

Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Meeting #13, Summary

September 10, 2013; 7:00-9:30 pm

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Third Floor, County Board Room

Panel Members in Attendance: Brian Harner, Paul Holland, Stan Karson, Tim Helmig, Andy VanHorn

Staff in Attendance: Kellie Brown, Kelly Cornell, Anthony Fusarelli, Claude Williamson, (Ben Carlson)

1. Welcome

- Brian Harner, Chair of the Rosslyn Process Panel, provided opening remarks and led introductions.

2. Updates/Follow Up from July 24 Process Panel Meeting

- Next Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Meeting Date: Staff confirmed September 25, 2013, (7pm) as the date of the next RPP meeting.
- Schedule Updates/Fall Community Forum: At this point, there are five more Rosslyn Process Panel Meetings per the project schedule. Dates have been set for three or them, and staff will work via email with the panel to set the other two.

3. Presentation on Urban Design Framework

- The first part of the presentation focused on follow up on urban design elements of the draft vision framework in greater detail, focusing more specifically on public realm design concepts.

4. Panel Discussion Points on Urban Design Framework

- Overall, it appears the presentation material is a refinement to things we've seen previously; anxious to see more advanced material on more public realm elements, such as the esplanade, Gateway Park, etc.
- Clarification sought on key takeaways and how they will be achieved, such as 1) Creation of key corridors in the block network; 2) Determining Wider Sidewalk widths; etc.
- Request for consideration of Metro expansion in Rosslyn and new entrances and bus transfer center opportunities;
- Appears Potomac Gorge viewshed not quite right, should correct and verify others as well;
- Regarding views, it is important to get broad feedback on view corridors most valued by the community;
- Request for sun/shade studies to tell us how much sun pedestrians would experience;
- Ground plane vision for the core seems realistic, given how much has already been approved.
- Reducing road width is a good idea, given constraints of Key Bridge; would be great to think more creatively about use of leftover space;
- Should be cautious about over management of retail, consideration of retail subsidies;
- In terms of urban precedents, would be helpful to have one example of a place that also has slope;
- For transitions, should think about townhome building type to help with sensitive transitions;
- Interested in any research and findings of positive impacts to be gained with wider sidewalks;

5. Building Height and Form, Land Use, and Sustainability Elements Presentation

- The second part of the presentation focused on follow up on refined building form scenarios, land use mix in the RCRD, and opportunities for sustainability.

6. Panel Discussion Points on Building Height and Form, Land Use, and Sustainability

- The summary points from the last meeting must reflect that the neighborhood is expecting 360 degree views from future Central Place observation deck;
- Suggest that there is a need to consider views both above and below 300 feet;

- Also a request to explore reduced FARs (possibly in the 6 to 7 range) on blocks/site abutting the neighborhood, understanding that community benefit expectations would be reduced;
- Is there any consideration for what the market impact might be of having every site at FAR 10?
- Before seriously advancing modeling, development feasibility economics study needs to be brought to the table and addressed to determine if assumptions and findings are supportable;
- Need for better imagery to convey ideas in a compelling manner; may be better to have a few really strong images than many which are less adequate;
- Modeling also needs to show potential redevelopment sites along RCRD boundary at an envelope that could be allowed by current GLUP or zoning;
- Encouraging housing is beneficial; are there tools out there that are most effective in encouraging residential?
- Need to improve justification for adding more residential, the support for additional retail may not be that particularly strong an argument.

6. Break

7. Proposed Approach to October 4 and 5 Community Events Presentation

8. Panel Discussion Points on Proposed Approach to October 4 and 5 Community Events Presentation

- The approach is good in that it provides more time for community discussion;
- Need to think through how we can ensure people attend the October 4 Open House;
- Should consider approach like DPR's outreach on Korean Embassy Park – received over 300 responses online;
- Should consider option of having project team staff talk to people on the street; could include an outdoor event in Central Space at Moore and Wilson;
- For Artisphere event, should think carefully about how we use the space;
- Project for Public Spaces used sticker boards well on Funeral Home site for informal feedback;
- On outreach, should approach media outlets; blogs such as: Ode Street Tribune; ARL NOW; WBJ;
- For workshop, why just 3 stations? More stations would allow more time for each individual to talk;
- Need to clarify key decision points, focus presentation/event on getting input on those particular issues;
- Should think about how to be prepared to answer questions from the community on topics such as air rights, Metro expansion.... (Possibly think about the FAQ;s);
- Having compelling material to get people to be emotionally attached is an important workshop goal;
- Should use any means necessary to get input and attention...consider utilizing some provocative statements or imagery to get attention;
- Getting the BID Board the information on the events is important;
- RAFOM will be getting the word out in a number of ways;
- Requested outline of the rotating workshop would look like for next panel meeting;

9. Adjourn