



Terry Savelle,  
CHAIR  
Ina Malis,  
VICE CHAIR

**ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA**  
**ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
 #1 COURTHOUSE PLAZA, SUITE 700  
 2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
 ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201  
 (703) 228-3525 • Fax (703) 228-3543



LISA MAHER  
COORDINATOR

December 6, 2006

Arlington County Board  
 2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
 Suite 300  
 Arlington, Virginia 22201

**SUBJECT: 4. U-1671-65-3 USE PERMIT AMENDMENT:** amendment for additional classrooms, dorm rooms, parking, auditorium; 2807 N. Glebe Rd (Marymount University) (RPC #03-065-001)

**RECOMMENDATION: Defer the Use Permit Amendment to the January Planning Commission and County Board meetings, with issues of concern for the applicant to address as listed in this letter.**

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard this item at its November 27, 2006 meeting. Jill Griffin made a staff presentation, first describing the site. Ms. Griffin provided a brief history of the university, the proposal, and an evaluation of the proposal against the site's General Land Use Plan (GLUP) and Zoning designations, as well as required findings for a use permit. Robert Gibson, Transportation Planner for the project, can address transportation issues in more detail.

Art Walsh made a presentation for the applicant. Marymount is the only four-year comprehensive university in Arlington County. The number of students has remained stable for the last 10 years. This is not a growth proposal, but is intended to meet current needs. The university's demographic profile is changing from commuter to on-campus students. There have been no major renovations for 40 years. Marymount needs to maintain its competitive status with other universities. Placing more students on campus will reduce traffic and parking. The applicant has had a significant outreach process. There have been two meetings of the Transportation Commission (TC), which recommended deferral. Mr. Walsh believes that working on conditions that would address TC's issues will make the proposal ready for action by the Planning Commission and County Board. Doug Carter, architect for the project, described the proposal in detail.

**Public Speakers**

Alice Harrington distributed a hard copy of her comments. The applicant said they would add 206 parking spaces. The proposal is to add 250 student beds, for upper level students who are able to bring vehicles. About 3,600 students are enrolled, and most are commuters. The proposal will take over the existing parking lot. The applicant proposed to add a lot of proposed

uses, but only 206 additional parking spaces, and those are supposed to accommodate the existing shortage. Whatever model Arlington is using to compute parking is flawed, because Arlington does not have enough parking. It puts a lot of burden on the neighbors.

Pamela Gillen spoke for the Old Dominion Citizens Association (ODCA). The civic association includes no public schools, parks, or trails. Yet ODCA residents believe in supporting the whole county. However, the hope is that as citizens of Arlington County, they do not have to scream and shout to have their concerns heard. ODCA had a formal vote—24 of 27 attending members voted to support the proposal but have issues that should be resolved. ODCA felt the land use is appropriate. The applicant needs a comprehensive construction management plan, and construction hauling should be limited to Glebe Road. The applicant needs to have ongoing discussions with the community to address any modifications to the project. The County needs to monitor traffic and mitigate any failing conditions, as well as address street parking problems. The County and Marymount should address pedestrian traffic from the library to the new facility and address safety concerns regarding the grade of the Yorktown Blvd./26<sup>th</sup> Street intersection. Three members strongly opposed the project for being out of scale with the neighborhood. The community was shortchanged in the process. Marymount redesigned in the middle of the process. If the redesign was earlier in the process, the community could have focused on the details. Seven stories are too high for a single family neighborhood. The student housing should be one story lower. There should be more variety in the buildings. The underpass should be improved. Install the traffic signal at 26<sup>th</sup> Street and Old Dominion Drive before construction starts.

David Haring spoke on behalf of the Yorktown Civic Association. Yorktown is one of four civic associations that surround Marymount. Yorktown Boulevard is a major gateway to the Yorktown neighborhood. Marymount representatives came to Yorktown Civic Association meetings. The civic association voted overwhelmingly to oppose the proposed use permit, and the resolution is the next to last item in the Planning Commission's packet for this item. The project is simply too much in too little space, in the wrong location. The more appropriate project would have been structured parking and a dorm only. Three years ago, Marymount developed a master plan, and this is the first element of implementation. It has been clear that something was going to happen on this site, but it was very different from the current proposal. This site is an island unto itself. Yorktown Boulevard drops below this lot and the campus. The proposal keeps the site an island. The civic association has been disappointed by the parking plan. This site was to address the critical parking shortage. Total required spaces for this expansion is 234, but the applicant is proposing to build 206, compared to 259 spaces that the engineer said was short today.

Carolyn Oxenford is a 20-year resident of Donaldson Run and a member of Marymount's faculty. She supports the proposed use permit. The university needs this proposal to meet demand. It can't offer faculty space they need to do some research in her field of psychology. Faculty need to share offices with as many as three other faculty. Users of the parking lot don't want to have to spend up to 45 minutes to find parking. The proposal would remove commuters and cars from the roads. Why should the community care? Marymount provides services to the community. Marymount graduates live in the community. The proposal would beautify the existing parking lot.

Ned W. Rhodes is the president of the Donaldson Run Civic Association. Donaldson Run has been involved in the use permit process. Mr. Rhodes's comments concentrated on density. The project does not fit into the neighborhood. Power lines would be undergrounded, but there are many trees on the site right now that would be affected. Mr. Rhodes showed photos of the site from the ground, not the perspective of the renderings, which is higher. On November 8, the Civic Association passed a resolution opposing the proposal. The proposal would heavily impact the streets. It is too tall, with too much impervious surface. The current design does not fit into the neighborhood and is much denser than anything in the neighborhood and anything in the existing campus. He looks forward to additional meetings to discuss an appropriate proposal.

Richard DeVore lives on 31<sup>st</sup> Street, which has a lot of curves, hills, and blind spots, and he feels the impact from the campus. He crosses 26<sup>th</sup> Street four times a day, and was almost hit by a car last year. The Planning Commission can recommend that additional traffic be directed to Old Dominion Drive and Glebe Road, which are four-lane roads.

Tom Simpson has lived in Arlington since 1975, now in Donaldson Run on 26<sup>th</sup> Street/31<sup>st</sup> Street. He enjoys the interaction with Marymount students but opposes the current expansion plans. There is too much impact on the neighborhood adversely affecting the quality of life. An additional 1,100 cars per day would degrade the neighborhood. A garage entrance on Yorktown would be at a blind curve. The applicant has not provided information on the use of the Ballston campus for expansion. How about some on-campus improvements? The applicant should explore alternatives to the automobile, including improved transit service with non-stop service between the campus and the Ballston Metro station.

Anne Wilson is the vice president of the Donaldson Run Civic Association and a nearby neighbor of Marymount. She appreciates the contributions of Marymount and would like to be able to support some improvement. However, this proposal is too much. Ms. Wilson focused on critical conditions and referred to items 15-17 on the fourth to the last page of comments from the civic association. The Glebe Road campus has buffers, but the proposal will make it much more visible. There would be more than 250 students living 300 feet from the nearest house. Protections would need to be built into the use permit. There would be no comfort to neighbors of this project. A cap should be placed on the number of residential students. Otherwise, the university could still grow its enrollment. The auditorium and other buildings could be used by outside groups. Restrictions should be placed on the outside use of these spaces. These elements were not addressed by the Task Force.

Ann Simpson and her husband have been residents for close to 30 years, and now live on 31<sup>st</sup> Street. Marymount lets residents use some of its facilities. The proposal includes too much project in too little space. She is concerned about traffic implications, particularly Levels of Service. Ms. Simpson is opposed to the current proposal.

Vauhn Collins is a member of the Donaldson Run Civic Association. He likes being next to the campus and appreciates having Marymount there. However, the current proposal is out of scale. The proposed design would be more appropriate on an urban campus. He organized a meeting with 80 attendees including County Board members, and a petition was signed in opposition to

the proposal. The proposal does not include any usable green space. A seven story building is completely out of scale. The proposal is not in the spirit of the County's new coverage requirements. Is this a harbinger of things to come? Mr. Collins publicly supports the Donaldson Run and Yorktown Civic Association resolutions.

Maureen Farrell, a member of the Donaldson Run Civic Association, opposes the project. Homeowners' building rights were reduced last year. If McMansions for residents are not allowed, there should not be McMansions for the university. The project must be scaled back. Maybe new structures should be built in the middle of the campus or in Ballston. She thinks the university has not listened to the neighbors' concerns.

Julie Fiddick lives in Donaldson Run. Most of the crazy driving on Yorktown Boulevard belongs to high school students. Her daughter is a student at Marymount but does not drive there. Ms. Fiddick understands community concerns, but until the County is better with public transportation, we just need to deal with it. She has visited many nearby universities and recognizes that Marymount is very creative with its limited space. The campus has no room for students, so has rooms at hotels and apartments around Arlington. This is inappropriate and disrespectful to the students. Arlingtonians owe it to themselves to take that into consideration. If parking is the problem, fix that problem.

Chris Keenan moved to Arlington 3 years ago and lives on 26<sup>th</sup> Street. She lives between Dr. Bundschuh, president of the university, and Vaughn Collins. She is full time faculty in the school of Nursing and teaches evidence-based practice. Applying an evidence-based approach to this, she has observed the impacts of the university from her front porch. She doesn't have lots of cars parked in front of her house. She parks her own car in front of her house. She does not hear noise from the university. In fact, more noise is from the country club. She and her kids use Marymount facilities. Foot traffic is wonderful—her kids like to watch people walk by. Students do not wander around in front of her house all the time. She needs a lab and space to train nurses.

Jarrett J. Kealey is the Marymount student body president, and spoke on behalf of the students in support of the proposal. Marymount has great diversity, and Marymount University is Arlington's university. He has fallen in love with the school and with the surrounding community. He uses community businesses and works for the County. Transportation will only get better. The shuttle fleet will be enhanced. Students are lobbying Metro for reduced student fare and are looking into zipcar service. Community input and student needs were taken into account during the planning process. There will be additional green space. This will enhance both Marymount and the County.

Robert Fitch is the father of a Marymount student, and a trustee of the university, and lives about 600 feet from the university. It's a university that has given a lot to his daughter. Marymount supports the Special Olympics, and buses in underprivileged children for Halloween. He is impressed by the due diligence shown by the planning of the expansion. He drove around the neighborhood and noticed that the most popular "vehicle" on the streets is construction dumpsters. More people are expanding homes for very few people, but they are trying to beautify the neighborhood. We should support Marymount, Arlington's university.

Lucia Maruska lives in Donaldson Run and opposes the project. They need to look at other options to expand within their campus. The proposal is not consistent with the neighborhood. There could be as many as 700 additional people in one place, and she cannot imagine what would happen in an emergency. The pedestrian bridge would not be enough. There would be safety problems for the students themselves. The architectural design looks like a fortress. There would be no green space and no plazas. It does not look at all like the rest of the neighborhood.

Frank Rizzo is a resident and employee at Marymount. He cannot wait to see the new building instead of the parking lot. A lot of students do not have cars. They use the shuttle system. A lot of students are living out in the community, and this would help more of the students live on campus, which would improve the community. Students make a big difference in the Arlington community. Students do a lot of community service. Students are using more bikes and have been asking for more bike racks.

Will Anthony lives in Donaldson Run, about seven houses down from Marymount, on 26<sup>th</sup> Street. This is not about the contributions of Marymount and its students. He opposes the proposed project, which would degrade community safety and lifestyle. It would also create tremendous traffic problems.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Foster presented the report of the Marymount Task Force, referencing a summary in the Planning Commission's packet to help organize the discussion. The first of five meetings was held in February 2006. The planning dates back a few years before the task force and grew out of the previous task force for the parking lot. The task force wanted to err on the side of thoroughness. During the task force meetings, it was discovered that there were differences of interpretation between the applicant and staff, and after the second meeting there was a hiatus from March to June, while the building was revised to meet zoning limitations. After the third meeting, the task force tried to come up with items of consensus. One of the main issues was parking. The County encourages a slight parking deficit to encourage alternative transportation. The idea was that students moving onto campus would drive less and therefore reduce traffic. More offices within the campus would not increase use or traffic, but they would relieve overcrowding. The parking would not exactly meet the parking requirement. There should be no exceptions to the zoning requirements. Proposed setbacks meet the requirements and exceed some other nearby setbacks. The use and mix was appropriate. Putting parking closer to the main roads was desirable. While the lowest point of the garage entrance/loading for the site on Yorktown Boulevard was not desirable, it was the best option. There was a preference for the pedestrian bridge to not be covered, although it seems to be covered now. The auditorium has been reduced in size. The consensus was that it should have 260-280 seats—more of a lecture hall. The architecture moved from a more civic scale to more residential. There was general consensus in support of the project, although there was specific and noted opposition, primarily related to the mix of uses, density, and future plans of the university. Some points that were left for the guidance of the Planning Commission pertain to conditions, many of which are addressed in the Donaldson Run conditions, which are not inconsistent with standard site plan conditions. Regarding density and height, the applicant noted early on in the process that other options had

been considered, including structured parking above ground. The cost of putting parking underground would be balanced by the improvements above.

Commissioner Savela asked Commissioner Foster to propose categories for the discussion. Commissioner Foster suggested the categories in the staff presentation. Commissioner Savela added landscaping and condition language. Commissioner Foster suggested that landscaping could be covered in the setback category.

Commissioner Fallon gave a Transportation Commission (TC) report. There were 12 speakers at the TC meeting, representing an even mix in terms of pro and con. The TC asked questions in order to understand the project more than to give specific guidance. Questions were asked regarding moving the garage entrance to Old Dominion Drive. Staff was not supportive after consultation with VDOT representatives. Circulation around and through the campus was discussed, including widening the pedestrian bridge to 10 feet. The TC recommended adding a condition regarding use by St. Mary's Church of the parking on Sundays. Bus drop-off at the main campus was discussed. The Yorktown/26<sup>th</sup> Street intersection would have a Level of Service (LOS) of F and the addition of a traffic signal or right turn lane was discussed. The TC talked about bicycle commuter facilities and felt that the proposed traffic management and parking plans were inadequate. Existing traffic volume along N. 26th/31st St and Yorktown Blvd was a problem, of which some responsibility was from the University. The TC recommended deferral, although not to a specific date.

Commissioner Savela asked whether staff had received any input from the Rock Springs Civic Association. Ms. Griffin answered that they were in general support, but staff has received nothing in writing. Mr. Walsh added that he thought the applicant has a letter of support, which they can share with staff.

Commissioner Foster started the discussion with parking and transportation, which received the lion's share of community concern.

Commissioner Savela asked Mr. Gibson to explain the proposed improvement in the parking situation. What is the perceived net gain? Mr. Gibson responded that the net gain would be associated with the growth in programs, and he doesn't know what that is. Commissioner Savela asked, more specifically, what the impact of parking demand is of on-site vs. off-site dorms. Mr. Gibson responded that only about half of upper class students who live on campus have cars. By relocating students from off-campus, those cars would be parked, so there would be some reduction in traffic.

Commissioner Monfort asked follow-up questions in order to understand the parking situation. Currently there are 169 spaces and the proposal would have 375, which would be an increase of 206. However, the Zoning requirement is to have 234 spaces for this building, so effectively the new parking would be short 28 spaces. Ms. Griffin responded that the required number is a strict interpretation of the zoning ordinance, with no sharing of parking spaces. Staff has found that it is not usually the case that all uses would be at maximum use at the same time. The zoning ordinance does not address this type of proposal. Commissioner Monfort noted that only 63 spaces are being allocated for 250 beds. However, based on current experience, the demand

would be 125 spaces. Ms. Griffin replied that the dorms may also be used by underclassmen, who are not allowed to have cars. The zoning ordinance does not look at Transportation Demand Management programs (TDM), which would reduce the demand for cars.

Commissioner Monfort asked if staff looked at the use of cars for outside people, such as those coming for experiments. Mr. Gibson said that staff would expect the same visitor parking rate as the university has now. How visitors would be treated hasn't been fixed and designated. Commissioner Monfort still didn't see how this translates to a 206 space increase. Mr. Gibson replied that Marymount has said there's an absolute gain of 206 spaces. Ms. Griffin reiterated that the requirements were based on a very strict interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance, which doesn't permit reductions in parking. Commissioner Savela asked, if the Zoning Ordinance does not permit reductions in parking, how can we approve a use permit for less than the required number of spaces? Ms. Griffin responded that the project as a whole meets the requirement.

Commissioner Monfort asked whether staff has looked at the worst case situation, for example if all resident students are upperclassmen, the auditorium is in use, the food service is in use, etc. Ms. Griffin replied that it's a double edged sword—the more parking you build, the more traffic you will have.

Commissioner Monfort asked about accommodating the current parkers. Is this a net addition or net subtraction? Ms. Griffin said that some students who drive now would not need a car if they lived on campus. Parking has been acknowledged to be an issue, and this project would not necessarily resolve all the parking problems. Marymount has stated that with its TDM, they would meet their parking requirements.

Commissioner Monfort asked what staff thinks about that. Ms. Griffin responded that staff is still looking at it.

Commissioner Savela understands that it is the same students who would live in the dorms and use the auditorium and classrooms. However, she is stuck on how a use permit can be approved if a use permit cannot modify the parking requirement. Ms. Griffin responded that on this site, for this project, the parking requirements would be met. Commissioner Savela stated that there is a use permit now for the existing university, and it would be modified and affect some of the parking for the existing university. If the rest of the university is also covered by a use permit, how will that be fully parked?

Commissioner Weihe noted that in 1992, he was involved in a four-year effort to look at the land swap that put the parking lot in its current location. Does this use permit only modify the existing lot, or the whole university? Ms. Griffin said that staff is looking at it as a separate project, but it modifies the use permit for the whole university. Commissioner Weihe commented that the existing use permit mandated off-site parking. How can you do this use permit without referring to the existing one? We can't discontinue the current use permit by building this garage. That has to be clarified in the analysis. It got more complicated with the Ballston campus, which has the same problem and has its own off-site parking requirement. He also has a concern with the way the pedestrian bridge works. People will be dropped off at 26<sup>th</sup> Street and/or Old Dominion Drive. They talked about a drop-off site, which shouldn't be on Old

Dominion Drive, but the building at 26<sup>th</sup> Street would have to be redesigned to accommodate a pull-off site. The bridge can be accessed with a shuttle service, but drop-offs are unresolved.

Commissioner Malis noted that the issues list for the discussion doesn't address traffic per se.

Commissioner Pebley stated that he was impressed with the report from Commissioner Foster. It illuminated the issues. The main issues are traffic, parking, and use/mass of the building. The parking thing is a Gordian knot. If a student lives in the dorm, his or her car would sit in the lot. If a student lives in dorm and can't park in the garage, he or she will try to park in the neighborhood. In the worst case, the lot will be full, and people will go back to parking in the neighborhood. Mr. Walsh said that the applicant worked to put the parking underground at great expense. The applicant can regulate use of the auditorium and other uses and manage the parking to accommodate the demand. Digging deeper for parking would be prohibitively expensive. There's a conflict between not building enough parking and building too much parking. The applicant is trying to avoid encouraging more people to drive to the campus. This solution is about an existing population going to the campus and not new growth.

Commissioner Foster commented that it seems a bit strange that the university would allow upperclassmen to park a car constantly. In other campuses, universities put those cars off-site and have students take a shuttle to a satellite lot off-site. How about prohibiting upperclassmen who live on campus from having cars? Mr. Walsh responded that some upperclassmen have internships or other reasons to have cars. Commissioner Foster suggested that the applicant explore by policy who needs cars and who doesn't. Managing that policy could help resolve the issue.

Commissioner Fallon stated that the understanding among all the groups is that the overall use permit will be amended. The overall activity, unlike an office building, is not site specific. Rather, users of the new garage would use multiple facilities on the campus. One of the reasons for using this site is that it is currently a parking lot. A concern would be taking other surface lots out of service in the future for future buildings, relying upon the parking under this proposal. Ms. Griffin answered that staff hasn't required anything related to future disposition of the other existing lots of the applicant, but could possibly ask the applicant to agree to a condition regarding removing other parking lots in the future.

Commissioner Fallon asked staff how many on-street parking spaces would be lost by creating a right turn lane from N. 26th St. onto Yorktown Blvd, and other proposed changes. Mr. Gibson responded that approximately 12 street parking spaces could be removed.

Commissioner Pebley suggested that if the Planning Commission was headed toward a deferral recommendation, what about having each commissioner list his or her issues, rather than going thoroughly through all the issues?

Commissioner Foster added that since there are complexities, and since it looks like a deferral, to make it most productive, first commissioners should be allowed to ask questions, and then they can make a motion, then provide guidance with their concerns. Commissioner Savela supported these suggestions and asked for questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Pebley asked whether, during construction, the applicant will be excavating rock, and/or using explosives, and can they drill rather than pile drive? Mr. Walsh said that he will check and have that answer for the Planning Commission the next time around. He will also look at whether the applicant can commit to pile drilling rather than pile driving.

Commissioner Monfort asked how long the façade along Yorktown Boulevard is proposed to be. It looks like about 300 feet. Mr. Carter responded that this façade is about 370 feet. Commissioner Monfort followed up by asking whether the applicant considered breaking that up. Mr. Carter responded that there is a break toward the 26<sup>th</sup> Street end. The bridge forms a very strong visual break, and then there is a vertical element that is the elevator. There isn't any point from which you can see the entire length of the building because of the curve of Yorktown Boulevard.

Commissioner Monfort asked what the design philosophy was for the building. Mr. Carter said that he took cues from the campus itself, particularly the Marymount chapel. He also used colors from the campus. Commissioner Monfort then asked whether there are mansard roofs on other campus buildings. Mr. Carter said no, rather it was a design that brought the visual height of the building down. Commissioner Monfort asked whether the applicant would consider making the bridge wider. Mr. Carter said that it has been widened to 10 feet.

Commissioner Savela asked how tall the dorm immediately behind the proposed project is. The applicant responded that it is eight stories, but doesn't know the exact height. Commissioner Savela requested a view of that building with the new building superimposed so the Planning Commission can get an idea what can be seen beyond the proposed building. Mr. Carter agreed to produce those images.

Commissioner Weihe noted that corrections need to be made to the LEED condition on page 38, committing to 26 credits.

Commissioner Fallon asked staff to explain the current proposal of the Yorktown Boulevard/26<sup>th</sup> Street intersection. Mr. Gibson described the proposed right turn lane from Yorktown Boulevard to 26<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Fallon asked whether staff was considering a signal at this intersection. Mr. Gibson noted that this intersection will not be a LOS F. Only the left turn movement from Yorktown Blvd. onto N. 26th St. would be LOS F. Adding the right turn lane from N. 26th onto Yorktown Blvd. will improve this movement. A signal is not warranted and would delay everyone except for the one failing movement. Commissioner Fallon asked whether the use permit and the proposed project are being parked to meet the ordinance requirement. If so, and there is significant spillover traffic upon completion of the project, can there be a trigger condition to require Marymount to obtain additional off-site parking? Ms. Griffin replied that she doesn't think it would be prohibited, but it would need to be written to be triggered by a measurable factor. Mr. Gibson noted that it would also need to ensure that existing resources, including off-site parking, are being fully used.

Commissioner Savela asked whether there is any prohibition against language like the Richmond [actually City of Fredericksburg] ordinance, which was distributed to the Planning Commission. Ms. Griffin responded that she can't respond because she hasn't seen it yet.

Commissioner Malis asked whether staff has looked at sight lines. Mr. Gibson said that, according to the applicant's calculations, both vertical and horizontal sight line requirements are within the County's acceptable range.

### **Planning Commission Motion**

Commissioner Foster made a motion to recommend that the County Board defer the Use Permit Amendment to the January Planning Commission and County Board meetings.

Commissioner Savela seconded the motion.

Commissioner Fallon noted a clarification that this motion would not preclude the item being heard by the County Board at its December meeting.

Commissioner Pebley recommended considering one more meeting between the neighbors and the applicant to look at parking, traffic, and mass.

Commissioner Hubbard agreed with Commissioner Pebley and is concerned that the Planning Commission did not have a full discussion because of the time.

Commissioner Hunt agreed that the parking math is very fuzzy. We are still talking about a campus that has 25% live on-campus students and 75% coming from off-campus. She is concerned that the proposed TDM will not resolve the parking problems and suggested that documented violations be examined. Commissioner Hunt is uncomfortable with the pedestrian bridge due to its extreme length. The County has a policy against pedestrian bridges. She would like to know the length. One solution to density would be to reduce the number of rooms, which would be a step in the right direction. If a use permit is not supposed to degrade the neighborhood, reducing even one lane's LOS is not good.

Commissioner Monfort does not buy the parking numbers and thinks that the dorms would use up all the additional parking. The solution is to reduce dorm rooms. He thinks the architecture is undistinguished. The project is very dense and tall. Interior spaces will be very crowded. He only likes the stone base.

Commissioner Weihe stated that he plans to move a substitute motion to deny in a little while. The main problem with the project is the mixed use—it is too much. The proposal would take the heart of activities out of the campus. The core activities need to be on the campus and not on the periphery. He doesn't think that can be solved by deferral.

Commissioner Fallon stated that he will support the recommendation to defer; however, he will second a motion to deny solely for the purposes of discussion. The student mix between commuters and residents has already changed. Marymount does need these facilities somewhere

on the campus. The university needs to develop metrics to manage future growth. The TDM and parking management plan are inadequate.

Commissioner Savela is not certain that there is still a parking problem, but she is not sure and needs more information on the existing use permit and on how parking is addressed overall. We seem to be double counting parking spaces, but that's not clear. Staff should look at information provided this evening, particularly the ordinance language distributed to the commission tonight, to see if that concept can be accommodated. With respect to single-family home density, some citizen comments were a bit off base. Last year's restriction was to coverage, not density. Commissioner Savela does not have a problem with the massing in terms of the FAR. The comparison of FAR for this project cannot be compared to the FAR for the campus overall; if the FAR were calculated on another building on campus based on its site area, it could also have a relatively large FAR. We need to decide if the height and setbacks are acceptable. She does not see any benefit to the County of imposing new enrollment caps on Marymount. However, there should be a long range planning exercise that looks at how the university would address future growth. Quite a few condition amendments have been proposed by the civic associations, and those should be included as appropriate. One additional SPRC meeting would be useful.

Commissioner Malis seconded the need for clarification on the existing use permit and this project, specifically as it relates to parking. The deferral would be useless if there were no further meetings with the neighbors. The applicant should take some time to understand the comments and understand the impacts of this project that can be mitigated to the satisfaction of the neighbors. The specific concerns are the mix of uses, the project is out of scale, too tall, etc. The applicant and community need to have a careful discussion of these issues. The architect has a lucky site to permit the proposed building height within the height limit, but should consider taking some height off the Yorktown Boulevard side of the building to work with the neighborhood. There is such a disagreement with the neighborhood. Marymount needs to develop a good relationship now with the community.

Commissioner Ciotti would like to associate herself with the comments of Commissioners Pebley, Hunt, and Malis. She thinks that students off campus should be brought on campus. The mixed use would be a campus next to a campus. Perhaps it would be helpful to look at the efficiency of the existing campus buildings. These buildings are quite old, inefficient to heat, are poorly designed for today's use, and are completely out of code by today's Americans with Disabilities Act as well as current code for new classrooms under 504 of the Rehab Act. In another, newer form, they could be more useful and better meet the needs of the University and the students served. This current project is not going to do Marymount justice going forward. It is not a good way to use the main campus to its fullest potential.

Commissioner Foster noted that there is consensus on the importance of clarity on the status of the existing special use, parking management, and TDM. On the mixed use issue, for the interests of traffic, the campus, etc., this is the right thing to do. It maximizes efficiency of the ingress and egress, which is a problem for campuses that separate their residential and non-residential uses. The campus is sufficiently small that it wouldn't be decentralizing the campus. He would hope that the mixed use concept wouldn't be unraveled, as it provides a diversity of energy demand. Commissioner Foster would like to add an SPRC meeting in January. On

architecture, Doug Carter hit it on the head, that the design takes cues from an eclectic university. The building may be a bit more eclectic than it needs to be, however. Perhaps the terra cotta color could be focused on the accents and the gray on the roof. Also, you could tone down the combination of classical, mansard roof, and Italianate styles. He thinks the scale and massing have made progress.

Commissioner Hunt asked whether it is enough to just have the guidance comments, or does the Planning Commission need to develop a list of items to be attended to? Commissioner Savela responded that this is the Planning Commission's decision. Given the length of the comments, it would be quite onerous to negotiate a detailed motion, so she would prefer to go with this format.

Commissioner Weihe made a substitute motion to deny the use permit amendment.

Commissioner Fallon seconded the motion for discussion purposes only.

Commissioner Weihe commented that the issue for him is that there are students that need to be brought on campus. The new site is 1.4 acres, when there is already a mixed use campus. The problems are the fundamental issues of a need for dorms and parking. The proposal is too dense, and the project is too tall on Yorktown Boulevard. The project needs a pull-off lane. Remove at least one floor, and maybe increase the setback. He doesn't think we ought to be encouraging upperclassmen to have cars on campus. The main activities should be on the main campus.

Commissioner Pebley stated that he is not ready to throw the baby out with the bathwater. He lives near the hospital so understands the height problem in a residential neighborhood. The applicant picked the worst possible place for this building, because of its visibility. He doesn't understand why upperclassmen should have cars. He likes the mansard roof.

Commissioner Hunt sympathizes with Commissioner Weihe, but the outstanding issues should be worked out. She doesn't agree with several of the points he made.

Commissioner Savela asked for a vote on the substitute motion, adding that a denial would cause additional expense and delay for the applicant.

The substitute motion failed by a vote of 2-8. Commissioners Monfort and Weihe supported the substitute motion. Commissioners Ciotti, Fallon, Foster, Hubbard, Hunt, Malis, Pebley, and Savela opposed the substitute motion.

The Planning Commission then voted 8-2 to support the main motion. Commissioners Ciotti, Fallon, Foster, Hubbard, Hunt, Malis, Pebley, and Savela supported the main motion. Commissioners Monfort and Weihe opposed the main motion.

Respectfully Submitted  
Arlington County Planning Commission

*Lisa Maher*

Lisa E. Maher  
Planning Commission Coordinator