo	Language in new code was brought forward from prior code with no changes. Would require discussions with WHBR and Town Attorney.	Research needed										

REV 02.06.24 6 of 6