

**Public Facilities Review Committee  
Ashlawn Elementary School Expansion  
Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, March 17, 2013**

**Attendees**

<b><u>PFRC Members (√ = present):</u></b>	<b><u>Arlington Public Schools (APS):</u></b>
√ Charles Monfort, Chair	John Chadwick, APS
√ Lander Allin, Schools	Doug Gehley, SHW Group
Jeff Certosimo, Housing Commission	
√ Elizabeth Gearin, Parks & Rec. Commission	<b><u>County Staff:</u></b>
√ Eric Harold, E2C2	Marco Rivero, CPHD
√ Jana Lynott, Transportation Commission	Lisa Maher, DES
√ Inta Malis, Planning Commission	Joan Kelsch, DES
√ John Miller, At-Large	Sergio Enriquez, DPR
	Peter Alchin, DPR
	Freida Wray, CPHD
√ Heather Obora, Schools	
Betty Siegel, At-Large	<b><u>New ES#1 Project-Specific PFRC Members:</u></b>
√ Steve Sockwell, Planning Commission	Lynn Pollock, Rock Spring CA
Jason Widstrom, Fiscal Affairs Adv. Comm.	Moe Kabiri, Rock Spring CA
	Paul Cullen, Williamsburg CA
<b><u>Ashlawn Project-Specific PFRC Members:</u></b>	Jim Lunson, Williamsburg CA
Tamara Gelboin, Boulevard Manor CA	David Friedman, Yorktown CA
√ Josh Handler, Boulevard Manor CA	David Haring, Yorktown CA
Matt Robarge, Dominion Hills CA	Ann Hafer, Franklin Area CA
Scott Christensen, Dominion Hills CA	Ed Hilz, Urban Forestry Commission
√ Ed Hilz, Urban Forestry Commission	Craig Esherick, Sports Commission
√ Craig Esherick, Sports Commission	

**General Discussion**

E. Harold asked that the PFRC Report be corrected to indicate that E2C2 voted to oppose the Manchester Street option of the Ashlawn project, rather than opposing the use permit.

There was significant discussion about the maintenance of on-site landscaping given that APS has limited funds in their budget for maintenance. J. Chadwick noted that APS will recommend that no more trees be planted on the site than what is required by the tree replacement guidelines and the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance.

There were several questions about County/APS plans for off-site transportation improvements, including the Wilson Boulevard/8<sup>th</sup> Road connection, and the narrowing of Wilson Boulevard. J. Handler identified three key areas of concern: 1) Parking per the Zoning Ordinance; 2) review of the TDM by the Transportation Commission; and 3) provision of a third stairway from Bluemont Park. C. Monfort stated that off-site transportation projects identified as critical by the PFRC should be addressed during Board consideration of the use permit even if they are County projects, and asked whether the County Board could adopt a separate resolution that it will commit to the projects.

### **Review of Draft Use Permit Conditions**

Below is a summary of comments made about specific conditions:

**#13. Landscape Standards** – Include language that prohibits planting of invasive plant species.

**#13.g. Landscape Standards, APS maintenance requirement** – The language is too generic and should be more specific to include requirements for: maintenance of trees; replacement of trees when they die; and maintenance of sod/lawn areas for the life of the use permit.

**#24. Underground Existing Aerial Utilities** – APS does not agree to undergrounding utilities because the estimated cost of \$800,000 is too excessive and would equal 5 percent of the total construction cost.

**#34. Parking Space Compliance with Zoning Ordinance** – The condition should include the number of parking spaces approved by the parking use permit.

**#35. Bicycle Storage Facilities** – Explore the provision of secure and/or covered bicycle storage facilities for students.

**#39. Review by Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Practitioner** – Include recommended edits.

**#53.a. Sustainable Design Elements** – Asked why the requirement for a 10% reduction in site energy intensity for the entire school is so low, given that the savings in the new addition will be much higher than that level.

**#60. Secondary Parking Agreement with Dominion Hills Area Recreation**

**Association** – Need to edit the language addressing the potential loss of Dominion Hills parking. If the parking is lost and the use permit is discontinued, include language that any new use permit amendment should also be reviewed by the PFRC and the Transportation Commission.

### **Public Comment**

There were comments made about on-site erosion issues, and what the PFRC's position would be on the proposed number of on-site trees given APS statement that it will only plant the number of trees required by the tree replacement guidelines.

### **Next Steps**

This was the last meeting of the PFRC on the Ashlawn School Expansion. The use permits for the school expansion and the secondary parking will be heard by the Transportation Commission on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, at the carryover meeting of the Planning Commission on May 8<sup>th</sup>, and the County Board on May 18, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 pm.