

## Long Range Planning Committee, Meeting Summary

March 27, 2014; 8:35-10:00 pm

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Conference Room Cherry/Dogwood

---

### 1. Welcome

### 2. Staff Presentation

- Staff provide a presentation that is available on the [Realize Rosslyn website \(direct link here\)](#):

### 3. Process Panel Chair Report

- Brian Harner, Chair of the Rosslyn Process Panel, provided brief remarks on the work of the panel to date. His comments addressed the relationship between framework, sector plan, and implementation strategies, noting that Sector Plan presents opportunity to define the desired public realm. But also raises the question about the degree of specificity needed at each step to address this.

### 4. LRPC Discussion

- Initial comments included a desire in trying to understand better the role of the framework, and how to address confusion around whether maps are general or not;
- Overarching framing for the LRPC discussion focused on identifying issues to put on the table before Monday's Planning Commission meeting;
- At policy level, need statement with hard numbers for desired land use mix;
- Revised text was suggested for Parks legend on page 35, to be clear that active and passive recreation could be accommodated in the same space;
- With Rosslyn Plaza, should try to have a plan that has real ability to achieve goals for Rosslyn open space; good thing about current approach is that it says more clearly what we want; having a map show a larger consolidated open space is appropriate for a sector plan, where we should aim big;
- More information needs to be provided as to the benefits of taking a more general approach to Rosslyn Plaza open space; is it to allow more time to give thought to the details? If so, need to know what is flexible. If new text directive added for Rosslyn Plaza open space, needs to state desire for large enough open space to sustain activation; if performance criteria is used, would like to know what the intended criteria are;
- There was a stated interest in better understanding several aspects of the Esplanade – its elevation, views, potential river connections, etc.
- There was also stated concern about the potential for flexibility to undermine Sector Plan goals, and an opinion that flexibility appears to be a natural part of the site plan review process;
- Regarding "Peaks and Valleys", if this document implies that some building heights will be above 300 feet while others will be below that, the document should clearly note that some heights may be lower than the potential maximum today;
- Document could also benefit by stating that significantly greater detail about the desired building forms will be addressed with Sector Plan Update;
- We should be honest and explicit as to whether diversity of affordable housing will be achieved thru new units in RCRD, or in units very nearby;
- There was a comment that Moore Street should be limited to use by buses and people, but not cars;
- Information about future of Gateway Park needs to be more fleshed out;
- Document's characterization of Freedom Park as "Rosslyn's High Line" is pie in the sky, should be framed with realistic expectations of how the space could be improved;

- Framework should maintain potential for intermodal transit center for Metrorail to interface with buses, in an underground fashion, as one way to help address Rosslyn curb space management challenges; this may not be an immediate achievement, but should be kept on the table for consideration through 2040;
- Framework would be improved if it can help address what will be regulated, versus what will remain policy; knowing this will be important to understand how we intend to implement key plan items in the future;
- In terms of 18<sup>th</sup> Street, only one option should be shown – exhibits should not conflict with each other;
- Adding the draft outline for the Sector Plan Update as an appendix to the framework would be helpful for everyone to better understand the direction of the document and next steps;
- There is some level of discomfort with the building heights section of the framework document, largely because we don't quite know yet where we will end up on this;
- Framework and sector plan update will need to address head on the balance and approach to dealing with flexibility and certainty in plan implementation;
- A preference was stated for a plan framework that did not show pending site plan/PDSP proposals in the concept, and was more general in how the vision is conveyed for those sites;
- There hasn't been that much discussion to date about Dark Star Park; would like to see a policy directive that speaks to the potential enhancements for this specific space;
- On building height and form, the document should emphasize point about priority views – and explain more specifically the range of factors upon which the to-be-developed building height map will be based;

## 6. Next Steps

## 7. Adjourn

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
1	LRPC	p. 37	<b>Land Use Mix</b> The framework should include some policy direction on land use mix. It doesn't need to be specific, could be a percentage range or an emphasis.	The framework's section intro language currently states more specific land use mix targets will be included in the Sector Plan Update. The project team will perform additional analysis to determine appropriate use mix targets soon after adoption of the framework. In terms of the plan framework's current nods to use mix, note that policy directive U3 calls for significant housing increases in the RCRD, while directive U2 identifies priority locations for pedestrian-oriented retail.	No changes proposed.
2	LRPC	p. 36	<b>Public Parks and Open Space</b> Passive and active uses are separated in the framework on maps and policies. Some spaces will have both, need to pull them together.	We concur.	Policy Directives P6 and P8 will be revised to reflect this comment, and the legend descriptions for Map P1 will also be refined.
3	LRPC	p. 35	<b>Rosslyn Plaza Open Space</b> Using performance objectives rather than a specific location and size could have unintended consequences. Sector Plan should be aspirational. Consider defining flexibility within certain limits.	We understand this potential, and understand that the exact wording of the performance criteria – if that approach is used – become very important.	No changes proposed.
4	LRPC	p. 35	<b>Rosslyn Plaza Open Space</b> A critical performance objective should be a space that is large enough to sustain a number of activities.	We concur.	If the performance criteria approach is ultimately applied, we would work to include a criterion that aligns with this idea.
5	LRPC	p. 35	<b>Esplanade</b> Provide more information on the Esplanade: elevation, views, and connections to the river.	More information on the proposed esplanade, and a variety of other elements in the plan framework, will be specified in greater detail in the drafting of the Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed.
6	LRPC	p. 35	<b>Dark Star Park</b> Consider a dedicated policy directive for Dark Star Park similar to other important parks (Gateway Park, Esplanade, etc.).	We concur.	A new policy directive will be added to Public Parks and Open Space Theme 3 that addresses Dark Star Park.

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
7	LRPC	pp. 41 - 45	<b>Building Heights</b> In the introduction to these policy directives, be more specific about qualitative goals for preserving view corridors, sensitive transitions, etc.	The notes on map B1 describe the goals for transition areas. Based on this and another comment, the legend on Map B2 will be revised to clarify the purpose of the priority view corridors.	Revision to legend on Map B2
8	LRPC	General Comment	<b>Flexibility vs. Specificity</b> Transformational elements (e.g. 18 <sup>th</sup> Street) of the Sector Plan shouldn't be undermined by flexibility in the Site Plan process.	We agree that the Sector Plan should include enough specificity to implement the major planning elements. The appropriate level of specificity will be determined in the drafting of the Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed.
9	LRPC	pp. 41 - 45	<b>Building Heights</b> Maps and text should be more explicit that some areas in the RCRD may have maximum height recommendations that exceed 300' and some areas may have maximum height recommendations that are lower than 300', which may be lower than the current potential.	Based on the current "taper policy" for building heights, sites zoned "C-O Rosslyn" that are not adjacent to the Metro station would not necessarily have the potential to build up to the potential maximum of 300'. We agree that the purpose of Map B2 could be clearer and will refine this map. The building heights analysis is on-going, and building height recommendations will be drafted and refined through the Sector Plan Update process.	The legend on Map B2 will be revised to remove references to 432' above sea level (the observation deck elevation). The "2° view corridor" designation (pink hatching) will also be removed from the map to simplify the diagram and eliminate potential confusion.
10	LRPC	pp. 41 - 45	<b>Building Form</b> We need a better understanding of the types of urban form recommendations that will be in the Sector Plan (e.g. build-to lines, step backs, etc.)	A draft outline for the Sector Plan Update will be included as an attachment to the staff report, and will identify generally the items the Sector Plan Update will include on this topic – recognizing that some items may be added/dropped based on analyses, preferences, and outcomes.	No changes proposed to framework. The requested information will be included in an attachment to the staff report for the County Board Meeting.
11	LRPC	p. 37	<b>Land Use Mix</b> Framework is moving in the right direction by recognizing that land use mix targets will be determined as part of the Sector Plan Update.	N/A	No changes proposed.

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
12	LRPC	General Comment	<b>Affordable Housing</b> What is the balance between providing affordable housing within the RCRD to help with income diversity goals versus the potential to provide a greater number of units in areas outside the RCRD?	We agree that this is a critical question that will be informed by necessary analyses and addressed as part of the community benefits discussion to be included in the drafting of the Sector Plan Update.	No changes proposed.
13	LRPC	p. 29	<b>N. Moore Street</b> Can N. Moore St. be bus and pedestrian only to provide a better pedestrian connection to Gateway Park?	The framework envisions N. Moore St. as a complete street that accommodates buses, pedestrians and cars. The proposed improvements to the pedestrian realm (streetscapes) and building facades along this street, including ongoing and approved development of pedestrian-oriented retail, will improve pedestrian connectivity to Gateway Park. Cars will need to access several existing and approved access points along Moore St, and can provide a beneficial role in decreasing the bus-dominance of the street.	No changes proposed.
14	LRPC	p. 36	<b>Gateway Park</b> Details on the future of Gateway Park should be incorporated into this planning process.	The Sector Plan Update will include a vision (or theme) and some potential program/design elements for Gateway Park. Detailed design is to be developed through a County-led Master Plan process to reconvene following the adoption of the Sector Plan.	No changes proposed.
15	LRPC	p. 35	<b>Freedom Park</b> References to turning Freedom Park into “Rosslyn’s version of the High Line” should be removed.	We concur.	Policy Directive P3 will be revised to replace the reference to the High Line with a description of program and design elements that are envisioned for Freedom Park.
16	LRPC	p. 30	<b>Bus Transit Center</b> The framework should include an aspirational reference to a bus transit center that integrates bus and other transportation facilities within a building.	Staff has determined that the sites closest to the Metro station that could house an integrated transit center would likely not be able to accommodate more than a few of the buses that currently serve Rosslyn.	No changes proposed.

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment No.	Source	Location	Question/Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Changes to Framework
17	LRPC	General Comment	<b><i>Illustrative Sketches</i></b> The illustrative sketches should be removed if they are in conflict with other aspects of the framework.	The sketches are intended to be rough drafts for more complete color renderings included in the Sector Plan Update. These draft sketches illustrate a number of vision elements (described with call-out text) that are an essential conceptual component of the Plan Framework. However, the draft sketches are not intended to dictate specific physical configurations; further refinement and integration of plan and implementation details may lead to updates of these images. Any inconsistencies in the location of the 18 <sup>th</sup> Street corridor or other plan elements will be rectified in the final renderings in the Sector Plan Update.	A note will be added to the sketches showing the 18 <sup>th</sup> Street corridor indicating that the renderings to be developed for the Sector Plan Update will show a location that is consistent with that ultimately shown in the Block Structure Map.
18	LRPC	p. 28	<b><i>Street Location Flexibility</i></b> Should the Plan Framework and the Sector Plan Update set absolute locations of new streets or should there be some flexibility?	Map T1 indicates that the locations of new streets are general. The ultimate alignment of new streets will be achieved through site plan redevelopment, to be informed by the maps and specific objectives set forth in the Sector Plan Update.	The Plan Framework will be revised to reference the need to develop specific objectives for the alignment of 18 <sup>th</sup> Street and other new streets in the Sector Plan Update, where needed.
19	LRPC	General Comment	<b><i>Sector Plan Update Elements</i></b> Can an appendix be added to the Plan Framework that lists the elements that will be included in the Sector Plan Update?	An outline for the Sector Plan Update that includes these elements will be added as an attachment to the Plan Framework staff report for the April County Board Meeting.	No changes proposed to the Plan Framework. A revised outline of the Sector Plan that addresses this question will be attached to the staff report.
20	LRPC	General Comment	<b><i>Active Site Plans</i></b> Are active Site Plan applications constraining the framework (i.e. illustrations of proposed buildings, location of 18 <sup>th</sup> Street corridor)? Illustrations should show the optimal scenario, not one that is constrained by Site Plans that are not yet approved.	Two sites plans/PDSPs submitted prior to the emergence of the draft Rosslyn Plan Framework are actively being reviewed by the County. Per guidance from a 2011 County Board work session, these applications are being reviewed per the existing planning and zoning framework, though discussions with staff may be informed by some of the concepts or ideas emerging through the Realize Rosslyn process.	No changes proposed.

ATTACHMENT 2

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Project Team Response</b>	<b>Proposed Changes to Framework</b>