
Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, January 18, 2023
7:00 p.m.

This meeting was a hybrid virtual/in-person public meeting held through electronic communication means.

Planning Commissioners in attendance:

James Lantelme (LRPC Chair) (in-person)
Leonardo Sarli (in-person)
James Schroll (Chair of this Study) (in-person)

Planning Commissioners absent:

Devanshi P. Patel
Tenley Peterson
Sara Steinberger
Daniel Weir
Denyse "Nia" Bagley
Elizabeth Gearin
Stephen Hughes

Other invited LRPC members in attendance:

Doris Ray, Disability Advisory Commission (virtual)
Caroline Haynes, Forestry and Natural Resources Commission (virtual)
Cynthia Schneider, Commission on Aging (virtual)
Chris Slatt, Transportation Commission (virtual)
Andrea Walker, Pedestrian Advisory Committee (virtual)
Laura Saul Edwards, Housing Commission (virtual)
John Sautter, GlebeWood Civic Association (in-person)
Don Weber, Waverly Hills Civic Association (virtual)

Staff in attendance:

Kellie Brown (CPHD – Planning) (virtual)
Anika Chowdhury (CPHD – Planning) (in-person)
Margaret Rhodes (CPHD – Planning) (in-person)
Angie de la Barrera (DES) (virtual)
Sergio Viricochea (DES) (virtual)
Brian Shelton (DES) (virtual)

Applicants in attendance:

Kedrick Whitmore, Venable (in-person)
Clyde McGraw, Sunrise (in-person)

2000 North Glebe Road (Sunrise) Special General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Study Tier II LRPC Meeting

Commissioner Schroll opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Schroll recognized members of several other Arlington County boards and commissions and civic leaders in attendance, as well as staff members and the applicant.

Staff made a presentation followed by a presentation by the applicant and a presentation by the GlebeWood Civic Association representative.

Questions and comments included the following:

- This is a legally non-conforming site. This should be addressed. The GLUP designation is not correct for the Mews either.
- Question about Tier II application submission and does the application address consistency with the surrounding context. Community is concerned about a lack of consistency with the surrounding context.
- Recommendation to add a guiding principle indicating a preference for elder care as opposed to residential use on this site.
- After the study, could the property be sold and redeveloped with residential development?
- The existing tree canopy should be depicted in the scenarios. There are mature, large trees.
- Trees should also be addressed in the applicant's FAQs.
- Was the transportation analysis done during the pandemic, such that it is not relevant to current conditions?
- It is important to have senior living facilities. There is a need for affordable units. Arlington lacks affordable senior living options. Will this be apartment-type assisted living or nursing home-type elder care? What level of accessibility will be provided?
- Desire to see affordable assisted living units. Some units were designated affordable in the Sunrise project in Old Town.
- Does the County track vacancies at senior living facilities?
- The Chair indicated that he had not heard any strong critique of the proposed "Low-Medium" Residential GLUP category.
- Why is the building in the models not shown up against 20th Street North and North Glebe Road? Having the greatest height along North Glebe Road makes sense. The grade should be used to facilitate the underground parking, allowing for less ramping. There should be good street frontage on both 20th Street North and North Glebe Road. The building should taper towards the neighbors and the site should include noise buffering. There should be a transition from the urban to the suburban across the site. The height analysis provided is good. No strong preference between the scenarios. The existing building has residential architectural elements. The applicant's roof plan looks unappealing.
- Mature trees and canopy trees are located on North Glebe Road and 20th Street North. Higher density is fine along North Glebe Road if tree conservation is achieved.
- No preference on the height options. Density should be loaded on North Glebe Road and should taper towards the neighbors. North Glebe Road is a very busy street and the more massing there is, the more sound buffering there would be. Underground parking is a good idea to free up some open space.

- The electrical wires should be undergrounded unless this negatively impacts the tree canopy. There is a very large, maybe 60' tall white pine, as well as some sycamores and oaks.
- The Chair summarized the discussion by saying that there was a preference for more height and mass on North Glebe Road with tapering towards the neighborhood to the north and west; people are ok with "Low-Medium" Residential; there is support for a guiding principle indicating a preference for senior living; trees and tree conservation are important; any potential site plan application should address parking, loading, stormwater management, (overhead power lines, pedestrian infrastructure), etc..
- Is R-10T associated with "Low" Residential or "Low-Medium" Residential on the GLUP?
- Concerns regarding the building overshadowing nearby buildings and preventing neighbors from being able to install solar panels, as well as potential damage to neighboring foundations.
- Importance of pedestrian and wheelchair access along North Glebe Road.

Public Comment

- Concerns regarding carbon emissions and the loss of embedded carbon by not reusing a building that is not that old. It looks impossible to preserve the trees and open spaces with redevelopment. The existing building fits in well with the neighborhood. The new building seems somewhat out of place.
- The new building will be double its current size on a barely one-acre lot. There will be a big increase in impervious cover. This site is at the top of the Lubber Run watershed. The trees will be bulldozed. The stormwater will run off the site. Why would there be an entrance off 20th Street North and not off North Glebe Road? Will there be any benefits for the neighborhood? The building will dwarf the neighborhood.
- Sunrise has been a good neighbor. Consideration should be given to the neighbors to the north and the west. No one has reached out to me from the applicant team. Consider the impacts on the community. Children will not be able to walk to the elementary school anymore. Not against development per se, but the proposed footprint does not make sense for this residential area.
- Have coexisted with Sunrise, but have not loved being near it. The property is already maximized. This proposal will be detrimental to the neighbors, school, people using North Glebe Road, etc.. Keep the R-6 zoning. Sunrise should do what it can with what it already has – modify from within and add more amenities. Doubling or tripling the number of units is greedy.
- What is the current occupancy rate? We are concerned about the integrity of the neighborhood. Will you be staying in this location or flipping the property? If there is no age restriction on the property, could it be sold to a multifamily developer?
- The building height should be considered in relation to the height of the adjacent townhouses. It could block our sunlight and prevent us from installing solar panels.
- Sunrise has been great for our relatives and friends. There is an issue with delivery trucks and landscaping trucks blocking the cul-de-sac and fire hydrants. The staff presentation should address topography in greater detail. There is a significant decline down 20th Street North. Sometimes only one vehicle can pass. There is heavy foot

traffic when schoolchildren, their families and pets walk to and from school in the morning and afternoon. The more traffic, the worse this will be.

- What is enough of a concern to stop this study process? At what point does it end? We have talked about stormwater, schoolchildren, etc.. Hearing the concerns of the neighbors is not enough? It seems like nothing we bring up is important enough. We bought in a residential, not a commercial neighborhood.
- Where will the current Sunrise residents go? What level of accessibility will be used here?
- Should address treatment of pervious surface and the undergrounding of overhead wires.
- What is the potential timeline?

Next Steps

Staff will prepare a Study Document to bring to public hearings at the Planning Commission and County Board.

Chair Schroll adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:13 p.m.