

Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Meeting #23, Summary

February 2, 2015; 7:00-9:30 pm

2100 Clarendon Blvd., County Board Room

Panel Members in Attendance: Brian Harner, Katie Elmore, Paul Holland, Andrew McGeorge, Stan Karson, Andy VanHorn

Staff in Attendance: Lida Aljabar, Kelly Cornell, Anthony Fusarelli, Matt Ladd, (Ben Carlson - phone)

1. Welcome

2. Air Rights Development

- Commonwealth's perspective is to maximize value of its real estate - also want to help County achieve its goals in the Realize Rosslyn process - study validates Virginia's view that this is feasible, may be farther in the future;
- Virginia received some interest from developers - what are private sector's considerations/risk factors/open questions? (*Response: developers indicated it is feasible from a technical perspective, no reservations from a market perspective, concluded that air rights is potentially viable - question about entitlement risks - more risk would diminish value*);
- Also, initial feasibility analysis indicated sites are high visibility, prime real estate, and this has led to general focus on residential condominium, also saw some interest in office;
- Were the responses to RFI including building configurations or just general? (*Response: mix of both - 3 of 6 went beyond conceptual design, one was very detailed proposal, but detail not included in final submission*);
- Is it a zero sum game where any development on the edge has negative effect on the core? Would challenge that premise - fixing the edge might induce redevelopment in the core by making Rosslyn a better place on the whole;
- Urban design/place making standpoint - merits discussion as to whether air rights development could have advantages - connectivity - removes presence of the highway - how do we leave the door open to that?
- Why not look at cost of decking for open space purposes? Could have same connectivity benefits as development - concern about Gateway Park as a potential development site;
- Would be helpful for County to give guidance as to what could be allowed (density, height);
- Feels like there is potential for negative consequences - major planned open spaces are adjacent to air rights sites - what is point of esplanade if a building can be built next to it? Also don't think Gateway Park should be considered;
- Concerned about transportation impacts and transitions to neighboring areas;
- Are we being consistent with MWAA's vision for flight patterns over Rosslyn?
- Would need more collaboration with the County to provide more certainty - think there is more redevelopment to happen in the core, and we should be focusing on that;
- Has county discussed working with the state to focus on this issue? (*Response: have had initial conversations about next steps, involving potential processes on how to consider proposals - is it a community-based process that is more collaborative in nature - is the vision developed by the commonwealth and its development partner?*)
- Have heard comments about timeframe - only way to find out timeframe is to see if someone will finance it - how can county provide guidance so that it could happen sooner?
- Some elements in sector plan (e.g. esplanade) would effectively cut off air rights development - esplanade could be shifted to accommodate air rights development

- W-ZHA's analysis overly conservative about predicting into the future - more detailed market analysis could shed more light - design opportunities - see some positives - better off letting core site redevelop first, more important to make investments in the core now;

Transportation Subcommittee

- In report from subcommittee, one issue raised was pedestrian/bike conflicts, seems like those are being addressed in presentation tonight, feels sector plan is moving in the right direction;
- Several cycle tracks are proposed, and occupy a lot of space. Tradeoffs between using that space for cycle tracks versus expanded sidewalks - are cycle tracks part of a larger system?
- Want to see visuals - are cycle tracks two-way on the same side of the street? Need implementation details with timing of cycle tracks and two-way conversion
- Okay with road diets - bottleneck northbound is M Street in Georgetown, southbound traffic speeds through Rosslyn on Fort Myer
- With Central Place under construction, is there an opportunity to move forward with 2-way conversion
- Could we eliminate bus tunnel through Central Place with 2 way conversion?
- Thought it was agreed that there would be a traffic study before moving ahead with 2-way conversion (*Response: intent is that traffic study would be included in study of implementation details (signaling, turns, etc.)*)
- Slide 21 is unclear - "two lanes in each direction at peak";
- Didn't see discussion of 2nd Metro entrance in presentation;
- Want more details on where buses will go in sector plan

Parks and Open Spaces

- Main themes discussed included connectivity, diverse uses of parks, and priorities;
- A lot of support for the esplanade and 18th street;
- Opportunities for diverse uses at Gateway Park;
- Priorities on first projects to implement were Gateway Park, streetscape improvements in conjunction with Rosslyn BID, and the boathouse;
- Generally consensus agreement from parks subcommittee on what we've seen tonight;
- Subcommittee looked at programming for Gateway Park, want to make sure that wasn't lost;
- Didn't see how private dining fits into parks, wants to encourage that - European model, biergartens, particularly along esplanade;
- Agree with that, but don't want public play spaces to be overtaken by private uses;
- Boathouse shouldn't get lost in the process;
- Thinks presentation on parks has been very helpful;
- Typology is a challenge nationally - can we say something about encouraging PSMP update to include typology definitions?

Building Height and Form

- Balance between having enough specificity in plan that we know what to expect and flexibility for the development community to facilitate redevelopment;
- Concern about flexibility to exceed height maximums; better to have flexibility to achieve height maximums by meeting certain objectives;
- Intent is to not incentivize office development over residential by limiting height;
- Clarify that concern is about flexibility for height;
- Concern that only 1 project modeled achieves 10 FAR, could represent huge losses of tax revenue and community benefits - could be \$150 million for three projects Monday looked at;
- Okay with some flexibility on heights - will we get to see information on community benefits? (*Response: team is looking at community benefits from a number of different angles - feel there is an opportunity for sector plan to talk about priority community benefits*)
- Support stepbacks and other building form guidelines that increase views;

- Observation Deck - will generate more than 600,000 visitors to Rosslyn/year, so need to ensure views are preserved to make sure it is successful

County Board Work Session

- Possibly later this month
- Looking for guidance as to whether plan is heading in right direction before full draft is released

Updated Schedule

- Tentatively aim for first draft end of February or early March
- Possibility for a final RPP meeting after draft released
- Want to have another process panel meeting

- Any macro level guidance on where we are?
- Want open space priorities included in next presentation
- Hope that sector plan update will be followed and not changed when projects ask for exceptions
- Want draft in time to review prior to the meeting - consensus on 2 weeks

Adjourn