

Winnie



County of Fairfax, Virginia

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

May 8, 2007

Gregory A. Riegle
McGuire Woods, LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215

Re: RZ/FDP 2005-SP-019, Ridgewood, (Tax Map 56-2 ((1)) 37): Site Modifications

Dear Mr. Riegle:

This is in response to your letters of January 24, 2007, April 2, 2007, and April 24, 2007, requesting an interpretation of the proffers and Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) accepted by the Board of Supervisors and the Final Development Plan (FDP) approved by the Planning Commission with approval of the above-referenced application. As I understand it, the question is whether certain proposed site design changes are in substantial conformance with RZ/FDP 2005-SP-019. This determination is based on your letters and attached proffers; a six page exhibit entitled "Interpretation Plan for Ridgewood (CDP/FDP 2005-SP-019)" prepared by Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc. dated April, 2007; a colored rendering of a portion of the south elevation of Building 3 prepared by The Preston Partnership, LLC; a colored rendering entitled "Conceptual Garage Entry Elevation" dated March 28, 2007, prepared by The Preston Partnership, LLC; a colored elevation of the interior facade of the Building 3 parking garage entitled "Conceptual Garage Courtyard Elevation" dated April 18, 2007, prepared by The Preston Partnership, LLC; and, an undated colored exhibit entitled "Building 3 Courtyard Shadow Study" that was prepared for the westernmost Building 3 courtyard. Your four questions will be addressed individually below. Copies of your letters and relevant exhibits are attached.

The first question is whether the following modifications to Building 3 and the associated parking garage are in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP.

- Relocation of the parking garage from the eastern end of Building 3 to a central location surrounded by Building 3;
- Provision of courtyard areas in two locations adjacent to the eastern and western sides of the parking garage. The approved CDP/FDP provided one courtyard area between Building 3 and the west side of the parking garage; and,
- Relocation of the garage entrance from the eastern side of the site to a central location on an internal private street that provides access from Ridgetop Road.

According to your letter, the modifications described above are necessitated by asbestos containing soils in and around Building 3. You have stated that the proposed changes will minimize the amount of excavation into such soils and that the proposed modifications do not diminish the effectiveness of any screening, do not place buildings closer to Route 29, and do not affect the location or configuration of the internal street system.

Department of Planning and Zoning
Zoning Evaluation Division
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 801
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509
Phone 703 324-1290
FAX 703 324-3924
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/

It is my determination that the proposed modifications to Building 3 and its associated parking garage described above are in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP.

The second question is whether the proposed modifications to Building 2.2 which consist of adjustments to the building shape and courtyard layout are in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP. As stated in your letter, building setbacks are maintained and the location and extent of the retail program on the ground floor of the building is unchanged.

It is my determination that the proposed modifications to Building 2.2 described above are in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP.

The third question is whether the proposed shift in units from Building 2.2 to Building 3 is in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP. According to your letter, the following density changes are proposed:

- Increase the number of units in Building 3 from 225 units to 293
- Decrease the number of units in Building 2.2 from 237 units to 191

The justification for the shift in dwelling units is based on Proffer #3, Maximum Density which states in part "... *The applicant reserves the right to construct a lesser amount of GFA provided that the buildings and Property remain in substantial conformance with that shown on the CDP/FDP as determined by the Zoning Administrator. Similarly, subject to the 1.2 FAR limitation of this proffer, the number of units described on the CDP/FDP may be adjusted upward or downward based on the final design, provided the maximum number of dwelling units shall be at least 400 units*".

The total number of units proposed is 484 which satisfies the above proffered requirement for a minimum of 400 units and is also within the approved 500 unit maximum number of multi-family units.

It is my determination that the proposed re-allocation of units from Building 2.2 to Building 3 is in substantial conformance with the proffers and the CDP/FDP.

The fourth question is whether the proposed architectural elevations are in substantial with the proffers and the CDP/FDP. Proffer #6 Architecture states in part that "*The final architectural design shall be in substantial conformance with the general type, quality and proportion of materials depicted in the illustrative perspectives, elevations, and sections shown on the CDP/FDP. Building facades not shown in the CDP/FDP shall be consistent with the general type, quality and proportion of materials depicted in the illustrative perspectives, elevations, and sections shown on the CDP/FDP...*"

The Interpretation Plan shows the front of Building 3 constructed as a straight line, without the articulation shown on the approved FDP. I understand that, in response to staff concern about the loss of articulation and interest along this long facade, you have provided an elevation which shows the use of varied building materials and colors and balconies with decorative railings to add interest to and break up the facade, as well as staggered setbacks for the facade, as seen from Route 29. In addition, the submitted elevation shows an architectural tower element, architectural cornice and trim and enclosed patios for ground level units.

It is my determination that the proposed architectural treatment for Building 3 is in substantial conformance with the proffers and CDP/FDP.

Gregory A. Riegle
Page 3

These determinations have been made in my capacity as the duly authorized agent of the Zoning Administrator. If you have any questions regarding this interpretation, please contact Mary Ann Godfrey at (703) 324-1290.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Byron, Director
Zoning Evaluation Division, DPZ

O:\mgodfr\Proffer Interpretations P\Ridgewood (RZ 2005-SP-019) site modif.doc

Attachment: A/S

cc: Elaine McConnell, Supervisor, Springfield District
Peter Murphy, Planning Commissioner, Springfield District
Diane Johnson Quinn, Deputy Zoning Administrator, ZAD, DPZ
Michelle Brickner, Assistant Director, Office of Land Development Services, DPWES
Angela Rodeheaver, Chief, Site Analysis Section, DOT
Craig Carinci, Director, Environmental and Facilities Inspection Division, DPWES
Audrey Clark, Director, Building Plan Review, DPWES
Kevin J. Guinaw, Chief, Special Projects/Applications Management Branch, DPZ
File: RZ/FDP 2005-SP-019, PI 0701 011, Imaging, Reading File

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Phone: 703.712.5000
Fax: 703.712.5050
www.mcguirewoods.com

Gregory A. Riegler
Direct: 703.712.5360
griegler@mcguirewoods.com

McGUIREWOODS

RECEIVED
Department of Planning & Zoning

JAN 24 2007

Zoning Evaluation Division

January 24, 2007

Barbara Byron
Director, Zoning Evaluation Division
Fairfax County Planning & Zoning
12055 Government Center Parkway
Suite 801
Fairfax, VA 22035

RE: Proffer Interpretation for Rezoning RZ 2005-SP-019

Dear Barbara:

This is a request for confirmation that several proposed minor modifications are in substantial conformance with the Conceptual Development Plan – Final Development Plan (CDP/FDP) that was approved in connection with the above-referenced rezoning. For ease of reference, the approved Proffers and associated CDP/FDP are attached as Exhibit 1. The exhibits detailing the modifications are attached as Exhibit 2, and entitled "Interpretation Plan." For ease of reference, the specific changes are circled on the Interpretation Plan.

In short summary form, the proposed revisions reflect the natural design evolution that inevitably occurs with a project of this size and scale as final engineering and architectural issues are resolved. In virtually all instances, the modification proposed was contemplated by and is directly addressed in the approved proffered conditions. Nonetheless, out of a posture of caution and to avoid delays or confusion in the Site Plan review process, we are seeking the appropriate confirmation now.

Consistent with the provisions of Paragraph 4 of Section 16-403 of the Zoning Ordinances under which such minor modifications are permitted, all aspects of this request are in response to issues of topography, layout and design. Of equal importance and as required by the Zoning Ordinance, the revisions do not: (1) increase the intensity of the proposal; (2) effect parking regulations; or (3) reduce the amount or effectiveness of any screening, landscaping or open space areas; or (4) fundamentally change the orientation or relationship to surrounding property. A more detailed description of the proposed modifications is as follows:

1. Minor Modification to Footprint of Building 3:

Subsequent to the approval of the rezoning, final engineering of the site has determined that there are potentially significant amounts of naturally occurring asbestos containing soils in and around "so-called" Building 3. In an effort to minimize the amount of excavation into such soils, the location of the internal parking garage for Building 3 has been reoriented slightly. In its modified form, the garage now occupies a more central location in the "so-called" courtyard area of the building. The usable area of the courtyard is not diminished and, in fact, the relocation of the garage allowed for the creation of an additional amenity courtyard such that the total area devoted to recreational amenities is now 8,500 sq. ft. more than that shown on the CDP/FDP. Consistent with theory of the design reflected on the CDP/FDP, the garage remains of a height that fully screened by residential building that surrounds it.

This modification also necessitates a minor change in the location of the entrance to the garage to reflect these circumstances. The new garage entrance is in a central location on the east/west internal street that provides access from Ridgetop Road. Please note that the overall number of entrances to the garage is not increased, and the new garage location is in an area that was already designated on the CDP/FDP as an area for drop off and pick up activities.

Also of note and consistent with the provisions of Section 16-403 of the Zoning Ordinance, this modification does not (1) diminish the effectiveness of any approved screening or buffering areas; (2) does not place buildings closer to Route 50 nor diminish the efficacy of any of the setbacks; and (3) does not substantively effect the location or configuration of the internal street system. Further, from a design standpoint, this minor modification has the added benefit of providing a superior design and screening along the eastern side of the Building. With the proposed minor modifications, all views of the entrance to the parking garage are fully shielded from abutting properties not part of the rezoning.

2. Minor Modification to Building Footprint for Building 2.2:

Final architectural plans for this Building, including the final design and incorporation of the required workforce housing units, have had a very minor impact on the shape and configuration of the footprint for Building 2.2. The proposed footprint is detailed on Exhibit 2. Similar to item 1 above, this minor modification has no impact on the overall intensity, the distance to peripheral lot lines or the relationship of the Building to surrounding properties. Perhaps of equal importance, the location and extent of the retail program on the ground floor is unchanged and the type and quality of all Proffered pedestrian and landscape amenities are retained as reflected on the governing CDP/FDP. In fact, as a result of this evolution in design, the building is setback further from the intersection of Government Center Parkway and Ridge Top Road, creating a

larger public space that accommodates additional pedestrian and landscape amenities on that key corner.

3. Minor Reallocation of Approved Residential Density:


Proffer 3 expressly permits an adjustment in the number of units on the residential portions of the project. The proffer further stipulates that at least 400 units must be developed and a maximum of 500 units is not exceeded. Consistent with the Proffer and in a response to final architectural design, and the final development of a workforce housing product which has produced slightly smaller units, there has been a slight reallocation in units from Building 2.2 to Building 3. As shown on the tabulations as deemed in Exhibit 2, Building 2.2 will allow a maximum of 191 units compared to 237 units on the approved CDP/FDP. Building 3 will now have a maximum of 293 units as opposed to 225 as shown on the CDP/FDP.

4. Final Architectural Renderings:

Proffer 6 acknowledged that the depictions of the buildings on sheets 5, 5A, 7, 8, and 8A of the CDP/FDP were illustrative in nature and subject to change at final engineering. Proffer 1 and the Building Data Chart of sheet 3 of the CDP/FDP established maximum heights for the various buildings, but also permit lower heights provided the resultant design is in substantial conformance with the rezoning. Consistent with these commitments, while more detailed than the rezoning exhibits, the attached drawings reflect an identical architectural style, varied roof lines, and a type and variation of materials for Buildings 2.2 and 3 that is consistent with both the letter and the intent of the architectural commitments in the Proffers and CDP/FDP. Please also note that as part of the final architectural design, the final height of Building 2.2 will be approximately six (6) stories. This is slightly lower than that depicted on the illustrative renderings presented at the time of rezoning.

Thanks in advance for your consideration of this request. Upon receipt if you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,



Gregory A. Riegler

GAR/ksg

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Phone: 703.712.5000
Fax: 703.712.5050
www.mcguirewoods.com

Gregory A. Riegle
Direct: 703.712.5360
griegle@mcguirewoods.com

McGUIREWOODS

April 2, 2007

Barbara Byron
Director, Zoning Evaluation Division
Fairfax County Planning & Zoning
12055 Government Center Parkway
Suite 801
Fairfax, VA 22035

RECEIVED
Department of Planning & Zoning
APR 02 2007
Zoning Evaluation Division

RE: Proffer Interpretation for Rezoning RZ 2005-SP-019

Dear Barbara:

This is a follow up and supplement to my January 24, 2007 letter (copy attached as Exhibit 1) on the same subject. As you may know, in recent weeks we have had meetings and numerous discussions with your staff in an effort to productively resolve several relatively minor questions associated with our original interpretation request. These meetings and discussions have been helpful and to our knowledge, the information that follows responds fully to questions and comments raised/made by staff. A revised "Interpretation Plan" (Exhibit 2) and a number of related exhibits are attached. For ease of reference, we have also provided Mylar overlays that will allow comparisons to be made between the pending Interpretation Plan(s) and governing Conceptual Development Plans – Final Development Plan (CDP/FDP).

Highlights of some of the most recent revisions are as follows:

1. Configuration of Certain Outdoor Plazas:

In our discussions, staff had requested that the plazas shown on the Interpretation Plan at: (1) Ridge Top Road and Government Center Parkway Extended; and (2) the southeast corner of Building 2.2 be redesigned to better reflect the approved CDP/FDP. The revised Interpretation Plan restores the plaza at Government Center Parkway Extended and Ridge Top Road to a size, shape and configuration that is identical to that reflected on the CDP/FDP.

Similarly, the plaza at the southeast corner of Building 2.2 has also been reconfigured to provide a general shape and usable area that is clearly in substantial conformance with the CDP/FDP. For ease of reference, I have attached several colored exhibits (Exhibit 3) that comparatively show the current proposed plaza in

relation to that reflected on the CDP/FDP. While it is true that final building design has caused a very minor reduction in the actual size, this reduction only comes at the expense of a narrow triangular portion at the north of the plaza that was largely unusable. The design reflected on the Interpretation Plan retains all of the required decorative and design elements, and actually has a depth that is slightly greater than that reflected on the CDP/FDP. The current design of this plaza is equally or more usable as compared to that shown on the governing CDP/FDP.

2. Minor Redesign of Parking Garage Entrance for Building 3:

Staff had requested additional design detail regarding the appearance of the parking garage entrance now proposed from the internal east-west roadway. Exhibit 4 contains a detailed rendering that shows the articulation, the design theme and building materials associated with this area of the property. As the Exhibit shows, the developer has gone to great lengths to make the entrance for the garage fully integrated, with the overall architectural scheme. This is a level of design detail well above the minimum requirements of the proffered conditions. As alluded to in our original interpretation request, the practical effect of this minor relocation of the garage entrance is to eliminate a large portion of the exposed parking garage that would have been visible from future development plan on the abutting property to the east.

3. Other Miscellaneous Questions.

Staff had also asked for confirmation regarding floor area and number of units associated with the proposed buildings relative to that shown in the CDP/FDP. This information is fully provided with the tabulations on Interpretation Plan. Changes for the CDP/FDP are circled. Any adjustment or reallocation of the number of units within the approved buildings remains in compliance with the parameters outlined in governing Proffer 3.

In various points in the interpretation process, there have been some questions about the "articulation" of the portions of the building fronting to Route 29. For ease of reference, Exhibit 5 contains the most current architectural rendering. As this drawing illustrates, there is considerable articulation in the form of building "breaks", variation in the color and texture of building materials and architectural styles. Perhaps most importantly, reflective of accurate topographic conditions, the developer has incorporated considerable additional vertical articulation beyond that conceptually shown in connection with the approval of the CDP/FDP. Collectively these commitments fully honor the intent of the approved rezoning which was to have an interesting and attractive facade along Route 29.

Staff had also asked for reconfirmation that the reconfigured interior plaza courtyard for Building 3 did not diminish exposure of these areas to natural light when compared to that shown on CDP/FDP. Obviously, the proposed minor modification

Barbara Byron
April 2, 2007
Page 3

creates considerably more usable interior recreation space. As to the question asked, there is no diminishment of available natural light. When compared to the governing CDP/FDP, building heights and configurations are not dramatically changed from the governing CDP/FDP. In fact, if anything, the interpretation plans strategically relocates the swimming pool to an area that has even greater exposure to sunlight. Similarly, as further evidence of the visibility of this area, the developer also contemplates the installation of an internal balcony to give residents further access to this area. For ease of reference, I have attached the shadow studies (Exhibit 6) conducted as part of the rezoning approval. Again, given that the height and configuration of the building is not changing in the relevant areas, these studies remain effective in terms of evaluating the presence of natural light.

We hope and trust this information is response. As always, upon receipt if there are any questions please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'GR', written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

Gregory A. Riegle

GAR/ksg
Enclosures

cc: Mary Ann Godfrey
Stephan Rodiger, KSI

V4510891.3

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Phone: 703.712.5000
Fax: 703.712.5050
www.mcguiirewoods.com

Gregory A. Riegler
Direct: 703.712.5360

McGUIREWOODS

RECEIVED
Department of Planning & Zoning

APR 19 2007

Zoning Evaluation Division
griegler@mcguiirewoods.com

April 19, 2007

Mary Ann Godfrey
Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning
Zoning Evaluation Division
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 801
Fairfax, VA 22035

Re: Pending Interpretation for Project Commonly Known As "Ridgewood"

Dear Mary Ann:

This is a follow-up to my earlier letters on the same subject. In our most recent conversation, you have asked for some additional information about the architectural and design treatment of the portions of the parking garage that are visible within the interior courtyards associated with "Building 3".

Fundamentally, the proffered conditions accepted by the Board of Supervisors in the approval of the rezoning impose no requirements as to the design of the parking garage in these areas. Nonetheless, the Applicant shares the view that these areas of the garage need to be designed to be as attractive as possible.

To that end, attached is a sketch showing design commitments that reflect this objective. Their comments go well beyond the obligations of the proffers. The proposed design incorporates an aggressive landscaping proposal at ground level. In fact, proposed trees closest to the garage will be 8-10" in height at the time of planting. In addition, the Applicant has committed to design the visible portions of the garage with a color and texture of materials that is complimentary to the building facade.

As always, please call me if you have any questions. Thanks in advance for your continuing assistance.


Very truly yours,




Gregory A. Riegler

GAR:jeb
Enclosure

V4535664.1



SCALE 1/16"=1'-0"



THE PRESTON PARTNERSHIP, LLC
A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DESIGN FIRM
3441 PARKWAY PARK DRIVE, SUITE 415
FALLS CHURCH, VIRGINIA 22042
TELEPHONE: 703 295 0000
FAX: 703 295 0001
WWW.THEPRESTONPARTNERSHIP.COM

PROJECT _____

FOR _____

KSI RIDGEWOOD

DATE _____

04/18/07

JOB NUMBER _____

0665103

DRAWING TITLE _____

CONCEPTUAL GARAGE
COURTYARD ELEVATION

DRAWING NUMBER _____

COMMENTS _____

RECEIVED
Department of Planning & Zoning

JAN 24 2007

Zoning Evaluation Division

PROFFERS
Midland Road LLC – Ridgewood
RZ 2005-SP-019

June 20, 2006

Pursuant to Section 15.2-2303(a) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, the property owners and Applicant in this rezoning proffer that the development of the parcel under consideration and shown on the Fairfax County Tax Maps as Tax Map Reference No. 56-2-((1))-37 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property") will be in accordance with the following conditions if, and only if, said rezoning request for the PRM District is granted by the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County, Virginia (the "Board"). In the event said application request is denied or the Board's approval is overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction, these proffers shall be null and void. The Owners and the Applicant ("Applicant"), for themselves, their successors and assigns, agree that these proffers shall be binding on the future development of the Property unless modified, waived or rescinded in the future by the Board, in accordance with applicable County and State statutory procedures. The Proffered Conditions are:

I. GENERAL

1. Substantial Conformance. Subject to the proffers and the provisions of Article 16 of the Zoning Ordinance, under which minor modifications to an approved development plan are permitted, development of the Property shall be in substantial conformance with the Conceptual Development Plan/Final Development Plan ("CDP/FDP"), prepared by Urban Engineering & Associates, Inc., and dated April 13, 2005, as revised through May 18, 2006. Notwithstanding that the CDP/FDP is presented on thirteen (13) sheets, it shall be understood that the CDP shall be only those elements of the plans that depict the

ERK TO THE B

JUL 27 2006

number and the general location of points of access, the amount and location of landscaped open space, peripheral setbacks, limits of clearing and grading, building heights, the total number, type, uses and the general location of buildings and roads (the "CDP Elements"). The Applicant reserves the right to request a Final Development Plan Amendment ("FDPA") for elements other than the CDP elements from the Planning Commission for all or a portion of the CDP/FDP in accordance with Section 16-402 of the Zoning Ordinance if such an amendment is in accordance with the approved CDP and these proffers.

2. Minor Modifications. In addition to that described above, pursuant to Paragraph 4 of Section 16-403 of the Zoning Ordinance, minor modifications to the CDP/FDP and these proffers may be permitted as determined by the Zoning Administrator.
3. Maximum Density. The maximum floor area ratio ("FAR") permitted on the Property shall be 1.2. Based on this maximum FAR, the maximum gross floor area ("GFA") that may be constructed shall be 941,166 square feet. The Applicant reserves the right to construct a lesser amount of GFA provided that the buildings and Property remain in substantial conformance with that shown on the CDP/FDP as determined by the Zoning Administrator. Similarly, subject to the 1.2 FAR limitation of this proffer, the number of units described on the CDP/FDP may be adjusted upward or downward based on the final design, provided the maximum number of dwelling units shall not exceed 500 units and minimum number of dwelling units shall at least be 400 units.
4. Phasing. Build-out of the Property may proceed in phases. The FAR, GFA and/or number of dwelling units per acre constructed within a respective phase of the project may exceed the maximum density limitations set forth in Proffer 3 so long as such


maximum density limitations are not exceeded over the entirety of the Property that is the subject of the rezoning. The creation of the landscaped open space areas and associated improvements may occur in phases, concurrent with the phasing of development/construction of the Property. As such, the total area of landscaped open space provided at any given phase of development shall not be required to be equivalent to the 20% overall landscaped open space; provided that the total combined landscaped open space at the completion of all development shall satisfy the overall landscaped open space requirement as shown on the CDP/FDP. Notwithstanding the above, if the Applicant develops Building 4 with the office/retail option in accordance with the CDP/FDP, then such Building shall be developed in a single phase and such phase shall include the entire office and retail component.

5. Density Credit. Density credit shall be reserved for the Property as provided by Section 2-308 of the Zoning Ordinance for all dedications described herein and/or as shown on the CDP/FDP or as may reasonably be required by Fairfax County, VDOT or others at the time of site/subdivision plan approvals.
6. Architecture. The final architectural design shall be in substantial conformance with the general type, quality and proportion of materials depicted in the illustrative perspectives, elevations, and sections shown on the CDP/FDP. Building facades not shown in the CDP/FDP shall be consistent with the general type, quality and proportion of materials depicted in the illustrative perspectives, elevations, and sections shown on the CDP/FDP. Rooftop mechanical equipment will be shielded from view from the ground-level of adjacent streets. Vinyl siding shall not be used on the exterior of any building, except for


facades facing the interior of the amenity courtyards and parking garages for Buildings 2.2 and 3.

7. Parking Garage Façade(s). In addition to the landscape screening shown on the CDP/FDP, the facades of parking garages labeled P-1 and P-4, and the eastern face of the parking garage labeled P-3 on the CDP/FDP shall be constructed such that a minimum of thirty (30%) of the exposed facades shall be brick of a tone that is consistent with the related companion building. Such facades shall also include, as appropriate to the design of the companion building, one or more of the following features: horizontal and/or vertical reveals, insets of contrasting color, ornamental metal railing or decorative metal detailing along the top panel or other similar treatment that breaks up the continuous façade of the garage in a manner that compliments the architectural details of the related companion building. Exterior lighting fixtures, if included, shall be identical in style to the related companion building.


Additionally, the height of all horizontal panels on all parking garages shall be sufficient to reasonably ensure that the potential glare from headlights of automobiles parked inside the parking garage is screened. Lighting internal to the parking garages shall be located between the beams to prevent glare. Lighting on the upper levels of the parking garages shall be fully cut off and be equipped to prevent glare resulting from direct visibility of light sources onto adjacent residential property. Where fixtures are mounted along the edge of the topmost deck of a parking garage, an opaque house-side shield shall be affixed onto the fixture or adjacent post to eliminate glare so that the lighted portion of the fixture shall not be visible from adjacent residential property.




1 RIDGE TOP ROAD AND GOV. CENTER PKWY. PLAZAS
1"=20'




4 BUILDING 3 COURTYARD
1"=20'




2 GOVERNMENT CENTER PARKWAY SECTION
1/8"=1'-0"



3 RIDGE TOP ROAD STREETSCAPE
1/8"=1'-0"



6 BUILDING 3 COURTYARD
1"=20'



5 BUILDING 2 COURTYARD
1"=20'

NOTES:
1. LANDSCAPING SHOWN IS PRESENTED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF DESIGN. LOCATIONS, SPECIES AND QUANTITIES MAY BE ADJUSTED WITH FINAL DESIGN AND ENGINEERING.

NO.	DATE	REVISION	APPROVED BY
1	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
2	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
3	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
4	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
5	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
6	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
7	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
8	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
9	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
10	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
11	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
12	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
13	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
14	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
15	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
16	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
17	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
18	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
19	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J
20	08-14-18	ISSUE FOR PERMITS	AS/J


LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - URBAN ENGINEERING & ASSOC. INC.
 1718 LITTLE LEPER TURNPIKE
 ANNANDALE, VIRGINIA 22003 (703) 442-8888

DATE: APRIL 2018
 SCALE: 1"=40'


INTERPRETATION PLAN

LANDSCAPE DETAILS
 RIDGEWOOD
 SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT
 FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA


SHEET 8 OF 11
 PLAN NO. ZP-1514




1 BUILDINGS 2.2 & 3 DROP OFF
1"=20'



2 BUILDINGS 2.1 & 2.2 DROP OFF
1"=20'



3 BUILDING 2.1 GARAGE ENTRANCE
1"=20'



4 HOTEL OPTION LANDSCAPE
1"=20'

NOTES:
1. LANDSCAPING SHOWN IS PRESENTED ONLY TO ILLUSTRATE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF DESIGN. LOCATIONS, SPECIES AND QUANTITIES MAY BE ADJUSTED WITH FINAL DESIGN AND ENGINEERING.


DATE	BY	REVISION
12-20-03	URBAN	1.0
01-20-04	URBAN	2.0
02-20-04	URBAN	3.0
03-20-04	URBAN	4.0
04-20-04	URBAN	5.0
05-20-04	URBAN	6.0
06-20-04	URBAN	7.0
07-20-04	URBAN	8.0
08-20-04	URBAN	9.0
09-20-04	URBAN	10.0
10-20-04	URBAN	11.0
11-20-04	URBAN	12.0
12-20-04	URBAN	13.0
01-20-05	URBAN	14.0
02-20-05	URBAN	15.0
03-20-05	URBAN	16.0
04-20-05	URBAN	17.0
05-20-05	URBAN	18.0
06-20-05	URBAN	19.0
07-20-05	URBAN	20.0
08-20-05	URBAN	21.0
09-20-05	URBAN	22.0
10-20-05	URBAN	23.0
11-20-05	URBAN	24.0
12-20-05	URBAN	25.0
01-20-06	URBAN	26.0
02-20-06	URBAN	27.0
03-20-06	URBAN	28.0
04-20-06	URBAN	29.0
05-20-06	URBAN	30.0
06-20-06	URBAN	31.0
07-20-06	URBAN	32.0
08-20-06	URBAN	33.0
09-20-06	URBAN	34.0
10-20-06	URBAN	35.0
11-20-06	URBAN	36.0
12-20-06	URBAN	37.0
01-20-07	URBAN	38.0
02-20-07	URBAN	39.0
03-20-07	URBAN	40.0
04-20-07	URBAN	41.0
05-20-07	URBAN	42.0
06-20-07	URBAN	43.0
07-20-07	URBAN	44.0
08-20-07	URBAN	45.0
09-20-07	URBAN	46.0
10-20-07	URBAN	47.0
11-20-07	URBAN	48.0
12-20-07	URBAN	49.0
01-20-08	URBAN	50.0
02-20-08	URBAN	51.0
03-20-08	URBAN	52.0
04-20-08	URBAN	53.0
05-20-08	URBAN	54.0
06-20-08	URBAN	55.0
07-20-08	URBAN	56.0
08-20-08	URBAN	57.0
09-20-08	URBAN	58.0
10-20-08	URBAN	59.0
11-20-08	URBAN	60.0
12-20-08	URBAN	61.0
01-20-09	URBAN	62.0
02-20-09	URBAN	63.0
03-20-09	URBAN	64.0
04-20-09	URBAN	65.0
05-20-09	URBAN	66.0
06-20-09	URBAN	67.0
07-20-09	URBAN	68.0
08-20-09	URBAN	69.0
09-20-09	URBAN	70.0
10-20-09	URBAN	71.0
11-20-09	URBAN	72.0
12-20-09	URBAN	73.0
01-20-10	URBAN	74.0
02-20-10	URBAN	75.0
03-20-10	URBAN	76.0
04-20-10	URBAN	77.0
05-20-10	URBAN	78.0
06-20-10	URBAN	79.0
07-20-10	URBAN	80.0
08-20-10	URBAN	81.0
09-20-10	URBAN	82.0
10-20-10	URBAN	83.0
11-20-10	URBAN	84.0
12-20-10	URBAN	85.0
01-20-11	URBAN	86.0
02-20-11	URBAN	87.0
03-20-11	URBAN	88.0
04-20-11	URBAN	89.0
05-20-11	URBAN	90.0
06-20-11	URBAN	91.0
07-20-11	URBAN	92.0
08-20-11	URBAN	93.0
09-20-11	URBAN	94.0
10-20-11	URBAN	95.0
11-20-11	URBAN	96.0
12-20-11	URBAN	97.0
01-20-12	URBAN	98.0
02-20-12	URBAN	99.0
03-20-12	URBAN	100.0

ALWAYS USE THE LATEST REVISIONS OF THIS PLAN. ANY CHANGES TO THIS PLAN SHALL BE MADE BY A SEPARATE REVISION SHEET. THIS PLAN IS THE PROPERTY OF URBAN ENGINEERING & ASSOC., INC. AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM. WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF URBAN ENGINEERING & ASSOC., INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.




URBAN ENGINEERING & ASSOC., INC.
CIVIL ENGINEERS - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS - LEAD DESIGNERS
1714 LITTLE WATER TURNPIKE
JACKSONVILLE, VIRGINIA 22802 (703) 544-4844

INTERPRETATION PLAN
LANDSCAPE DETAILS
RIDGEWOOD
SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT
FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA
C.I. No. _____
DATE: APRIL, 2007
SCALE: 1"=40'
SHEET
8A
OF
11
FILE No.
7P-1614



© COPYRIGHT 2006 THE PRESTON PARTNERSHIP, LLC R51-~~XXXXXXXX~~ - 21 Dec. 06





THE PRESTON PARTNERSHIP, LLC
A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DESIGN FIRM

3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 416
FALLS CHURCH, VIRGINIA 22042
TELEPHONE: 703 806 0830
FAX: 703 806 0831
WWW.THEPRESTONPARTNERSHIP.COM

PROJECT _____

FOR _____

KSI RIDGEWOOD

DATE _____

03/28/07

JOB NUMBER _____


0665103

DRAWING TITLE _____

CONCEPTUAL GARAGE
ENTRY ELEVATION

DRAWING NUMBER _____

COMMENTS _____



BLDG 400


BLDG 100


TEXTURE PRINT APPLIED
TO PRE-CAST, TYP.
FINAL COLORS TBD

GARAGE ENTRY


BRICK VENEER

OPENINGS IN PARKING GARAGE, TYP.







January, 10:00 am




January, 4:00 pm




April, 10:00 am




April, 4:00 pm




July, 10:00 am



July, 4:00 pm



October, 10:00 am



October, 4:00 pm

2 BUILDING 3 COURTYARD SHADOW STUDY

