

## **Rosslyn Process Panel (RPP) Meeting #24, Summary**

**May 13, 2015; 7:00-9:30 pm**

**2100 Clarendon Blvd., Room 311**

**Panel Members** in Attendance: Brian Harner, Katie Elmore, Paul Holland, Tim Helmig, Stuart Stein, Andy VanHorn

**Staff** in Attendance: Lida Aljabar, Kelly Cornell, Anthony Fusarelli, Elizabeth Weigle, (Ben Carlson)

---

### **1. Welcome**

### **2. Plan Overview**

- Will there be an executive summary, is this a possibility? (R: staff considering ways in which one might be incorporated or created as separate document);
- P. 62 – transition into the Goals and Policies is very abrupt; could benefit from introductory text;
- P. 94 – table on transportation guidelines dimensions seems lost; could benefit from preceding text that explains the table;
- Overall, there are a lot of prescriptive elements in this plan; it could be very helpful for staff to clearly outline what is prescriptive vs. what is guideline;
- Impressed with overall document, very easy to follow content. Lack of executive summary doesn't seem to be an issue;
- In final document, would be great to have table of contents hyperlinked for easy navigation of plan;
- In Implementation chapter, would like to see priorities called out more – find a way to emphasize what are the low-hanging fruit, and ID what you can do independent of redevelopment;
- Consider building in more cross-references among different parts of the plan; for instance, between policies, recommendations, and implementation actions (R: can refer back to policies);

### **3. Updated Content Slides / 4. Comments Throughout Plan**

- Chapter 1 does good job of framing the document; nothing missing, and the set-up seems find.
- P. 15 – in addressing regional context, shouldn't just show context in Arlington but show a broader look of the DC region, make reference to competition and opportunities;
- P. 16 – should consider discussing potential impacts of increase in households on capital costs related to things such as parks, schools, etc. Maybe as basis as describing what schools that kids in the study area currently attend. Knowing student generation rates from inside RCRD could also be helpful.
- P. 32? – Notes cap of 470' asl derived from two specific sites, and not based on applications to the FAA for sites west of Fort Myer Drive – not accurate to suggest that FAA has acted on all of Roslyn. Would be interesting to know whether FAA would permit buildings up to 540' asl west of Oak Street;
- What's interesting is that the notion of limiting ourselves to 470' asl isn't new, and seems odd to raise this as an issue/notion now;
- If it's a question as to whether the plan is unclear on whether or not height should go above 470' asl if the FAA were to permit it, then it would be important to address that;
- There is still the outstanding issue of OEI;
- P. 34-36: be explicit about what parks are inside or outside RCRD; and be genuine about where space is within RCRD and not within RCRD;
- P. 51: This rendering/view is important; shows how tops of buildings will be visible from observation deck, and raises the importance of design guidelines to address issues of screening, etc. Mechanical equipment and elevator overruns are necessary elements that will need to be dealt with in some way;

- P. 61: for 18<sup>th</sup> Street east of Lynn Street, prefer a pedestrian only or limited use street; not convinced with the need for a new, complete street accommodating cars too;
- P. 44: doesn't state that the RMTS identified need for new streets; if Sector Plan recommends new streets, this conflict/inconsistency should be resolved;
- P. 66 – In policy B2, need clarity on what is meant by “varied building facades”;
- P. 168 – based on the design guidelines in the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet, and rest of the page, would 1812 N Moore meet these guidelines? They seem too prescriptive, could be easier to achieve for residential than office, some suggestions here may be problematic; If these are just guidelines, why have such finite dimensions included within them?
- P. 69 – With Illustrative Concept Plan, future site plans may have great difficulty in gaining approval when they don't show exactly what's depicted in the ICP; Is it necessary to have the massing diagrams in the ICP? Could we just existing footprints? Concerned about opportunity to include open space opportunities if not shown in ICP;
- Observations have been that many site plans come forward with significant deviations from what's shown in ICP, and they still get approved; maybe disclaimer language can be enhanced to make it crystal clear that it's expected 4.1 submissions will vary in exact building footprint and massing from what is shown conceptually in the ICP.
- P. 66 – Have we done a retail analysis as part of developing ground floor land use plan? Concerned that Moore Street near Central Place is not shown as Red – Rosslyn could support more Red in the future, that's what it needs;
- On the Retail plan, some planning commission members think sector plan should influence County's retail plan more, not the other way around;
- Maybe Moore Street north of 19<sup>th</sup> should be shown as Gold, not Blue;
- Did the County do a retail market study as part of the County's retail plan updates in progress?
- P. 76 – maybe this is a potential location to address the issue of potential increases in population and school aged children in particular;
- P. 77 – several support the goal of up to 30% of community benefit value be directed at affordable housing; preservation of market rate affordable units are not noted here – should they be? Concern with putting housing outside of the RMSA – how can this plan address that? No need to say “Prioritize cash contribution for affordable CAF units elsewhere in the RMSA, since that seems to be what's most often done anyway”;
- At same time, need to consider how the plan can speak to other community benefit needs that need to be prioritized; which may compete with reaching this affordable housing target in all cases;
- Statement in T6 about expanding number of bus stops, concerned that don't need to “increase” number of stops but perhaps better to rationalize stops and use them more efficiently;
- P. 94 – table doesn't include sidewalk widths as component, seems like that is missing? Can we at least add dimensions of separate components of sidewalks, as typical guidelines? Maybe the sidewalk widths provided in the table could provide a lower range, and recognize many sidewalks could be wider;
- How are clear zones being addressed; total sidewalk width and clear zones are separate dimensions that are both important – need to address this;
- Subcommittee also discussed perhaps taking some space from cycle tracks and adding to sidewalks;
- P. 107 – likes the specificity seen in the sidewalk with map, so that don't have to debate the appropriate sidewalk width in SPRC and Planning Commission discussions on site plans;
- Can there be added language that addresses how to evaluate other options? (perhaps when trying to achieve sidewalk with outdoor dining? Could provide a more attractive environment and intimate setting than just having wide sidewalk that is not activated);

- P. 108 – should make clear that RAFOM strongly opposes incorporation of Corridor of Light project into the Mead Street Bridge project and having that relationship expressed in the Sector Plan is an issue; others would like to better understand why RAFOM is opposed to Corridor of Light on Meade Street;
- P. 125 – need to confirm whether space #11 (1101 Lee Hwy) is include in the open space acreage totals presented on page 122. Should be included, recognizing it will be park/open space use in the future;
- P. 144 – With respect to the boathouse, plan should discuss the Chesapeake Bay policy update (from 2014) about adding 300 additional public rec access points to this facility;
- P. 125-127- Rosslyn Circle (#10), maybe having goal/action item related to this – should be something that gets prioritized to improve conditions here in near-term; perhaps address as part of the master planning for Gateway Park revitalization;
- Thinks Park and Recreation Commission will be very supportive of the park vision and recommendations in the plan;
- In building height and form, concerned with lack of transition to areas to the south, and southwest of the RCRD. Nash Street south of 17<sup>th</sup> should have bulk-plane angles to provide for tilted surfaces to aid with transitions from the Noland and Xerox building sites; Also would like to see more transition from 1500 Wilson Blvd to the south;
- P. 147 – notes bullet 1, with respect to the role of the FAA and relationship to 470’ asl not yet being tested for all of Rosslyn;
- Need strong conversation about the overall approach, and very concerned w/ use of the term of "form-based guidelines"; need much more flexibility than the plan seems to provide;
- With point T4 on p. 168, there is too much detail on how buildings should be designed, and a lot of prescriptive elements would challenge architects and put them in a box;
- Why even mention 8 FAR on page 147? Several developers have consistently taken issue with assertion that redevelopment could happen at FARs that much below 10 FAR;
- Would be better to code the design guidelines differently so as to avoid potential confusion with coding system used for the Policies earlier in the document;
- Very important to push for the best use of the observation deck, to ensure great views;
- Agree with the 3 things that the plan currently proposes for codification; although not happy about height flexibility, it is important to reinforce that guidelines should be guidelines;
- Overall, this will have much greater impact in the community since it result in more density and development, but staff has done good job with comprise and finding balance in these areas;
- p.151 - issue with use of term "must" is an issue, should be more of a "should" if this is in fact to be a guideline as is suggested;
- Generally don’t agree with the building height and form approach overall – though support the goals or preserving views from the Central Place observation deck; open to refinements and finding compromises that can make this approach more workable, as opposed to scrapping it altogether;
- Supports idea of SPRC images of rooftops, but need to consider how can that be enforced;
- Implementation – overall, implementation agency is too weak – need stronger term or need to identify a lead agency;
- Don’t like “ongoing” as a timeframe – isn’t specific enough to get anything done; things are always “ongoing”
- P. 184: Too weal of a recommendation for #36 – boathouse; can DPR take the lead on this?
- Maybe add check mark or some other column to make clear what County can do on its own, and differentiate that from what will require redevelopment.