

CHAPTER 6-SERVICE DISTRICTS

■ INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters have provided background information on the physical character of the County and its demographics. This information helps to explain the foundation upon which the goals and policies in the first chapter were formulated. These goals are the result of a merger between public policy and enlightened owner self-interest; that is, the realization by County government and residents alike of the need to retain the natural beauty of the County for public and private good while accommodating growth. In understanding this need, the County recognizes that its purpose is to accommodate orderly, efficient, and well-planned growth while preserving and protecting the natural environment and countryside. ~~Early speculative development can have a devastating effect upon the realization of the full potential of the area.~~ The County seeks optimum development patterns and an equitable distribution of costs and benefits, realizing in the process that the sum of subdivisions does not necessarily make a community. Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 translate the [Vision, Guiding Principles and Policies of Chapter 1 into Goals, Objectives and Implementation Actions to realize the County's Vision](#). ~~goals, policies, and background data into an action plan for the County.~~

■ LAND USE PLANS—GENERAL INFORMATION

In developing the following land use plans, and their supporting fiscal, transportation, and public facility/utility plans, it has been accepted as given that:

1. The County has a variety of physiographies each with attributes worth preserving, each with sensitivities to development, but each with areas suitable to some type of development; and that,
2. Areas suitable for development should be delineated and planned according to general County need, ability to provide services, and the character of the area; and that,
3. Certain patterns of development may be a burden to the taxpayer and destructive to the environment and character of the County and, therefore, should be minimized.

For the purpose of developing land use plans, the County is divided into three categories: service districts (Chapter 6), villages (Chapter 7), and rural areas (Chapter 8). Areas designated as service districts are designed to accommodate the highest density residential, commercial, and industrial uses in the County. Service districts are either currently served with public utilities or planned for the future provision of some type of public utilities in the form of public sewer, water or both. Village designations have limited and smaller scaled mixtures of residential, commercial, and service land uses.

Over 90 percent of the County, characterized by agricultural uses, open space, wooded tracts, and mountains, is designated as rural area. It is divided for the purpose of zoning into the Rural Agricultural (RA) and the Rural Conservation (RC) districts. The RA land consists predominantly of open agricultural lands; the RC land contains predominantly the wooded mountain and steep slope areas. Both zoning district categories are intended for agricultural or agriculturally related uses. Zoning regulations establish standards that discourage and limit residential development to very low densities not intended to conflict with the agricultural and forestal uses or the environmentally sensitive areas of the County.

■ SERVICE DISTRICTS

Introduction

~~An long-standing~~ and important Fauquier County planning goal since 1967 has been to concentrate and guide growth into the Service Districts. Service Districts are the County's urban growth areas planned for relatively more intensive use and density. In order to support and promote growth, adequate public facilities and infrastructure, including public water and sewer, have been planned for the service districts.

However, portions of service districts may be designated to receive only one type of public utility where economic, physical or environmental considerations make the provision of all public services infeasible. Where this occurs, the portions of the service district ~~which~~ that are not planned for public utilities are designated as “non-sewered” or “non-watered” growth areas. While still part of the overall service district, these areas may be planned for substantially less growth and densities than the rest of the service district, but more than that found in the agricultural areas of the County.

The accomplishment of many other important County policies and goals is facilitated through the service district concept, particularly protecting and promoting traditional agricultural uses, rural lifestyles, historic sites and areas, unique open spaces, and preserving the environment. By concentrating the majority of population growth and non-agricultural industrial and commercial uses in service districts, the County is able to promote other planning goals designed to protect the rural areas from unplanned and destructive growth and also provide public services in a more efficient and cost effective manner.

The County has six Service Districts and three Village Service Districts. The Service Districts include: Bealeton, Marshall, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington (includes the Town of Remington) and Warrenton (includes the Town of Warrenton). Portions of these districts are currently served with public sewer and water and have a range of existing or planned public facilities (e.g., fire and rescue, library, parks, schools) associated with smaller town scaled development, with build-out populations generally ranging from 5,000 to 14,000 16,000 residents.

The incorporated town of The Plains functions as a Service District within its corporate boundaries. Portions of Warrenton, Bealeton, New Baltimore and Remington are currently served by public water and sewer, and Opal is served by public sewer while public water service is under development. Marshall is served by a public sewer and has a public water system that was made public by the acquisition of the privately-owned Marshall Water Works by the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority.

The Village Service Districts are Calverton, Catlett, and Midland. Public facilities and services are expected to be limited due to the planned village scale and build-out populations, resulting in a maximum population of approximately 1,200 within each community. Catlett is currently served by public water but not sewer. Midland, with the exception of limited public sewer serving the airport, and Calverton presently have no public sewer and water services. Community growth in Calverton and Catlett is severely limited by the Occoquan Watershed Sewer Policy and state wastewater treatment, discharge and permitting requirements. Both villages have a significant number of existing businesses and homes with failing drainfields needing limited public sewer service, as outlined within their discrete plan sections. Midland is located in the Occoquan and Rappahannock Watersheds, and faces similar public wastewater treatment constraints.

Details regarding each district are included within this Chapter.

Urban Development Areas

Section 15.2-2223.1 of the Code of Virginia ~~requires~~ allows the County to designate one or more Urban Development Areas (UDAs) within the Comprehensive Plan, with such designated areas sized to accommodate 10-20 years of projected growth in the County. Urban Development Areas are areas where higher density development is appropriate due to the availability of public water and sewer, proximity to transportation facilities and adjacency to other developed areas, with the goal of improving coordination between transportation and land use. Urban Development Areas are areas for compact, mixed use development, with residential densities of at least 4 units per developable acre for single-family, 8 units/acre for townhouses and 12 units/acre for multi-family, and commercial development at a minimum 0.4 FAR (floor area ratio).

The County's Service Districts embrace a similar concept to the State's UDAs by channeling growth and development into denser settlements and maximizing the efficiency of the public infrastructure. While ~~the~~ The County's Service Districts are targeted areas for growth and development generally; however, their individual land use plans recommend a variety of densities that are appropriate for the specific district in a Virginia Piedmont scale and pattern of development. Not all areas within all Service Districts would be appropriate for a higher intensity urban form of development, especially those with a lower density pattern

of development or similar conflicting land use goals. The designation of Urban Development Areas is consistent with the land use plans for the town center core area of the Bealeton Service District, ~~and~~ the downtown core (Main Street and Salem Avenue) of the Marshall Service District ~~and the Arrington project in the Warrenton Service District~~. Land uses within these ~~two~~ three areas include mixed-use neighborhoods and a mix of housing types. The specific boundaries of the designated UDAs are shown on the Land Use Plan for the Bealeton Service District (See Figure BE-1), ~~and~~ on the Neighborhood Plan for the Marshall Service District (See Figure MA-9) ~~and the Land Use Plan for the Warrenton Service District (See Figure 6-WA-1)~~. Mixed use development and infill development at or above required densities and in an amount to accommodate a minimum of the County's 10 year population growth, but no more than 20 years projected growth, are provided within these designated UDAs. However, in implementation, densities and intensities for individual parcels or groups of parcels may be higher or lower than the general standards noted in the prior paragraph, as long as they are met in some combination within the UDA areas as a whole.

The service district plans for Bealeton, ~~and~~ Marshall ~~and Warrenton~~ provide specific guidance in the employment of traditional town design standards applicable to the designated UDAs. Generally, these design principles include strong pedestrian scale and orientation in building design and layout, connectivity of streets and pedestrian facilities, positioning of multi-story buildings to create a defined streetscape, parks and civic spaces, as well as other standards to promote and reinforce the traditional town concept, providing a sense of place for the community.

As noted above, ~~The~~ UDA concept, as reflected in the current State legislation, is similar to our Service District approach, in that population growth and density are focused in concentrated areas. The reason the designation of UDAs can be so easily accommodated is Fauquier County's traditional land planning, which also considers the broader public service delivery and community development goals. It is important that Fauquier's rural land plan be considered as a vital ingredient of the UDA designations, as concurrent rural land and farmland preservation is integral to the success of such growth management approaches.

Planning the Districts: 1997-2020

~~In planning the Service Districts, and in making periodic adjustments to Service District boundaries, land uses, and densities therein, the County reviews and analyzes a range of factors. Of the factors considered, existing land use and zoning, and the wishes of residents concerning Service District growth, are of major importance. To foster public participation, the Board of Supervisors in the 1992 Plan update appointed a committee of three citizens from each magisterial district to serve on an advisory committee to the Planning Commission. The Plan Review Advisory Committee (PRAC) met with citizens in their districts, and the Planning Commission, on a frequent and continuing basis as the 1992-2010 plan was prepared. In addition,~~

~~the Planning Commission held public meetings throughout the County to explain the planning process and to gather public information. Such meetings were held for all the Service Districts.~~

~~In 1997, the Board of Supervisors initiated the update of the Service District plans through an expanded and lengthy public process. An appointed Citizen Planning Committee for each district plan was established. Each committee held extensive public work sessions that extended over 18 months. The draft plans were submitted through the public hearing and adoption process for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. The Marshall and Warrenton Service Districts were the last to be adopted.~~

~~The 1997-2004 Comprehensive Plan amendments altered district boundaries, allowing traditional neighborhood, village and town-sealed land use designs. These designs are more compatible with existing neighborhood densities, citizen views and expectations of their community at build out, environmental constraints, as well as public facility infrastructure requirements and limitations in expanding public sewer and water services.~~

Service District Phasing

~~The 1992 Plan promoted time-phased development within the service districts (Phase I: 1992-2000; Phase II: 2000-2010; and Phase III: Post-2010) based on the extension of transportation, sewer and water infrastructure. The elemental phasing was envisioned to enable cost-effective planning for public facilities, utilities, transportation infrastructure, and to better predict overall development and the availability of public facilities. Implementation of the Service District plans was primarily dependent upon the provision of public water and sewer facilities to accommodate the planned densities for commercial, industrial and residential densities. Providing planned schools, transportation, sewer and water infrastructure requires long-range planning and capital investments to produce timely and cost-effective services and facilities.~~

~~During the Service District Plan Update from 1997-2003, the Board of Supervisors adopted phases for specific and designated areas planned for public water and sewer. For example, some plans specifically delineate "Sewered Areas" and "Non-Sewered Areas" where public sewer service is limited or not planned for the future.~~

~~This principle is demonstrated in the Warrenton Service District. The limited public sewer and water service extension capabilities of the Town to serve the unincorporated areas of the Warrenton Service District are controlled by agreements reached between the Town and County in the summer of 2001. The two jurisdictions defined certain limited areas where Town water and sewer would be provided, and established that such service should not be expected for the remainder of the Service District. Those limited areas are~~

~~identified within The Town/County Master Water and Sewer Agreement, as amended. Properties that are not specified within this agreement for sewer service or served within a community sewer system owned, operated and maintained by the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority (WSA), are located in the designated Non-Sewered Area of the Warrenton Service District. Furthermore, all future development needing public sewer and water in areas not designated for Town of Warrenton public utilities would also require a Plan Amendment authorizing service to be provided by the Fauquier County Water and Sanitation Authority.~~

Service Districts: Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 Areas

The County and the Water and Sanitation Authority (WSA) have undertaken studies to address the future provision of water and sewer to the Service Districts. It can be anticipated that amendments will be made to Service District plans as the County moves ahead in its planning. The County will fully monitor population projections, and the Service District plans for the provision of water and sewer, and amend the Service District plans, including phasing, as appropriate. The County recognizes that in order to facilitate the cost-effective provision of water and sewer services it may be appropriate to redistribute densities within certain areas of the Service Districts. It must also be recognized that due to certain constraints, the cost-effective provision of water or sewer may not always be possible, and that could require the re-designation or planning of the affected service district.

It is not intended, however, that the phasing provisions preclude the extension of public water and sewer to correct existing or potential health problems for existing dwellings, commercial or industrial buildings. Similarly, this Plan does not intend to preclude the extension of public water and sewer to existing or planned governmental facilities that are near or adjacent to service districts.

Changes to Phasing Plans

~~Phasing areas are included in several district plans, and timelines are based on 2000 U.S. Census and related information and population projections made shortly thereafter.~~ Over the period of this plan there will almost certainly be a need to make adjustments to the phasing boundaries and timelines based on population growth patterns, and the recommendations of the Master Water and Sewer Plan and other studies, such as transportation assessments. Changes in phasing areas and timelines, however, should not be automatic, but based on deliberate decisions by the Board of Supervisors following review and recommendations from the Planning Commission.

The Board of Supervisors may approve changes to the service district phasing following review and recommendation by the Planning Commission and findings by the Board of Supervisors provided that:

1. The patterns of population growth and development within the service district are nearing build-out capacity; and
2. The expanded area is clearly justified and appropriate for that specific community; and
3. Existing public water and sewer capacity to support the changes are available or scheduled to be provided prior to development in the new area; and
4. Other infrastructure, including roads, is sufficient to accommodate development, is planned to be in place at the time of development, to be provided either by public or private funds or public private partnerships; and
5. The proposed amendment is consistent with the orderly development of the service districts.

In a low density area such as Fauquier County, residential rezoning and subdivision applications that meet Comprehensive Plan guidelines and Zoning and Subdivision regulations still present challenges to elementary, middle and high school capacities. The County has a comprehensive, 5-year capital improvements programming process, and education and school costs dominate that program. Hence, applicants are expected to ~~work with the Planning Commission, School Board and Board of Supervisors in developing~~ **provide** an acceptable phasing program for any residential rezoning pending approval which meets school seat capacities or planned expansions. The County needs to determine if there are design and density incentives that can be included within the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances which would encourage developers of by-right subdivisions to phase their projects for durations more compatible with existing and planned public facilities and roadway expansions.

Residential Development within the Service Districts

~~The population projections and growth allocations in Chapter 3 show that approximately 75% of total residential growth will occur in service districts. This target is consistent with planning goal number 5 to concentrate and guide growth in service districts. Since 2000, approximately 60 percent of countywide growth has occurred within these districts. To this end, County plans and regulations will continue to guide growth toward the service districts at proper zoning densities to ensure that services can be efficiently and economically provided.~~

Additions to the Service District

Any proposed addition to a service district shall require a Comprehensive Plan amendment. In considering such amendments, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should examine such factors as: (a) the justification for the proposed expansion of the community; (b) the availability of water and sewer and other infrastructure such as fire and rescue facilities, schools and roads; (c) the fiscal and communitywide impacts of the addition; and (d) the consistency of the proposed expansion with the orderly development of the service district.

Determining Service District Area and Land Use

Another objective of the service district planning concept is to provide sufficient quantities of undeveloped land, either zoned or with the potential for residential development. ~~Population projections and service district allocations are discussed in Chapter 3 (Tables 3-17, 3-18, and 3-19).~~ The service districts should also provide sufficient land for future commercial and industrial growth and for public facilities such as schools, roads, and parks.

A good future land use plan should include a mix of residential densities to provide for a variety of residential needs (e.g., single family detached, townhouses, and apartments) and for efficient delivery of services. Equally important and somewhat more complex is the need for community design ~~which~~ that reduces dependency on the automobile as a result of considered school and employment locations, and provides modest room for service district growth and redevelopment.

Since population is a major key determining planning areas, Fauquier County has used a methodology that first converts population projections to dwelling units, and uses the resulting number to determine the planned land area. In a number of service districts, total land planned for residential development exceeds that required to accommodate projected population. Where this over-planning exists it is generally the result of specific factors in the service district, such as the amount of existing development. It is possible to calculate from the area planned for development theoretical yields of dwelling units. ~~The population forecasts are stated in Chapter 3.~~

Land use mix and densities are also important elements of the service district plans. The service district plans include a range of residential densities that include low density (single family detached homes at a density of 1-3 dwelling units per acre), medium density (typically townhouses at a density of 4-6 dwelling units per acre) and high density (garden apartments or low-rise apartments at a density range of 7-20 dwelling units per acre). There are also provisions for a Planned Residential Development (PRD), Planned Development Mixed Use (PDMU) and Mixed Use Bealeton (MU-Bealeton) zoning districts within the

Fauquier County Zoning Ordinance. Each are mixed use districts allowing a variety of residential units and densities and commercial uses (including offices) as part of the development.

Any PRD, PDMU or MU-Bealeton zoning application proposal may also need an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan justifying its fit within the designated community, demonstrating that it provides for its public facilities and infrastructure requirements, and meeting other established standards contained both within the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The Plan provides for Planned Industrial Districts which would allow a mix of offices, warehouses, and light industrial uses, and Planned Commercial/Industrial Districts which would allow a mix of retail uses, offices, and light industrial uses.

The residential densities in this Plan utilize a similar density range as the 1994 plan as shown below. The one exception is the Planned Residential Development land use, which has been removed as a category. It is a genuine Zoning Ordinance district and is no longer used as a category to define land use within the Comprehensive Plan.

	1994 Plan	2000 Plan	Density Used for Calculation Area
Low	1-3	1-3	1
Medium	4-6	4-6	4
High	7-20	7-10	7
Planned Residential	3-6	None <u>specified</u>	0

These density ranges are intended to:

1. Promote more efficient utilization of land;
2. Promote more affordable and diverse housing for all housing types;
3. Support more efficient and cost-effective use of public utilities;
4. Provide more flexibility for ~~proffers~~, impact fees, and adequate public facilities and programs (~~when~~ if authorized by State enabling legislation) ~~for public facilities~~;

5. Provide sufficient density to enable the implementation of limited Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) ~~programs (when authorized by State enabling legislation)~~; and
6. Provide development incentives that will be economical and at the same time foster development patterns that result in desirable communities with a sense of place and community.

The residential build-out estimates resulting from the Service District land use plans and incorporated towns are summarized in the table [below](#) ~~on the following page~~.

In-Fill Development

In service districts where substantial development has already occurred, the increased density afforded by this Plan to properties within those districts presents unique interface concerns. A key concern is what level of the density range is compatible with the adjoining and existing neighborhood.

In considering in-fill development within such service districts, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should consider the following: 1) in-fill development effects on adjacent properties; 2) methods in which the in-fill development may be buffered to alleviate interface problems with less dense parcels; 3) consistency with this Plan; and 4) whether such development is occurring in a consistent, orderly manner such that in-fill development at higher densities than already exist in the area occurs in a natural progression (i.e., from a more central area of higher density to lower densities at the district's perimeter boundary).

■ PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the service district land use plans will require a commitment to also implement the County's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The CIP is designed to provide the required infrastructure for development in a timely and coordinated manner, and to provide appropriate land use control mechanisms to assure that development is coordinated with the infrastructure. Chapter 9 is specifically devoted to the infrastructure needs and should serve as a general guide for capital improvement programming.

Service District Build-Out Information

Service District	Towns	2000 Dwelling Totals	Dwelling Units/Build-Out Totals
Bealeton		1,027	3,200
Calverton		140	145
Catlett		156	312
Marshall		693	2,762
Midland		121	400
New Baltimore		2,435	5,000
Opal		128	200
Remington		392	2,700
Warrenton		1,526	2,300
	Remington**	255	300
	The Plains**	118	150
	Warrenton**	2,856	4,215***
Total Dwelling Units		9,847	21,684

* Represents totals for the specified Service District, but excludes the incorporated portion of Remington and Warrenton. The latter is estimated separately.

** Incorporated Town 2000 data is based on the U.S. Census.

*** Based on the Town of Warrenton Comprehensive Plan.

The rezoning process should be utilized to ensure timely development, including phasing projects through time so their service demands placed on schools and other basic facility capacities are manageable. Rezoning should be required for densities in excess of the lower end of the land use density ranges except when performance incentives are involved.

The County should also consider adding performance incentives in the service districts to assist in better accomplishing the goals and objectives of the Plan. For example, density incentives could be granted for providing low and moderate income housing, or for acquiring development rights for land that creates open space, parkland, and preservation areas in or near the affected service district community as designated within the Comprehensive Plan.

Residential rezoning applications are expected to be presented at the low end of each density range for the specified service district location. For example, in the plan designated residential locations where low

density development is proposed (1-3 units per acre), any application above 1 dwelling unit per acre ~~must~~ should justify those increases with the:

1. Provision of affordable housing (low/moderate income housing); and/or
2. Elimination of lot subdivision potential through easements (Purchase of Development Rights) on:
(a) Rural Agricultural (RA) and Rural Conservation (RC) zoned properties generally located within the service district's magisterial district; (b) property designated as parkland or marked as a hard open space edge along the service district boundary within the service district plan; or (c) a critical future transportation corridor designated by the Board of Supervisors needing protection from further development; and/or
3. Implementation of unique town-scaled designs consistent with the adopted service district plan; and/or
4. Other combinations other than cash/material contributions to the needs of the County.

Future Measures

The land use plans shown for each service district are limited in the extent that specific details of individual communities are addressed. These land use plans are intended to be general when indicating areas where specific types of zoning are appropriate. No attempt has been made at this stage of the planning process to actually design the individual towns and communities. However, a master design plan is not a static document. It builds upon and improves the community as it presently exists and is subject to periodic review and refinement.

Where a strong town character has been established, the community and the County can continue to improve upon those preferred attributes through expanded and enhanced future street, building and general architectural design. In Fauquier County, planning will seek to foster towns by providing opportunities for parks, schools and other public facilities, all carefully linked through a pedestrian friendly transportation network, and a variety of retail and employment services and opportunities. The planning process will discourage loose groupings of poorly linked streets with access limited through cul-de-sac dominated subdivisions which do not create real communities, create emergency service problems, and simply do not represent the best that the planning process can offer. County and community plans will be the result of coordinated efforts among existing residents, local officials, and a wide spectrum of professionals including architects, landscape architects, developers, and planners.

Transfer of Development Rights

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) was authorized by state enabling legislation in 2006. As the County has not adopted a TDR program consistent with the Code of Virginia, the County, as an adjunct study, should set its priorities for desired open space both as to what types of lands (i.e., water supply sheds, prime agricultural areas, steep slopes, dominant terrain and exceptional viewsheds, areas of unique flora and fauna, and historic areas), where they are located, to where they may be transferred, and the density increase given per acre for each type.

All revised service district plans have open space, parkland, school sites and other associated town or village aspects which set the unique character of that community. One important and active principle is the development of a clear, hard edge of open space and parkland at the perimeter of the districts. An example of that principle's implementation is represented in the Warrenton Service District with the 850+ acre St. Leonard's Farm. Here the approved rezoning application resulted in 41 lots being clustered, or approximately 80 percent of the overall property "by right density" in one location, while leaving 800 acres of the remaining property in a recorded conservation easement. The rezoning resulted in no overall net increase in density. The planned clustered lots are effectively served through public water and sewer, while a valued open space gateway into the Town of Warrenton was preserved. Other districts have similar opportunities through easements and the Purchase of Development Rights Program.

Impact Fees

~~Impact fees are not yet authorized through state enabling legislation as a method for funding public facilities other than for roads. The County, however, should study the impacts of development; arrive at a methodology for measuring fiscal impacts, and use that methodology to evaluate infrastructure and facility needs in the rezoning process so that appropriate proffers may be negotiated. Developing such a methodology will also enable the County to implement impact fees expeditiously if when enabling legislation is approved, and perhaps be of utility in convincing the General Assembly to develop more comprehensive impact fee legislation.~~

~~A modestly successful implementation technique is through the development of Proffer Policy, which covers, for example, the cost impacts per residential unit on basic public facilities (e.g., fire and rescue, libraries, parks and recreation, schools and the Sheriff). The Board of Supervisors adopted such a Proffer Policy on October 21, 2002. Pursuant to this document, the County staff: (a) calculates the annual net cost of public facilities; (b) calculates the fiscal impact of a rezoning request that permits residential uses; and (c) administers the collection and expenditure of proffered funds. Pursuant to the Code of Virginia, the Board of Supervisors may accept cash proffers for rezoning requests that permit residential uses in~~

~~accordance with this policy, to mitigate public facility infrastructure impacts and requirements. The Board may also accept land, conservation easements or in-kind improvements in accordance with County and state law.~~

■ OTHER PLANNING FACILITIES

Water and Sewer

The availability of public utilities (central water and sewer) is critical to the identification of an area as a service district. Although utilities are only one of a number of possible limitations to supporting higher density residential uses, they are the most acute constraint. Without water and sewer, service districts can exist only as villages with low density residential development and limited types of commercial and industrial development. The importance of water and sewer is reflected in the fact that utilities are the cornerstone of the service districts which are essential to the Land Use Plan.

When planning for public water and sewer, the “Occoquan Policy” must be taken into consideration. The Occoquan Policy, adopted by the State Water Control Board in 1971, was enacted for the purpose of protecting water quality in the Occoquan Reservoir, a major water supply for Northern Virginia. Over one third of Fauquier County's land area contributes to that watershed and thus falls under the requirements of the policy. Six of the nine County service districts and village service districts are either wholly or partially contained within the Occoquan watershed. New Baltimore, Catlett, and Calverton are entirely within the watershed; Midland, Opal, and the Warrenton service districts are partially within the Occoquan watershed.

The “Occoquan Policy” limits the number of sewage treatment facilities, which may discharge within the watershed. New plants must also treat effluent at the highest level that technology now permits. This tertiary treatment includes nitrogen, phosphorus, and chlorine removal before the effluent can be discharged to receiving waters. The cost of such facilities, including the required redundancy factors, can more than double the cost of treatment.

Transportation Planning

Transportation plans for each of the service districts propose new roads and indicate the improvements to existing roads necessitated by growth. Details of these plans are contained in Chapter 10. Alignments for the proposed new roads are shown as dashed lines on the various transportation plans, and are general in nature. These plans will provide the necessary framework for right-of-way acquisition, ~~and~~ construction, ~~and~~ ~~proffer~~ in conjunction with the development process.

There are three major inter-service district arterials which must be carefully planned so that they will continue to function effectively as through- traffic movers. These are U.S 15/29, Route 17, and Route 28. U.S. 15/29 and Route 17, due to their linkages with I-66, I-81 and I-95, experience the mixing of significant local and regional automobile and truck traffic moving through the Washington Metropolitan Area. There are legs of U.S. 15/29 from the Prince William County line to the Opal Service District where daily traffic volumes in ~~2004~~ 2013 are exceeding 45,000. The pressures are becoming critical, with the limited availability of existing rights-of-way and funding constraints, to: (1) enforce limitations on the number of new development entrances; (2) close dangerous median crossings; and (3) implement more aggressive and coordinated efforts for expanded turn lanes, service roads, traffic signalization, and traffic calming designs.

In the Catlett, Calverton, and Midland service districts, a major constraint to further development is Route 28 itself. This state primary road's capacity is already stressed by existing traffic loads. It is imperative that the future location and configuration of Route 28 be planned so that, along with the development of these Village Service Districts, it will continue to function effectively as an arterial highway and at the same time complement the planned communities by providing access. The Village Service District Plans for these communities have proposed safety improvements to key intersections along Route 28. Those improvements are proposed to alleviate some of the existing volume issues over the next 10-15 years. Any improvements or changes to Route 28 also must consider the historic areas for these communities. As of 2015 ~~2010~~, 18 ~~22~~ towns and villages have been listed on the Virginia Landmarks and National Registers, ~~with Midland and The Plains scheduled for final survey work and nomination.~~

~~On a more comprehensive transportation planning level, VDOT has enacted statewide the Secondary Street Acceptance Regulations effective July 1, 2009, and these directly affect our County's road planning and permitting process. These regulations establish design and connectivity standards for public streets located in three discrete "Area" types which affect the nature and character of our community. The three category types are: Compact, Suburban and Rural Areas. The Virginia Administrative Code (24VAC30-92-50) defines those thresholds.~~

The On a comprehensive transportation planning level, the County has consistently expressed that the Service Districts will be where our more compact and traditional town or village scale residential densities and business development will occur. This Chapter presents both land use plans and specific transportation elements which portray that Fauquier County vision in more detail. Here such growth can be more effectively served through public facilities, services and utilities, be provided an interconnected public street network (including multi-purpose paths and sidewalks), and be more effectively connected to open spaces, parks, schools and other key public facilities and services. These communities will need a far more

improved and linked street network to provide the balanced distribution of vehicle trips, options for future public transit, and pedestrian accommodation envisioned.

~~Bealeton, Marshall, New Baltimore, Opal, Remington and Warrenton Service Districts and their street network will be subject to the “Compact Area” requirements set forth in the VDOT Secondary Street Acceptance Regulations (SSAR), while Calverton, Catlett and Midland will be subject to the “Suburban Area” requirements. The area limit for the “Compact or Suburban Area” will coincide with the Service District boundaries identified previously, as periodically amended. All new land development applications will be subject to the connectivity and all SSAR requirements associated with the specified area designation.~~

~~Benefits of the “Compact or Suburban Area” designation for the nine Service Districts are that it brings VDOT land development review and street planning thresholds into alignment with the Fauquier County Comprehensive Plan for those communities, along with the expected road network, and requires that residential, business and mixed use projects:~~

- ~~• Have sufficient street connections in multiple directions;~~
- ~~• Provide pedestrian accommodation;~~
- ~~• Incorporate context sensitive street design; and~~
- ~~• Add streets as a project package and part of the overall community secondary street network.~~

~~As noted above, all of the six town Service Districts are designated as Compact Areas under the VDOT Secondary Street Acceptance Regulations as specified in 24 VAC 30-92-50. With the designation of Urban Development Areas, the SSAR specify the application of Suburban Area requirements for areas located within a two-mile radius of a UDA. The Service District concept calls for a defined, compact, more traditional town form of development, with hard edges to separate the Service District from the rural areas. The County’s rural areas have a substantially lower density than that specified for “Suburban Areas”. Application of this Suburban Area requirement outside of the Service District would be inconsistent with Service District goals and unacceptable in the context of protecting the hard edge. Thus, the County will request special consideration from VDOT to continue to designate its six town Service Districts as Compact Areas and the rural areas surrounding them as “Rural Areas”.~~

■ SERVICE DISTRICT PLANS

The following are plans for the six Service Districts (Bealeton, Marshall, New Baltimore, Opal Remington and Warrenton) and three Village Service Districts (Calverton, Catlett and Midland). Presented in alphabetical order, each district plan provides its boundaries and key features, such as floodplain, parks, roads, schools, streams and railway lines. Planned uses and densities are identified by a legend shown on each Service District Plan, and/or are described within the subsequent text.

[*Bealeton, Opal and Remington Service District Plan*](#)

[*Catlett, Calverton, Midland Village Service District Plan*](#)

[*Marshall Service District Plan*](#)

[*New Baltimore Service District Plan*](#)

[*Warrenton Service District Plan*](#)