

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
<b>Background-related Comments</b>				
1	LRPC member	Identify that the Queens Court is on the HRI.	Staff agrees.	Language will be added to Chapter 2 that states that Queens Court is on the HRI.
2	WG member	Need to include a reference to the Public Spaces Master Plan (PSMP).	Staff will evaluate this further.	No change at this time.
3	WG member	Joint use of public facilities should be captured as a “big idea” in the plan.	Staff agrees.	Add language to Chapter 3 that highlights this point.
<b>Concept-related Comments</b>				
4	LRPC member	How would the school building siting and orientation decisions be made?	These decisions will be made by the County Board as part of the Use Permit review process, which will be guided by the ongoing Public Facilities Review Committee and Building Level Review Committee processes.	No change.
5	LRPC member	Consider moving the new street further east in order to achieve an east-west orientation of the private development that is planned to be west of the new street.	Staff is cautious about this suggested change. An important goal of this planning process, as outlined in the County Board Charge, is to include “feasible private development... that supports the County’s goals”. Moving the street further east will impact the potential density to be achieved and the marketability of the overall development.	No change.
6	LRPC member	Can an ultimate Frisbee field be included in the Plan? There is currently no mention of it.	Yes.	Add language to Chapter 3 to address this point.

**Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change to Area Plan</b>
7	WG member	The alternative development layout (p.22) should be the desirable solution and preferred concept.	<p>At this time, staff does not know the viability of this alternative concept, given the site development constraints that would be placed on the School Development Area. Through further discussion with APS staff, a better understanding of this issue may arise.</p> <p>Staff believes the Plan adequately describes this alternative and finds it to be generally consistent with the main Concept Plan. This alternative, if proved viable, could be pursued further if the County Board and School Board can reach agreement on the real estate transaction(s) that would be deemed necessary to implement the alternative concept in a timeframe that meets APS' schedule. No additional language is needed in the Plan document to support/promote this outcome.</p>	No change.
8	WG member	The Illustrative Concept Plan shows a parallelogram-shaped building in the Mixed-Use Development Area. Is this type of floorplate likely to occur?	The intent of the Illustrative Concept Plan is to provide one view of how build-out could occur within the study area, and often, some creative expression is offered in depicting buildings, architectural details	The Illustrative Concept Plan and Concept Plan Illustrative Models will be revised to show a simpler building form.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
			and site layout. At the same time, it is not staff's intent to confuse the reader.	
<b>Land Use-related Comments</b>				
9	APAH, WG member	Add specific goal of 250 units of affordable housing as discussed in the Working Group process for the Residential Development Area and that it should be permitted through a GLUP note and related ZO amendment.	Staff agrees.	Language has been added to the Land Use Element that affirmatively states this.
10	APAH	The GLUP designation for the APAH site is both "High-Medium" and "Low-Medium" Residential. The outline designating the WRAPS boundaries is not consistent with the property line. The language should acknowledge that half of the site is designated "High-Medium" Residential currently.	Staff has determined that the current land use designation for the Queens Court site is "Low-Medium" Residential (16-36 units/acre).	No change.
11	LRPC member	Need to be more specific about the proposed school and APAH density.	Staff agrees; however the Zoning Ordinance does not specify density for parcels zoned "S-3A" which is the school site's designation.	Language has been added to the Land Use Element to outline the potential density for the Queens Court site.
12	WG member	Retail should be consistent with what is planned in the Arlington County Retail Plan.	Staff agrees.	Language has been added to the Land Use Element to be consistent with the Arlington County Retail Plan.
<b>Heights-related Comments</b>				
13	APAH, WG member	Clarify how heights should be calculated, including development in the Housing Development Area.	Building height is determined to be the distance between average site elevation to the main roof of the building (top of the	A note will be added to the Heights Element of the Plan to indicate how this measurement is determined.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
			highest occupiable floor) and does not include the penthouse	
14	LRPC member, WG member	Heights of other buildings in the surrounding area should be noted in the plan.	Staff agrees.	The Plan will be updated to include a map, showing a broader context, with heights of existing buildings, as well as the proposed building heights incorporated in the Western Rosslyn Area Plan and the 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan.
15	WG member	28 stories is too high here.	Proposed heights within the WRAPS study area are consistent with the heights proposed in the 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan and are proposed as a means to better achieve the goals of this Plan.	No change.
16	WG member	Height for penthouses should be mentioned in the plan.	Staff agrees.	A note will be added to the Heights Element of the Plan to address this point.
<b>Transportation-related Comments</b>				
17	APAH	Key Boulevard should be included as a secondary street, so that garage and loading dock access from Key Boulevard is possible, as the grade makes this the most sensible location.	Staff agrees.	Language has been added to the Urban Design Element to address this point.
18	LRPC member	Why not have the same street cross sections for 18 <sup>th</sup> Street and Wilson Boulevard as in the Rosslyn Sector Plan?	There is no recommended street cross section in the draft 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan that corresponds to the segment of 18 <sup>th</sup> Street between the eastern boundary of	No change.

**Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change to Area Plan</b>
			<p>the Western Rosslyn study area and Oak Street.</p> <p>The recommended street cross section for Wilson Boulevard in the Western Rosslyn Area Plan is consistent with the street cross section recommended in the draft Rosslyn Sector Plan.</p>	
19	WG member	Are there plans to widen Wilson Boulevard?	No. Generally, staff does not recommend that streets get widened. Rather, we propose traffic management and transit improvements, as well as changes to encourage users (employees, others) to use other travel modes.	No change.
20	WG member / Transportation Commission member	Plan needs to address short-term parking needs for quick drop-off situations. Where will this occur?	Staff agrees.	Language has been added to the Urban Design Element address this point.
<b>Open Space-related Comments</b>				
21	APAH	There should be flexibility for the location of the public park in the Residential Development District	Staff continues to recommend that the public park space should be located on the corner of Quinn Street and 18 <sup>th</sup> Street North to increase visibility. The overall shape and configuration can be determined through the site plan review process.	No change.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change to Area Plan</b>
22	APAH	Clarify that the park on the APAH site will not be required to go through the same park planning process as the other open spaces, and that this space will include a tot lot open to the public but also serving the residential building.	Staff recommends that a coordinated park planning process be initiated, in the short term, to provide guidance on the specific amenities to be included in the park spaces within the study area.  Staff agrees that the Plan could indicate a preferred use for the proposed park on this site.	The Land Use and Open Space Elements of the Plan will be updated to indicate that the proposed park space within the Housing Development Area could include a tot lot, as a compatible use with residential development.
23	LRPC member	The plan needs to be clear that the open space in the Residential Development Area is usable by the community.	Staff agrees.	No change. The Plan identifies this park space as a public park.
24	LRPC member, WG member	The plan needs to be clear that the rooftop recreational facilities on top of the school is available to the community.	During the Public Facilities Review Committee process, it will be determined whether rooftop amenities will be included in the school design and how public access can be achieved. Staff agrees that, should rooftop amenities, such as basketball or tennis courts, be included in the school design, efforts should be made to achieve public access to the rooftop spaces consistent with the Guiding Principles.	The Open Space Element will be updated to address this point.
25	LRPC member	If the entire Mixed-Use Development Area has underground parking, does the Plan need to address the depth of soil above the parking to accommodate true canopy trees?	The Plan includes a Guiding Principle, in the Implementation Element, that address this point.	No change.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
26	WG member	The plan needs more coordination language among parties in the open space section.	Staff agrees.	Language has been added to the Open Space Element to address this point.
27	WG member	How and when will the community weigh in on the use of the APS field?	The community can participate in the ongoing Public Facilities Review Committee process. Ultimately, the Use Permit application for the school will be considered at a County Board Hearing, at which the public may provide their comments.	No change.
28	WG member	Passive space in the public parks is needed. There should be opportunities for shade trees in the new park.	Staff agrees. The park planning process, which is proposed as a follow-on process, is the appropriate venue to discuss this matter.	No change.
<b>Urban Design-oriented Comments</b>				
29	APAH	Exclude the APAH site from the general list of architectural requirements/design guidelines.	Staff does not agree. The Urban Design Element of the Plan has both area-wide and site specific guidelines that will ensure coordinated and high quality development. However, staff is open to discussing refinements to this Element as the community review process continues.	No change.
30	APAH	Exempt APAH from the above-ground parking restrictions, or provide additional flexibility in screening types, particularly when significant grade changes are at play.	Staff does not agree. The Urban Design Element of the Plan has both area-wide and site specific guidelines that will ensure coordinated and high quality development. However, staff is open to discussing	No change.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
			refinements to this Element as the community review process continues.	
31	LRPC member, WG member	Why not apply the Rosslyn Sector Plan design guidelines here?	Staff does not agree because:	No change.
32	LRPC member, WG member	The proposed buildings along 18 <sup>th</sup> Street and Wilson Blvd should have the step-back requirements as the Rosslyn Sector Plan for those streets.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The Western Rosslyn planning area has different goals than the Rosslyn Sector Plan planning area. In this planning area, one major goal is the achievement of a new fire station and significant park improvement through joint development.</li> <li>2) One objective of the step-backs that are recommended in the 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan is the preservation of views – which are primarily to the east. The Western Rosslyn study area is at the western end of the high-density Rosslyn core.</li> <li>3) The inclusion of 15’ building step-backs would impede feasible, viable development for the Mixed-Use Development Area.</li> </ol>	No change.

### Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix

Comment #	Source	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Change to Area Plan
33	LRPC member, WG member	Tower separation (51') should be consistent with what Rosslyn Sector Plan is calling for (60'). This 51' feet separation may be a tight space.	There would be at least 60' of tower separation within the Mixed-Use Development Area between developments across the proposed new street.	No change.
34	LRPC member, WG member	Build-to-lines should be consistent with what the Rosslyn Sector Plan is calling for.	This Plan incorporates proposed street cross sections that are generally consistent with the street cross sections proposed in the 2015 Rosslyn Sector Plan.	No change.
35	LRPC member	Should a fencing standard be stated in the Plan for the School Development Area?	Staff agrees that a fencing standard should be included in the Plan document.	The Urban Design Element will be updated to address this point.
36	WG member	Design guidelines for retail should be in the Plan.	Staff agrees that the Arlington County retail Plan should be referenced in the Plan	The Land Use Element has been updated to reference the Arlington County Retail Action Plan.
37	WG member	The dimensions for building façade composition is too explicit and should be removed.	Staff will evaluate this further.	No change at this time.
<b>Environment-related Comments</b>				
38	APAH	Remove the target of carbon neutrality for the Housing Development Area and other areas of the plan based on the cost implications not making it achievable.	Staff will evaluate this further.	No change at this time.
<b>Implementation-related Comments</b>				
39	APAH, LRPC member	Add that all processes related to the APAH site require a flexible timeframe, given	Staff will evaluate this further to determine how this point can be addressed.	No change at this time.

**Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change to Area Plan</b>
		reliance on County funding and the LIHTC schedule.		
40	LRPC member	Need a phasing plan.	Staff agrees.	A Phasing Plan will be added to the Implementation Element of the Plan.
41	WG member	HALRB should be more involved in the BLPC/PFRC processes.	HALRB has been invited to participate in these processes.	No change
42	Transportation Commission member	Why include a north-south pedestrian thoroughfare through the County/APS parcels if there is a desire for more park space?	The pedestrian pathway, which currently exists and extends from Wilson Blvd to Key Blvd, is recommended to continue as part of future development. This pedestrian connection links open spaces through these blocks.	No change
43	Transportation Commission member	When and how was the decision to locate the HB Woodlawn program made? How would the Transportation Commission and other advisory group get involved in the siting processes for schools.	In late 2014, APS conducted a several-month-long process to identify school development projects to help alleviate the school crowding issue. The decision to locate the HB Woodlawn program, and associated programs currently located at the Stratford School site, was reached in December 2014. The County and APS are currently conducting a Community Facilities Study to, in part, develop recommendations for future siting decisions for schools and other public facilities.	No change

**Draft Western Rosslyn Area Plan Comment and Response Matrix**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>	<b>Proposed Change to Area Plan</b>
44	Urban Forestry Commission member	Plan should include space for the planting of tree groves, which would contribute to the reduction of the heat island effect - not just street trees and other planting around the new development;	This objective will be difficult to achieve given that there will be below-grade parking and/or building spaces proposed on each site.	No change.