
Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Subcommittee on Building Height + Massing Meeting Summary

December 2 2014; 7:00-9:30 pm

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Lobby Level Conference Room 109/111

Subcommittee Members in Attendance: B. Harner (Chair), S. Cole, K. Elmore, A. McGeorge, M. Novotny, S. Stein, D. VanDuzer, A. VanHorn,

Staff in Attendance: A. Fusarelli, E. Kays, M. Ladd (B. Carlson)

1. Welcome

2. Proposed Scenario

- Goal of trying to increase development potential from Scenario C is generally to provide more options for development, community benefits potential, and height differentiation;
- In TDR scenario, it's not clear whether 3 sites shown would go above 10 FAR? (*R: FAR could increase above 10 FAR on those sites, but sending site is envisioned to be from another RCRD project*);
- It's not clear whether any changes are proposed to the existing 3.8/4.8 FAR base densities. (*R: Have not considered changes as of yet*); then, it's not clear how TDRs would work in practice with current base densities;
- Should clarify whether heights with TDR scenario are the same as shown on heights map; (*R: Right now, the maps generally do not account for TDRs, meaning heights could be increased on those 3 sites if TDRs were applied*);
- It's not clear if penthouses are included in heights (*R: not included in ASE numbers, but is included in ASL numbers*);
- "C-O Rosslyn" allows 23' for penthouses, model assumes 20' – suggest modeling be adjusted;
- Is achieving density the first goal in heights – it appears that way? (*R: achieving at least FAR 8.0 is one of the goals*);
- It would be helpful to number the buildings and provide a key for reference purposes;
- What ultimately goes into sector plan? Max heights on slides 35-36 or rules on p. 30 or both? (*R: general thinking is that maximum heights and a few other items would be required, other elements could be guidelines*);
- Clarifying "heights on other sites limited to 70-80% of nearby towers" would be helpful;
- It's not clear what the arrows on slide 30 graphics depict – do they reflect priority view corridors from observation deck, if so they are inconsistent with framework; (*R: graphics show view corridors from all buildings, not just obs deck*);
- Do not understand why there are peaks at the edge of RCRD opposite residential buildings outside RCRD (e.g. Xerox building near Belvedere);
- It's not clear how TDRs advance the overall goals - can you limit TDR to specific sites (legally)?
- It'd be good to clarify whether the density/maximum height is a given, or if it would still be earned per C-O Rosslyn;
- There's concern that a lot of sites are shown at 200', not much taller than current CO zoning - might incentivize adding height to an existing tower but discourage full redevelopment (*R: In many places, 200' buildings are examples of multiple building sites, achieving 9.0+ FAR, policy application would be max height of tallest building, lower building heights wouldn't be described individually, but would be relative to tallest building*);
- Framing questions don't get to the right tradeoffs, as there are other goals that should be balanced that aren't here. The problem is fragmented thinking of building heights, open space, transportation. Looking at view corridors from only one point is not helpful, want to maximize all views; we should

protect against having views decreased dramatically if you go down a few floors from building top (*R: the second bullet framing question is about public value as well as private – the differences in height between buildings set forth in the proposed scenario would create the desired view opportunities*);

- Buildings at edge seem to block all views in and out (particularly the view from the Lincoln Memorial; the view from Georgetown looks more permeable);
- Concurrence with the point about too much focus on views from one site, need to explore further the ability to differentiate heights on a site, and we should not be creating walls that block views;
- Missing transitions and views from other buildings;
- Struggling with idea that you have to protect everyone's views, this is just not realistic; think staff has done a thoughtful job of trying to vary height, preserving views, and incentivizing redevelopment
- This is a nearly impossible equation to solve; the FAA limit and ground elevations and zoning density expectations are all working against us, but we should still strive for a regime of massing and height that maximizes the collective whole, if possible.
- The middle of RCRD has metro, and will have most activity, we need a partnership between heart and perimeter, as redevelopment in the heart benefits the perimeter, and vice versa;
- Monumental view corridor is what makes Rosslyn unique - need to think of views from buildings other than observation deck too;
- The height map has a number of sites that exceed traditional 300' limit - citizens seem to understand the benefits of that - fairly significant that it is loosening up a bit;
- One model (San Francisco) to consider includes stepping down height as elevation steps down, in this case it could step down to the river and monumental core - would maximize views;
- Should consider whether there can be an incentive to orient buildings to increase views and sunlight? i.e. lower height if you orient building for broadside view;
- Problem is that would ignore other reasons for building orientation – such as effects on the ground plane - shadows, etc.;
- It could be possible to have a good ground plane separate from tower orientation;
- TDR could be thought of as an agreement between 2 property owners with development proposals

3. Design Guidelines

- Limited discussion on presentation due to time constraints

4. Next Steps

- This subcommittee is one of few opportunities for citizens and developers to sit at the same table
- Other venues are not the same;
- When do all the parts come together - parks, heights, transportation - need to discuss the balancing of all components;
- Hard to digest information in short amount of time - want more time to think about it and to reconvene as subcommittee;
- Need to understand what deliverable is
- Want to reconvene to get into discussion of design framework - in some respects more critical than massing
- If there is another meeting, its structure should be around second half of tonight's presentation;
- Advantage to meeting in public is that everyone gets to hear different viewpoints;
- In the interim, should comments be sent to staff? yes BH - not likely to meet prior to Jan. 1 due to scheduling constraints

5. Adjourn