



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
(703) 228-3525 • FAX (703) 228-3543



CHRISTOPHER FORINASH
CHAIR

NANCY IACOMINI
VICE CHAIR

MICHELLE STAHLHUT
COORDINATOR

GIZELE C. JOHNSON
CLERK

June 10, 2015

Arlington County Board
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 300
Arlington, Virginia 22201

SUBJECT: **3. Realize Rosslyn**
Request to Advertisement of public hearings by the Planning Commission and the County Board to consider the adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Commission recommends the County Board authorize public hearings to advertise the adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan as proposed in the County Manager’s memorandum dated May 26, 2015. The Planning Commission further recommends the following changes to the “Request to Advertise” draft of the Rosslyn Sector Plan attached to the May 26, 2015 County Manager’s memorandum.

1. Amend the **Vision Statement** (page 48) as follows:
 - Delete “world class” in the first sentence.
 - Delete “; the jewel of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor” at the end.
2. Amend **Goals and Policies: Transportation** (pages 62-3) as follows:
 - In T3, delete “contingent upon adequate feasibility studies, monitoring, and mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.”
 - Add a new T13:”Work with the Rosslyn BID and Rosslyn property owners to develop a modern, central bike parking facility in Rosslyn using either existing unused automobile parking capacity or allowing a future redevelopment project to incorporate such a facility in its design in lieu of equivalent automobile parking space.”
3. Amend **Goals and Policies: Public Parks and Open Spaces** (page 64) as follows:
 - In P2, delete “N. Oak St.” and insert in its place “N. Quinn St.”
4. Amend **Goals and Policies: Building Height and Form** (pages 65-6) as follows:
 - In B1.e, delete “public” before “open spaces” and insert “in the public realm” following “open spaces.”

P.C. #44.

5. Amend the **Illustrative Concept Plan** (pages 67-9) as follows:
- Under “Key Highlights,” add as additional transformative features:
 - Unobstructed views of the monumental core from the Central Place Observation Deck
 - The Rosslyn Boathouse
 - Wider, More Accommodating, Well-Designed Sidewalks and Streetscapes replacing the Skywalk system
 - Air rights development
 - Peaks and Valleys Heights Plan
 - An “Attracting” Skyline
 - A Modern, Central Bicycle Parking Facility
 - Under Key Highlight B, 18th Street Extension by deleting “Oak” and inserting “Quinn.”
 - Under Key Highlight C, Rosslyn Metro Station Entrance Improvements, Delete “Entrance Improvements” and add an “s” at the end of “Station” in the heading. Add at the end, “The Plan design will accommodate the location and design of the second Rosslyn Metro station included in WMATA’s Momentum Plan.”

6. Amend **Land Use** (pages 74-85) as follows:

- Include in the paragraph entitled “Use Mix” a specific use mix target, including a minimum of:
 - Residential GFA as a proportion of total GFA of 30 percent.
 - 5,000 total residential units
 - A residential population of at least 7,500
 - An evening population of at least 25 percent of Rosslyn’s daytime population
- Require that achieving the change in residential population occur steadily over the timeframe for the plan.
- Page 76: delete the final paragraph before “Affordable Housing” that describes the “two-tower” tool for achieving better use mix and replace it with a tool that requires each new site plan to include a proportion of the needed units required to achieve the 2040 use mix goal. Applicants could elect to include the required residential units in their own development or through contract via a partnership with the developer of another property in the RCRD.
- Page 77, second full paragraph: In the second sentence following “creating new units,” insert “in Rosslyn but”. At the end of the paragraph, replace “County” with “Rosslyn.”
- Page 77, delete the fifth paragraph, including the bulleted section.
- Page 79, Map 3.2, Ground Level Uses,
 - Combine Green and Blue Streets into a single color, indicate this is an “optional retail” area.
 - Change Wilson Boulevard from N. Lynn Street to N. Pierce Street to “Red.”
 - Revise the legend to make the map more easily understood without needing to reference text.
 - Pages 82-83, Air Rights Development, revise this section to:
 - Call for a follow-on study of no longer than six months to establish maximum heights, densities, and design guidelines for the air rights area: The study will consider:
 - Providing for incorporation of the air rights area contiguous to the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District into that district
 - Changing the GLUP from “Public” to “High Office-Apartment-Hotel”

- Changing the zoning designation from “S3-A” to “C-0-Rosslyn”

7. Amend **Transportation** (pages 86-117) as follows:

- Streets (pages 86-101)
 - Add a block-by-block illustration of the design/build-out of the 18th Street corridor similar to the section-by-section illustration of the Esplanade design (pages 134-5)
 - On page 88, under “A,”
 - Second bullet: delete the first sentence and insert in its place: “Designate the blocks of 18th Street between N. Lynn St. and Arlington Ridge Road as Pedestrian-Bicycle Priority Streets consistent with the definition in the Master Transportation Plan while recognizing vehicle access is appropriate on these blocks to increase vehicle circulation options.”
 - Add a third bullet that establishes 18th Street from N. Oak St. west to the Western Rosslyn Coordinated Development District as an Urban Center Local Street as defined in the Master Transportation Plan, Streets Element
 - On page 89, Map 3.5 and on page 91, Map 3.6, add an alley connecting N. Moore St. to Ft. Myer Dr. in the “Rosslyn Gateway Block.
 - On Page 92, include a new street classification, “Pedestrian Street,” and indicate a needed amendment to the Master Transportation to incorporate this classification.
 - On Page 93, Map 3.7, change the designation of 18th St. between N. Lynn St. and Arlington Ridge Road to a Pedestrian and Bicycle Priority Street.
- Amend Transit (pages 102-5) as follows:
 - Under Leveraging Metrorail Improvements (page 102):
 - Add a discussion of Metrorail capacity in the context of the increased demand from growing Rosslyn population.
 - Ensure there is adequate space for a well-designed Metro entrance for the planned new Metro station serving Rosslyn.
 - Under Bus Facility Improvements (page 104)
 - Add a paragraph calling for County collaboration with WMATA to explore the possibility of an off-street bus transfer station.
 - In the fifth carat (>), insert before “close proximity,” “outside but in.”
- Amend Pedestrian and Bicycle Network (pages 106-111)
 - Establish a single sidewalk width as the Rosslyn Standard, not ranges for various locations and a minimum 10 foot clear zone for pedestrians along arterials.
 - Address the seeming inconsistencies on Map 3.9, Sidewalk Widths. In particular, consider changes to changes to:
 - Wilson Blvd. between Kent and Lynn Sts. and Oak St. to the WRAPS study area boundary. The sidewalks could possibly be narrowed in these areas to create a consistent sidewalk width along Wilson Blvd. in the RCRD.
 - The legend, in place of “Dedicated Pedestrian walk,” substitute “Pedestrian Street.”
 - The Rosslyn Gateway block, adding the alley
 - Amend Bicycle Network Improvements (pages 110-111):
 - On page 110, add “H” development of a central modern bicycle parking facility.
 - On page 111, Map 3.11, Bike Facilities, change the Wilson Blvd. facility from Lynn to Oak Sts. from “bike lanes,” to “Cycle track/protected bike lanes” and 18th St. from

Arlington Ridge Road to Lynn St., change from either “sharrow” or no designation, to “Pedestrian and Bicycle Priority St.”

- Amend Off-Street Parking (page 113):
 - Indicate that below grade parking is the “default.”
 - Add a new bullet between the second and third bullets: “Gross floor area (GFA) of above grade parking will be counted as density at the rate of 100 percent of actual above grade garage FAR. To not be counted as FAR, above grade parking should be fully screened by 30 feet depth of active uses.

8. Parks and Open Space (pages 131-145)

- 18th Street Corridor (p136): in the last sentence of the first paragraph, delete “complete streets” and insert “pedestrian and bicycle priority street.”
- Rosslyn Plaza Park (page 140-144):
 - In the first sentence (page 140), delete “in the heart of existing and new development.”
 - Delete Figure 3.6 (page 142), illustrating Rosslyn Plaza Park fronting on N. Kent St.
 - Revise the first paragraph on page 144 as follows: “Rosslyn Plaza Park should be located along the frontages of 18th Street and Arlington Ridge Road. See concept plan on page 142. A future Rosslyn Plaza Park should meet the following performance criteria fully;”

9. Urban Design, Building Height and Form (pages 148-175)

- Eliminate any uncertainty about allowable heights proposed in the plan. In particular:
 - Page 147, first paragraph, first sentence, delete “preferred.”
 - Page 147, first paragraph, last sentence, delete entire sentence.
 - Page 148, first paragraph, delete onward from “The guidelines are not regulations . . .”
- B1 – Building areas and edges (page 150):
 - Delete the fourth bullet concerning optional publicly accessible spaces. Insert a new bullet that reads: “Optional plazas not called for in this plan are inconsistent with Rosslyn’s urban design and if proposed must be accompanied by a justification. If determined to be appropriate, they should follow the design and access standards indicated in the Parks and Open Space section.”
- B2 – Ground level building area design along street and public space edges (pages 152-55)
 - Give greater prominence to the information contained in the footnote to Chart 3.5 on page 155 and in the first sub bullet, strike “on average”
 - In Chart 3.5, Ground Floor Design and Use Standards for Building Edge Types, amend the chart as follows:
 - Under “Land Use Standards” for Red building edge type, delete “Retail services or retail equivalents may be considered on a case-by-case basis.”
 - Under “Land Use Standards” for Gold building edge type, change “65” to “75”
 - Combine building edge types Blue and Green. Use the “Dimensions and other elements as indicated” associated in the draft with the blue edge type. Before “exterior,” add “interior and.” Add an asterisk. Use all other Blue edge type standards.
- B3 – Service and parking access (pages 156-7)
 - Under “Guideline,” first sentence, after “service alleys,” add “and below grade.”
- B4 – Parking location and design (pages 158)
 - Under “Guideline,” first sentence, delete wherever possible.

- Add a bullet and sub bullets that indicate criteria that will apply in reviewing requests for above grade parking (e.g., actual core samples showing bedrock at a specified depth; high probability of uncontrollable water incursion, etc.)
- Revise the second bullet to read: "Semi-below grade parking shall be screened as fully above grade parking, except in locations on frontages indicated on the Map 3.xx. When semi-below grade parking is not required to be screened by active uses, it should be screened by an architectural façade consistent and/or complimentary with the design of the floors above."
- Delete bullet four.
- T1 – Building Height (pages 162-3)
 - Adjust building heights as shown on Map 3.16, to ensure that views from the observation deck in the view shed of the monumental core are unobstructed from the western shore of the Potomac River. In addition, modify the rendering of views from the observation deck on page 51 to show unobstructed views of the monumental core from the western bank of the Potomac River.
 - Adjust building heights shown on Map 3.16 wherever needed to ensure that in no direction are the only unobstructed views from the observation deck views of the sky.
 - Under "Overall Building Height," first paragraph, second sentence, delete "generally."
 - Delete the bullet on page 162 "Occupied space at or above the maximum height depicted in map 3.16 is devoted to housing or hotel only."
- T3 – Tower orientation, dimensions, spacing and use
 - Delete the section under the first carat (>) of bullet three relating requiring a tower(s) of a two tower (or greater) development on the same site be devoted to residential use.
- T4 – Architectural composition of towers and caps
 - In the paragraph that begins "Building caps should . . ." insert at the beginning, "Where indicated on Map 3.16," and add to Map 3.16 asterisks on buildings identified as appropriate for distinctive caps.
- Streetscape (pages 170-1)
 - In the second paragraph, strike "generally" in the first sentence.
 - Modify the section to call for a public review of the proposed Rosslyn BID-developed "Streetscape Elements Master Plan."
- Green streets and surfaces (page 174)
 - Adjust this paragraph in consideration of the fact that at ground level, and generally above grade, buildings will have active uses. In places where building facades are architectural elements on garage fronts, consider whether green walls should be allowed in pace of complementary architectural design.

10. Throughout the draft plan, section headings entitled "Recommendations" should be replaced by section headings entitled, "Guidelines."

11. Append the Long Range Planning Committee report to the letter to the County Board.

12. The Planning Commission recommends that the County Board add a statement that the Rosslyn Sector Plan should govern building heights and forms unless an applicant can present a compelling reason for changes.

13. On page 173 the first full paragraph add "currently" in front of "four luminous bodies sculptures" and add after "...is being restudied", "at the same time the number of luminous bodies proposed for the Meade Street bridge be re-studied as well."

14. Add Item C in 4.1 on page 182 under GLUP actions item 7 "to amend the boundary of the RCRD to include the potential air rights development sites over I-66 as shown in Map 3.4."

15. Add the following to the Rosslyn Sector Plan main body or to the Appendix of Street Designs:

- 1) Intersection designs for critical intersections including at least Wilson at Fort Myer and Wilson at Lynn, and those designs consider priority bicycle intersection (PBI) treatments;
- 2) A cycle track to the section of Clarendon Boulevard between Pierce and Oak Street;
- 3) Full cycle tracks in each direction of Wilson Boulevard between Nash Street and Lynn;
- 4) A Median to the section of Fort Myer between 19th and Lee Highway corresponding to the median in the section of Ft. Myer between 19th and Wilson Boulevard;
- 5) A cross section of 18th between Oak and Quinn.

16. Amend the Wilson Boulevard street cross-section at Lynn Street by changing the west bound 15-foot travel lane to an 11-foot travel lane and give the four-foot balance split evenly two feet and two feet to make the existing bike lanes in the proposal to eight-foot wide cycle tracks.

17. Amend the 17th Street North cross-section from North Nash Street to Fort Myer Drive to change the 12-foot travel lane to a 10-foot travel lane.

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard this item at its June 3, 2015 public hearing. Anthony Fusarelli, Department of Community Planning, Housing, and Development (CPHD) Planning, gave an overview of the Realize Rosslyn Sector Plan and the proposed Request to Advertise (RTA). Also present was Steve Cover, Director, CPHD-Planning, Claude Williamson, CPHD-Planning, Elizabeth Weigle, CPHD-Planning, Meliha Aljabar, Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), Kelly Cornell, Department of Environmental Services (DES).

Public Speakers

There were six public speakers signed up to speak for this item.

Steve Campbell expressed support for the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the tree canopy goal of 15%, use of trees to achieve stormwater goals, and siting the public park east of the office building at Rosslyn Plaza. Mr. Campbell recommended that Arlington Ridge should remain at-grade to allow the Esplanade to be contiguous to the public park, and that the park trumps street connectivity. The Rosslyn Plaza underground parking garage network should be designed so vehicles on Kent Street would be able to access on-grade Arlington Ridge Road. He is opposed to placing statues at the south end for the Corridor of Light because it would cause accidents.

Mike Novotny, Vornado Charles E. Smith, said Rosslyn Plaza has an active development site plan. This is an important project for a number of reasons and they are concerned about pages 142-143 and the location of Rosslyn Plaza Park. It should be located on Kent Street because it places the open space closest to the downtown core, the retail uses vital to activation of the open space are best suited on 10th Street in order to attract retailers, it provides a connection to Freedom Park, the views from other buildings behind Rosslyn Plaza will be better with the park on 10th Street, and views from the on-site buildings will be better. The economic feasibility of the alternative siting of the park is not desirable.

Kedrick Whitmore, Venable, representing the Weisberg Corporation, owner of RCA Building, expressed concerns about a maximum height of 260 feet rather than 300 feet. The loss of the ability to achieve 300 feet causes monetary loss. Mr. Whitmore suggested that a potentially lower community benefit contribution associated with reduced height would not make up for the loss in value of the height. The buildings with lower height maximums are absorbing monetary losses on behalf of the greater plan. There should be a credit given for the loss of potential height.

Stuart Stein said the draft Sector Plan represents a compromise on all parts. Mr. Stein suggested that the height and design transitions included in the plan are questionable and bare minimums, and additional reductions in transitions would be unacceptable. Height, density, and build-to lines should be codified, and everything else should be a guideline. He strongly opposes the Corridor of Light on the Meade Street Bridge as it is out of context for the community.

Terri Prell expressed opposition to two-waying Lynn and North Moore Streets. The way one gets to and from Key Bridge requires that a left be made on the overpass over I-66 and left on Lee Highway. On a good day, it's impossible to make that left; many hours of the day traffic would be backed up. She asked the Planning Commission to look carefully at the transition between Rosslyn and Georgetown. The discussion about one-way streets is disingenuous and is not a justification for conversion to two-way streets. Clarendon and Wilson are one-way streets and are successful. Finally, developers believe that 10 FAR and 300 feet in height are given; it should be made clear that the 300 feet height is earned and not given.

Tom Kornis said the unique and distinctive character of the loop road is an organizing, distinctive element for Rosslyn and should be retained and enhanced.

Stan Karson, President, RAFOM, has been involved in every project in Rosslyn for 15 years and they support the plan. They are concerned about the impact of greater and unlimited height. The Corridor of Light doesn't belong on the Meade Street Bridge. He pointed out that open space is also looking up. They endorse 10-foot clear sidewalks and affordable housing.

Danielle Fredrickson, resident, does not like the sculpture idea for the Meade Street Bridge or the Corridor of Light, and is concerned the project elements will overpower the Iwo Jima Memorial.

Planning Commission Committee Reports

Commissioner Harner thanked the participants on the Rosslyn Process Panel and sub-committees. The last Process panel meeting had a number of comments that were captured in the comment matrix.

Commissioner Cole reported the LRPC reviewed the plan in six hours of meetings over two nights and asked that the LRPC meeting notes be appended to the letter to the County Board. The conversation focused on the nature of 18th Street as a transformative element in the plan, the impediments to the quality of the observation deck, the location of the Rosslyn Plaza park, overall heights plan, tools for achieving the use mix goal, a focus on the public realm, ground-level retail uses and distribution of retail within the coordinated development district, air rights development, the new WMATA metro station, off-street parking, and architecture and building tops.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Iacomini asked if there is any plan to schedule recreation activities at the plaza. Ms. Aljabar responded there is interest in establishing permanent facilities on the Plaza and there is a possibility for scheduled activities.

Commissioner Cole asked how staff's position had changed on the issue of bonus density for sites with allowable heights of less than 300 feet. Mr. Fusarelli referred to page 162 and said the intent was to reflect that in the area where there is a discussion of building height flexibility for the single tower sites planned for below 300 feet, the draft plan currently identifies a number of criteria for evaluation of site plans trying to achieve somewhere between the height limit and 300 feet. The update refers to the list "The appropriateness" and the intent was to identify goals of the plan related to building height and form. There is further consideration about whether these can be expressed in a more objective way because there is concern with trying to limit the amount of subjectivity with future site plan proposals for those seeking to make use of this modification. Staff is not ready to eliminate all of the items but wants to look at further refining them and focusing on elements that are more objective. Staff is considering getting rid of the bullet discussing maximum height or any height or occupied space above the height limit and eliminating the constraint of only residential or hotel. It might be better to bring back the idea of trying to balance additional building volume that is above the height limit that would be less than or equal to the volume that has to be sculpted below the height limit, which is a better way forward than trying to limit actual use of uppermost floors. Staff is still discussing addressing above grade parking.

Commissioner Harner asked about the thinking on above grade parking. Mr. Fusarelli responded the Plan discourages it but does not prohibit it. There is further consideration about whether above grade parking should be included in the list of criteria and if buildings that are seeking to get additional height should not include above grade parking as part of the project.

Planning Commission Motion

Commissioner Cole made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend that the County Board authorize public hearings to advertise the adoption of the Rosslyn Sector Plan as proposed in the County Manager's memorandum dated May 26, 2015. The Planning Commission further

recommends the following changes to the “Request to Advertise” draft of the Rosslyn Sector Plan attached to the May 26, 2015 County Manager’s memorandum:

Commissioner Harner seconded the motion.

Commission Schroll sought unanimous consent to change the reference in part three to “P2” from “P3”. There was no objection.

1. Amend the Vision Statement (page 48) as follows:

- Delete “world class” in the first sentence.
- Delete “the jewel of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor” at the end.

Commissioner Cole said world class does not add value and even detracts from it. Deleting the “jewel” phrase is an effort to avoid unnecessarily insulting other Metro station areas in the R-B corridor.

2. Amend Goals and Policies: Transportation (pages 62-3) as follows:

- In T3, delete “contingent upon adequate feasibility studies, monitoring, and mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.”
- Add a new T13:”Work with the Rosslyn BID and Rosslyn property owners to develop a modern, central bike parking facility in Rosslyn using either existing unused automobile parking capacity or allowing a future redevelopment project to incorporate such a facility in its design in lieu of equivalent automobile parking space.”

Commissioner Cole said the idea of making Fort Meyer Drive and Lynn Street two-way streets was studied in great detail in the multi-modal study and an additional feasibility study is unnecessary. The second bullet introduces the concept of a central bike parking facility.

Commissioner Iacomini does not agree with taking out the contingent statement in T3 because the neighborhood still has misgivings about the proposed changes.

Commissioner Iacomini made a motion to strike the first bullet from the Transportation Goals and Policies section of the motion. Commissioner Ciotti seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cole clarified his motion does not remove the Fort Meyer Drive tunnel.

Commissioner Gutshall supports Commissioner Cole's motion and wanted to be clear on the intent of removing the Fort Myer tunnel. Commissioner Forinash added that all the transportation studies are done with adequate feasibility, monitoring, and mitigation of impact. Commissioner Iacomini clarified that reinforcing the changes are worthwhile particularly with something this transformative and it needs more time. Commissioner Harner said this item received a lot of discussion in the Process Panel and RAFOM has had continuing concerns about traffic, but there is also a desire that making a commitment to implementing projects that are “low-hanging fruit,” such as the implementation of two-way streets, would have a dramatic impact on the retail environment and safety of the streets. He added that the Planning Commission should think about when to make a commitment that a good idea needs to be implemented and move forward with something.

The Amendment failed 2-9 with Commissioners Ciotti and Iacomini in favor and Commissioners Brown, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell against.

3. Amend **Goals and Policies: Public Parks and Open Spaces** (page 64) as follows:

- In P2, delete “N. Oak St.” and insert in its place “N. Quinn St.”

Commissioner Cole said the point is to emphasize that even though Quinn Street is outside the area covered by this plan, the 18th Street corridor actually ends there and the nature of the 18th Street corridor should be consistent for its length.

4. Amend **Goals and Policies: Building Height and Form** (pages 65-6) as follows:

- In B1.e, delete “public” before “open spaces” and insert “in the public realm” following “open spaces.”

Commissioner Cole noted the language in the plan is too broad as it includes private spaces with a public easement. The focus should be the public realm as there is a desire to not encourage every site plan to include a plaza. Commissioner Cole noted that property owners have an incentive to include plazas on their properties as one way to achieve greater height is to build only on a portion of the site; a policy to address the proliferation of plazas not in the plan is needed.

5. Amend the **Illustrative Concept Plan** (pages 67-9) as follows:

- Under “Key Highlights,” add as additional transformative features:
 - Unobstructed views of the monumental core from the Central Place Observation Deck
 - The Rosslyn Boathouse
 - Wider, More Accommodating, Well-Designed Sidewalks and Streetscapes replacing the Skywalk system
 - Air Rights Development
 - Peaks and Valleys Heights Plan
 - An “Attracting” Skyline
 - A Modern, Central Bicycle Parking Facility
- Under Key Highlight B, 18th Street Extension by deleting “Oak” and inserting “Quinn.”
- Under Key Highlight C, Rosslyn Metro Station Entrance Improvements, Delete “Entrance Improvements” and add an “s” at the end of “Station” in the heading. Add at the end, “The Plan design will accommodate the location and design of the second Rosslyn Metro station included in WMATA’s Momentum Plan.”

Commissioner Cole clarified the list of key highlights is intended to express the view that there are many other transformative elements that could be added to this list. The second bullet reflects that idea that 18th Street extends to Quinn Street.

6. Amend **Land Use** (pages 74-85) as follows:

- Include in the paragraph entitled “Use Mix” a specific use mix target, including a minimum of:
 - Residential GFA as a proportion of total GFA of 30 percent.
 - 5,000 total residential units
 - A residential population of at least 7,500

- An evening population of at least 25 percent of Rosslyn’s daytime population
- Require that achieving the change in residential population occur gradually and steadily over the timeframe for the plan.
- Page 76: delete the final paragraph before “Affordable Housing” that describes the “two-tower” tool for achieving better use mix and replace it with a tool that requires each new site plan to include a proportion of the needed residential units required to achieve the 2040 use mix goal. Applicants could elect to include the required residential units in their own development or via a partnership with the owner of another property in the RCRD.
- Page 77, second full paragraph: In the second sentence following “creating new units,” insert “in Rosslyn but.” At the end of the paragraph, replace “County” with “Rosslyn.”
- Page 77, delete the fifth paragraph, including the bulleted section.
- Page 79, Map 3.2, Ground Level Uses:
 - Combine Green and Blue Streets into a single color; indicate this is an “optional retail” area.
 - Change Wilson Boulevard from N. Lynn Street to N. Pierce Street to “Red.”
 - Revise the legend to make the map more easily understood without needing to reference text.
- Pages 82-83, Air Rights Development, revise this section to:
 - Provide for incorporation of the air rights area contiguous to the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District into that district
 - Change the GLUP from “Public” to “High Office-Apartment-Hotel”
 - Change the zoning designation from “S3-A” to “C-0-Rosslyn”
 - Call for a follow-on study of no longer than six months to establish maximum heights, densities, and design guidelines for the air rights area

Commissioner Cole said one of the shortcomings of Rosslyn is the significant imbalance in the use mix. There has not been a critical mass of residents willing to spend time in the core of Rosslyn to support businesses or services. This amendment sets concrete targets for use mix and they shall be achieved steadily and gradually. The two-tower tool says if a site has two towers, one must be residential. It creates the perverse incentive for property owners to find creative ways to not build two towers if the market is not rewarding residential development. This amendment proposes a new tool that requires each new development to contribute an amount of residential use on its own site or in partnership with an owner on another site in proportion to its share of expected new development (GFA) as illustrated in the concept plan.

Commissioner Cole said the fifth bullet, to remove the 30 percent goal for community benefits devoted to affordable housing at this point short circuits the site plan process, which by its design balances needs. The Rosslyn Sector Plan will require significant public investment in public infrastructure, which need to be supported by community benefits, and if needed, the Capital Improvement Plan. To the extent the County wants as many infrastructure and public space changes as early as possible, establishing a strict affordable housing goal seems unhelpful. Commissioner Cole concluded that even as an advocate for affordable housing he sees this goal as not helpful.

The last bullet is an effort to establish the land use policies that would invite people to seriously consider investing in the air rights area in Rosslyn.

Commissioner Siegel asked for clarification on bullet two. Commissioner Cole said it is just keeping track of how many residential units and GFA are achieved over time in Rosslyn, as is now required in Crystal City. The point is that some sort of steady, regular improvement in the land use mix would make sense.

Commissioner Iacomini asked staff about the notion of including specific targets in the use mix. Mr. Fusarelli said the targets in the first bullet are generally in alignment with the Plan. One potential clarification needed is that 5,000 total residential units is ultimate build out of the plan and with the time horizon of 25-30 years, the number of units is probably closer to 2,500-3,000 units in that timeframe. The overall target of 30 percent of GFA devoted to residential/hotel uses and an evening population that is 25 percent of the daytime population, is generally consistent with the plan. Commissioner Cole said the bonus density devoted to residential or hotel use would not be beneficial. He has proposed that additional height not be granted for that reason because if we allow property owners to fill in the valleys of the peaks and valleys concept, we fail to achieve goals of the plan at the outset and do ourselves an injustice.

Commissioner Gutshall said the makeup rate to get to the ultimate build out is 33 percent. Mr. Fusarelli said the pie charts are based on proposed scenarios from the last meeting by the Building Heights and Forms Subcommittee. There were certain assumptions about certain buildings being assigned certain uses and this plan does not prescribe that exact outcome be realized and there is some margin, but the point is correct that if 33 percent of the new development that is realized in the RCRD over the ultimate build out is housing, that would get us to 30 percent at the end of the day. Commissioner Gutshall referred to the new tool but asked if there is a way to be more specific.

Commissioner Cole responded, with respect to the mechanism proposed to require property owners to contribute to achieving the use mix goal, the notion is if you assume that there's an aggregate projected GFA added to Rosslyn over the 25 year period and you calculate the density expected on each of the building sites and use the numerator as the density of the development and the denominator is the added density to all of Rosslyn, there's a small fraction of the added residential units that each property would have to be responsible for ensuring are realized and it is different from how the Crystal City plan achieves its use mix. While Crystal City has large blocks often with multiple owners and the related block plans, Rosslyn buildings are often the only building on a block. Commissioner Gutshall was thinking the RCRD was akin to a Crystal City block. Commissioner Cole responded that in Crystal City only for site plans on the east side of Route 1 is a new block plan is developed.

Commissioner Iacomini asked about air rights development bullet and if the intent was to change the GLUP from public to high office apartment hotel. Commissioner Cole said his intent was to extend the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District to include the air rights area so that the zoning would be the same. Changing the GLUP makes sense to be consistent with the zoning. The notion is that we can provide an opportunity that may never be taken advantage of at very little cost to ourselves or we can decide to do nothing until someone comes in with an idea. If we want all the benefits that can come from this, there is a little harm in trying to define the nature of the land use now and inviting people to take advantage of whatever economic opportunities we create.

Commissioner Iacomini said the air rights are interesting and there should be a follow up study but there hasn't been enough discussion to just do it.

Commissioner Iacomini sought unanimous consent to remove the four bullets under pages 82-83. Commissioner Gutshall objected.

Commissioner Iacomini made a motion to remove the four specific items under pages 82-83 and leave the call for a study. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gutshall does not support the motion because he was excited about the possibility of the air rights development and wants to invite opportunities for development.

Commissioner Siegel suggested offering a substitute motion that instead of deleting the first three bullets under air rights development, they be put as subtext and to include a study. Commissioner Forinash said he would support encouraging the study that considered those items.

Commissioner Siegel offered a substitute motion that would simplify this section to require a follow-on study in a short duration that would consider the first three bullets. Commissioner Iacomini seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted 10-1 to support the substitute motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support and Commissioner Gutshall opposed.

The Planning Commission voted 10-0-1 to support the main motion as amended with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support and Commissioner Gutshall abstaining.

7. Amend **Transportation** (pages 86-117) as follows:

- Streets (pages 86-101)
 - Add a block-by-block illustration of the design/build-out of the 18th Street corridor similar to the section-by-section illustration of the Esplanade design (pages 134-5)
 - On page 88, under “A,”
 - Second bullet: delete the first sentence and insert in its place: “Designate the blocks of 18th Street between N. Lynn St. and Arlington Ridge Road as Pedestrian-Bicycle Priority Streets consistent with the definition in the Master Transportation Plan while recognizing vehicle access is appropriate on these blocks to increase vehicle circulation options.”
 - Add a third bullet that establishes 18th Street from N. Oak St. west to the Western Rosslyn Coordinated Development District as an Urban Center Local Street as defined in the Master Transportation Plan, Streets Element
 - On page 89, Map 3.5 and on page 91, Map 3.6, add an alley connecting N. Moore St. to Ft. Myer Dr. in the “Rosslyn Gateway Block.
 - On Page 92, include a new street classification, “Pedestrian Street,” and indicate a needed amendment to the Master Transportation to incorporate this classification.
 - On Page 93, Map 3.7, change the designation of 18th St. between N. Lynn St. and Arlington Ridge Road to a Pedestrian and Bicycle Priority Street.
- Amend Transit (pages 102-5) as follows:

- Under Leveraging Metrorail Improvements (page 102):
 - o Add a discussion of Metrorail capacity in the context of the increased demand from growing Rosslyn population.
 - o Ensure there is adequate space for a well-designed Metro entrance for the planned new Metro station serving Rosslyn.
- Under Bus Facility Improvements (page 104)
 - o Add a paragraph calling for County collaboration with WMATA to explore the possibility of an off-street bus transfer station.
 - o In the fifth carat (>), insert before “close proximity,” “outside but in.”
- Amend Pedestrian and Bicycle Network (pages 106-111)
 - Establish a single sidewalk width as the Rosslyn Standard, not ranges for various locations.
 - Address the seeming inconsistencies on Map 3.9, Sidewalk Widths. In particular, consider changes to changes to:
 - o Wilson Blvd. between Kent and Lynn Sts. and Oak St. to the WRAPS study area boundary. The sidewalks could possibly be narrowed in these areas to create a consistent sidewalk width along Wilson Blvd. in the RCRD.
 - o The legend, in place of “Dedicated Pedestrian walk,” substitute “Pedestrian Street.”
 - o The Rosslyn Gateway block, adding the alley
 - Amend Bicycle Network Improvements (pages 110-111):
 - o On page 110, add “H” development of a central modern bicycle parking facility.
 - o On page 111, Map 3.11, Bike Facilities, change the Wilson Blvd. facility from Lynn to Oak Sts. from “bike lanes,” to “Cycle track/protected bike lanes” and 18th St. from Arlington Ridge Road to Lynn St., change from either “sharrow” or no designation, to “Pedestrian and Bicycle Priority St.”
- Amend Off-Street Parking (page 113):
 - Indicate that below grade parking is the “default.”
 - Add a new bullet between the second and third bullets: “Gross floor area (GFA) of above grade parking will be counted as density at the rate of 50 percent of actual above grade garage FAR. To not be counted as FAR, above grade parking should be fully screened by 30 feet of active uses.

Commissioner Cole stated that the first bullet says provide a better set of images to really show what 18th Street can look like. There are some wonderful images on pages 134-135 of the Esplanade and a similar quality images of 18th Street that would really go a long way toward emphasizing what the vision is that we have for Rosslyn and it is worth doing that.

The second bullet deals with the designation of street type for 18th Street between North Lynn and Arlington Ridge Road. It introduces the concept of the bicycle priority street. Commissioner Cole wanted to make it clear that he understands the importance of this as a vehicle connection as well. At the times of day that vehicles will need to use this it will be open to them but for much of the day and the evening it will be no doubt be dominated by people walking and riding their bicycles and this seems to be an opportunity to create a signature kind of corridor here by acknowledging that people are awfully important on 18th Street. That is what the first sub- sub-bullet does.

The second one establishes the street type for 18th Street west of Oak Street which he does not believe is included in the plan. The next bullet adds a connecting alley to the map through the Rosslyn Gateway development that has already been approved but is not on the street and block pattern map although it has already been approved.

The next bullet recommends the creation of a new street type called the "Pedestrian Street" and that street type be affixed to the parts of 18th Street where vehicles cannot and will not go. The final sub-bullet there does what the second bullet does but in a different place.

Commissioner Cole explained under "Transit" the first bullet reflects the comment that was made in the Long Range Planning Committee about the extent to which the current Metro station has the capacity to accommodate all of the potential new riders from the development that is expected and this calls for that study.

The second sub-bullet calls for ensuring that the space available presumably in the Ames Center block is sufficient for a well-designed Metro entrance for the new Metro station and perhaps elsewhere where a second entrance to that station might be.

Under bus facility improvements, it calls for adding a paragraph to work in collaboration with WMATA to explore the possibility of an off-street bus transfer station. It's hard to imagine a thing that would more usefully change the nature of the environment there than getting the flotilla of buses off the street. And finally, it proposes to be clear that the bus layover and staging area for buses should be outside the RCRD.

Under Pedestrian and Bicycle, the first one recommends establishing a single sidewalk width as that Rosslyn standard, not ranges at various locations recognizing that applicants are always free to seek exceptions. The second is designed to address as it says inconsistencies in the map in sidewalk widths in particular consider changes to a set of locations as discussed in Long Range Planning where some of the sidewalk widths did not seem to be consistent with the segments that they connected to. The last two sub-bullets are to continue points that were set up above where changes needed to be made for consistency purposes.

In terms of Bicycle Network improvements, the first one is to add a new H on page 110 to recommend the creation of a central modern bike parking facility. The next one is changes to the bicycle facilities, in particular the map that has a cycle track to the east of Lynn Street and west of Nash Street on Wilson Boulevard but for the three block area in between there is no cycle track. This recommends extending the cycle track through that area. Wilson Boulevard is uncommonly wide here and should not be challenged to accommodate the cycle track. It also recommends for the 18th Street in the Rosslyn Plaza block and the block to its west that is what is called a "sharrow" on this map is only shown in the Rosslyn Plaza block. There should be something for this block to the west as well. The notion is that instead of it being sharrows, it would actually be a pedestrian and bicycle priority street which is a different kind of facility.

In terms of Off-Street Parking, it notes that the recommendation is that below grade parking is the default and recommends a new policy that any above grade parking shall be counted as density on the rate of one-half square foot to one foot of above grade parking to create a financial incentive to

put parking below grade. The notion is that today not only does the incentive to put parking above grade significant, it is significant for two or three reasons. Reason number one is that it reduces cost. It is simply cheaper to build parking above grade than below grade. Reason number two is that by putting parking above grade, the heights at the top of the building are raised where the floors are relatively more valuable. This says that in the event where it is not possible to put parking below grade, if you seek to put it above grade, there is a cost to you as a developer for doing that. But it gives an exception there which says that you would not have to be counted as density if you fully lined the above grade parking with active uses at a depth of 30 feet.

Commissioner Forinash asked for clarification on whether that depth was intended to be 30 feet. Commissioner Cole said he would like to make that unanimous consent request.

Commissioner Ciotti made a motion to insert a new bullet under pedestrian bike network that says there should be a minimum 10-foot clear zone for pedestrians along arterials. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted 11-0 to support the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

Commissioner Schroll made a unanimous consent request under bike improvements on page 4 to include “protected bike intersections at the intersection of Lynn Street and Wilson Boulevard.” Commissioner Cole objected.

Commissioner Schroll made a motion that the second bullet be amended to include a “protected bike intersection at Lynn Street and Wilson Boulevard.” Commissioner Ciotti seconded the motion.

Commissioner Schroll said the predominant movement of bikes is a left turn and it makes sense to protect that movement. Commissioner Hughes said the plan for a two-way street would require a different movement. Commissioner Schroll said the intention is to give bikes a lead over other traffic. Commissioner Forinash suggesting tabling the discussion pending an upcoming motion. Commissioner Schroll agreed to table his motion and Commissioner Ciotti agreed.

Commissioner Forinash moved to strike the 50 percent clause in the off-street parking section and replace it with 100 percent. Commissioner Harner seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to support the amendment with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

Commissioner Iacomini asked if the Corridor of Light originally intended four sculptures on the Meade Street Bridge. Mr. Fusarelli responded the scope originally entailed the Meade Street Bridge, the Lynn Street Bridge, and the segment of Lynn Street between those. Commissioner Iacomini asked Ms. Prell if the original proposal involved four lights on the Meade Street Bridge. Ms. Prell responded it did not.

8. Parks and Open Space (pages 131-145)

- 18th Street Corridor (p136): in the last sentence of the first paragraph, delete “complete streets” and insert “pedestrian and bicycle priority street.”
- Rosslyn Plaza Park (page 140-144):
 - In the first sentence (page 140), delete “in the heart of existing and new development.”
 - Delete Figure 3.6 (page 143), illustrating Rosslyn Plaza Park fronting on N. Kent St.
 - Revise the first paragraph on page 144 as follows: “Rosslyn Plaza Park should be located along the frontages of 18th Street and Arlington Ridge Road. See concept plan on page 143. A future Rosslyn Plaza Park should meet the following performance criteria fully;”

Commissioner Cole explained his amendment on Open Space and highlighted the proposal is designed to recommend a single option for the Rosslyn Plaza Park with the location on east side of the project towards the Potomac River.

Commissioner Harner said it is important is that the Planning Commission express a view that is a preference. It boils down to the notion of the public space and commitment to the waterfront and the edge and whether it is more publicly oriented or privately oriented. Putting the open space on the public edge was the direction from the LRPC discussion.

Commissioner Hughes said that what is missing is that there is a large green space that is not pictured in the images in the plan and does not consider the possibility of air rights development. It is appropriate to leave this at the site plan level. Commissioner Harner responded that the issue of looking at the overarching direction belongs in the Sector Plan. The air rights development is an important component and the safer bet at the moment is the waterfront. Commissioner Gutshall said he is comfortable with Commissioner Cole's amendment but from a planning point of view, the gesture toward the river makes sense. It is important to be mindful that if it is not economically feasible, that it will not happen.

Commissioner Schroll sought unanimous consent to change a reference to 142 from 143. There was no objection.

9. Urban Design, Building Height and Form (pages 148-175)

- Eliminate any uncertainty about allowable heights proposed in the plan. In particular:
 - Page 147, first paragraph, first sentence, delete “preferred.”
 - Page 147, first paragraph, last sentence, delete entire sentence.
 - Page 148, first paragraph, delete onward from “The guidelines are not regulations . . .”
- B1 – Building areas and edges (page 150):
 - Delete the fourth bullet concerning optional publicly accessible spaces. Insert a new bullet that reads: “Optional plazas not called for in this plan are inconsistent with Rosslyn’s urban design and if proposed must be accompanied by a justification. If determined to be appropriate, they should follow the design and access standards indicated in the Parks and Open Space section.”
- B2 – Ground level building area design along street and public space edges (pages 152-55)
 - Give greater prominence to the information contained in the footnote to Chart 3.5 on page 155 and in the first sub bullet, strike “on average”

- In Chart 3.5, Ground Floor Design and Use Standards for Building Edge Types, amend the chart as follows:
 - Under “Land Use Standards” for Red building edge type, delete “Retail services or retail equivalents may be considered on a case-by-case basis.”
 - Under “Land Use Standards” for Gold building edge type, change “65” to “75”
 - Combine building edge types Blue and Green. Use the “Dimensions and other elements as indicated” associated in the draft with the blue edge type. Before “exterior,” add “interior and.” Add an asterisk. Use all other Blue edge type standards.
- B3 – Service and parking access (pages 156-7)
 - Under “Guideline,” first sentence, after “service alleys,” add “and below grade.”
- B4 – Parking location and design (pages 158)
 - Under “Guideline,” first sentence, delete wherever possible.
 - Add a bullet and sub bullets that indicate criteria that will apply in reviewing requests for above grade parking (e.g., actual core samples showing bedrock at a specified depth; high probability of uncontrollable water incursion, etc.)
 - Revise the second bullet to read: “Semi-below grade parking shall be screened as fully above grade parking, except in locations on frontages indicated on the Map 3.xx. When semi-below grade parking is not required to be screened by active uses, it should be screened by an architectural façade consistent with the design of the floors above.”
 - Delete bullet four.
- T1 – Building Height (pages 162-3)
 - Adjust building heights as shown on Map 3.16, to ensure that views from the observation deck in the view shed of the monumental core are unobstructed from the western shore of the Potomac River. In addition, modify the rendering of views from the observation deck on page 51 to show unobstructed views of the monumental core from the western bank of the Potomac River.
 - Adjust building heights shown on Map 3.16 wherever needed to ensure that in no direction are the only unobstructed views from the observation deck views of the sky.
 - Under “Overall Building Height,” first paragraph, second sentence, delete “generally.”
 - Delete the section with the heading “Building Height Flexibility.”
- T3 – Tower orientation, dimensions, spacing and use
 - Delete the section under the first carat (>) of bullet three relating requiring a tower(s) of a two tower (or greater) development on the same site be devoted to residential use.
- T4 – Architectural composition of towers and caps
 - In the paragraph that begins “Building caps should . . .” insert at the beginning, “Where indicated on Map 3.16,” and add to Map 3.16 asterisks on buildings identified as appropriate for distinctive caps.
- Streetscape (pages 170-1)
 - In the second paragraph, strike “generally” in the first sentence.
 - Modify the section should be modified to call for a public review of the proposed Rosslyn BID-developed “Streetscape Elements Master Plan.”
- Green streets and surfaces (page 174)
 - Adjust this paragraph in consideration of the fact that at ground level, and generally above grade, buildings will have active uses. In places where building facades are architectural

elements on garage fronts, consider whether green walls should be allowed in pace of complementary architectural design.

Commissioner Iacomini asked for clarification on T1 and the heights that are unknown.

Commissioner Cole said there was no way to know currently how to meet that need. Additionally, in the comment matrix staff did not accept this proposal because they think the economic feasibility of redevelopment on International Place in Rosslyn Plaza is sufficiently reduced that they weren't willing to accept it. Mr. Fusarelli responded that today the western bank of the Potomac is not visible. Commissioner Cole said the question is what is the appropriate height and the extent to which the buildings that are between the observation deck and the river detract sufficiently to reduce the quality of the experience to the point where the observation deck in no way achieves what anyone hoped it would achieve. He asked if the Planning Commission wants to risk allowing the buildings too high or lowering them somewhat to increase the chance the observation deck will be successful.

Commissioner Gutshall referred to the last bullet under T1 and said it was going too far and to not have some kind of criteria to ensure that the integrity of the heights plan is protected with the protected views from the observation deck but there needs to be some provision for flexibility. Commissioner Harner said the key is that the Planning Commission reinforce the primacy of the observation deck.

Commissioner Ciotti is satisfied with staff's language on page 167. Commissioner Cole said he is not the enemy of flexibility. Every time there is an opportunity to raise the height, it is always raised to the highest point possible. There is no flexibility to achieve anything less than the highest height. He is not proposing heights less than 300 should be allowed to go up to 300.

Commissioner Harner said one of the past problems with site plans is not having criteria and the criteria on page 162 will be useful. All view impacts from adjacent and nearby buildings would need to be addressed, not just the tops. He sympathizes with Commissioner Cole's view of the height plan and opening the door to flexibility is dangerous. The line needs to be drawn somewhere.

Commissioner Gutshall made a motion that the Planning Commission strike the last sub-bullet under T1 on page 6 "Delete the section with the heading "Building Height Flexibility." Commissioner Iacomini seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted to support the motion 6-5 with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Gutshall, Harner, Iacomini and Siegel in support, and Commissioners Forinash, Cole, Sockwell, Hughes, and Schroll against.

Commissioner Gutshall moved to add a sub-bullet under T1 to read "Delete the bullet on 162 occupied space at or above the maximum height depicted in map 3.16 is devoted to housing hotel only." Commissioner Hughes seconded the motion.

To explain his proposed motion, Commissioner Gutshall said that height should not be used as a tool to achieve the use mix.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to amend the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

Commissioner Hughes sought unanimous consent to add to the third sub-bullet under B4 "and/or complimentary" after consistent. There was no objection.

Commissioner Forinash made a motion to strike the first two sub-bullets under T1. Commissioner Ciotti seconded the motion. Commissioner Forinash said he does not believe it is feasible. Commissioner Harner said he would be concerned about striking this without language discussing the significance of the observation deck.

Mr. Fusarelli responded that staff will be adding detail to the document to highlight this point. Commissioner Cole said he would not support the motion but the second bullet refers only to the view to the west, which will be blocked. Commissioner Forinash modified his motion to just the first sub-bullet and Commissioner Ciotti agreed.

The Planning Commission did not support the proposed motion 5-6 with Commissioner Siegel, Ciotti, Iacomini, Forinash, and Brown in support and Commissioners Cole, Harner, Sockwell, Gutshall, Hughes, and Schroll against.

10. Throughout the draft plan, section headings entitled “Recommendations” should be replace by section headings entitled, “Guidelines.”

Commissioner Cole explained the Plan establishes guidelines for development of proposals and the review of them and there would be confusions with the term “recommendations,” which suggests they could be accepted or rejected.

11. Append the Long Range Planning Committee report to the letter to the County Board

Planning Commission Motions

12. Commissioner Sockwell made a motion that Planning Commission recommend to the County Board that the Board add a statement that the Rosslyn Sector Plan should govern building heights and forms unless an applicant can present a compelling reason for changes. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion. Commissioner Sockwell wants to make it clear that the Sector Plan governs because it represents a community vision.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to amend the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

Commissioner Cole made a motion that the County cooperate and collaborate with the District of Columbia in its consideration of the gondola linking Georgetown and Rosslyn. Commissioner Sockwell seconded the motion. Mr. Fusarelli pointed out to the Planning Commission that this has already been included in the Rosslyn Sector Plan. Commissioner Cole withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Harner wanted to explore what is appropriate for the Sector Plan versus what is the purview of the Public Art Committee. The Sector Plan should provide a framework for public art and the reinforcement of Lynn Street as a continuous public art component is appropriate to include in the sector plan, but that the sector plan should not define exact details of the art. Commissioner Iacomini said that given the fact the idea is being re-opened, it would be appropriate to re-study the number of luminous bodies for the Meade Street Bridge. Commissioner Harner said the idea of a unified public art component is significant and would like to see the Sector Plan state it is an important part without dictating exactly what that may be, and that the Public Art Committee is the appropriate venue to review proposed changes to the Corridor of Light Plan.

13. Commissioner Iacomini sought unanimous consent that on page 173 the first full paragraph add "currently" in front of "four luminous bodies sculptures" and further on that page add a sentence at the end of the "...is being restudied" that we add, "at the same time the number of luminous bodies proposed for the Meade Street bridge be re-studied as well." There was no objection and it was added to the main motion.

14. Commissioner Gutshall made a motion that in Section 4.1 on page 182 under GLUP actions Item 7 add Item C to amend the boundary of the RCRD to include the potential air rights development sites over I-66 as shown in Map 3.4. Commissioner Iacomini seconded the motion. Commissioner Gutshall is not speaking to adding a GLUP designation but only extending the RCRD because in the 1977 plan there was a section on air rights and it is necessary to pave the way to make these things happen.

The Planning Commission supported the amendment 10-1 with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support and Commissioner Iacomini opposed.

15. Commissioner Forinash made a motion that the following additions be made to the Appendix of Street Designs. 1) Include intersections designs for critical intersections including at least Wilson at Fort Myer and Wilson at Lynn Street and those intersection designs should consider priority bicycle intersection treatments; 2) The section of Clarendon Boulevard between Pierce and Oak Street include a cycle track; 3) Wilson Boulevard between Nash Street and Lynn have full cycle tracks in each direction; 4) Fort Myer between 19th and Lee Highway have a median corresponding to the median in the section of Fort. Myer between 19th and Wilson Boulevard; and 5) The package include a cross section of the section of 18th between Oak and Quinn. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to amend the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

16. Commissioner Schroll sought unanimous consent to amend the Wilson Boulevard street cross-section at Lynn Street by changing the westbound 15-foot travel lane to an 11-foot travel lane. Commissioner Gutshall objected. Commissioner Schroll made a motion to amend the Wilson Boulevard street cross-section at Lynn Street by changing the westbound 15-foot travel lane to an 11-foot travel lane. Commissioner Gutshall seconded the motion.

Commissioner Schroll said the balance is to make the bike lanes into eight-foot cycle tracks. Commissioner Schroll amended the motion to give the four-foot balance split evenly two feet and two feet to make the existing bike lanes in the proposal to eight-foot cycle tracks.

Commissioner Ciotti asked staff about the reason for the lane width of 15 feet and if this motion is a problem. Ms. Cornell responded the 15 feet is leftover space that widens and turns into a left turn lane onto Fort Myer Drive and she would have to look at the full two blocks to see where that transition could happen more abruptly. In terms of using additional space for a cycle track, the County generally prefers a nine-foot minimum, which would provide a six-foot bike space plus a three-foot shy zone. In order to split that space between both sides of the street, there would be changes needed to the median unless the additional space were taken from the building area on the south side. Commissioner Ciotti asked if they could be ten-foot lanes. Ms. Cornell responded the County prefers 11-foot lanes next to the median to provide space between tires and the curb of median but 11-foot lane next to the bike lane could be reduced to 10.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to amend the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

17. Commissioner Schroll moved that 17th Street North cross-section from North Nash Street to Fort Myer Drive be amended to change the 12.5-foot travel lane to an 11-foot travel lane. Commissioner Forinash seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to amend the motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 11-0 to support the main motion with Commissioners Brown, Ciotti, Cole, Forinash, Gutshall, Harner, Hughes, Iacomini, Schroll, Siegel, and Sockwell in support.

Respectfully Submitted,
Arlington County Planning Commission

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher Forinash". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Christopher Forinash
Planning Commission Chair

**Arlington County Planning Commission
Long Range Planning Committee
Meeting Report
May 20-21, 2015
Review of the Draft Rosslyn Sector Plan**

Peaks and Valley Approach

- Broad support for the peaks and valleys approach replacing the “tent pole” approach that has been in place.
- Peaks and Valleys aids in improving virtually all views throughout Rosslyn. The draft should be specific that height limits are established to achieve this goal.
- Consensus that heights of buildings in the monumental core view corridor should not impede views from the Central Place observation deck from the western shore of the Potomac River going east.
- Heights of buildings in other important view sheds should be assessed carefully to ensure they do not intrude on quality views from the observation deck.
- Views to the west from the observation deck need to be preserved as well. The 3D animation showed this view significantly blocked by draft allowable height on the Metro Center building site.
- Peaks and Valleys approach is significant for all buildings in Rosslyn (not just the observation deck), helping to maximize views from as many buildings as possible while still allowing significant density on each site.

Height Flexibility

- Beyond the site-specific height limits included in the plan, in general, height flexibility does not seem to be a workable concept.
- Since there is a long history of granting maximum allowable height, proposing the possibility of height exceeding that shown in the heights map seems a misnomer as any request for flexibility (i.e., height above the plan limit) is likely to be granted.
- When sites eligible for flexibility are located in the “valleys,” a consequence is that approval of heights that exceed those in the map will fill in the valleys, limiting views in the center of Rosslyn, reducing light coming into Rosslyn, unnecessarily shading streets, open spaces, and other buildings.
- If site plan applicants can request added height, clear standards/criteria need to be set for evaluating these requests.

Parking Garages

- Heights should not be allowed to rise above those in the heights map in circumstances where above-grade parking is the basis for requesting additional height.
- Above grade parking garages should count as density.
- Allow the height and density in order to help property owners defray the cost of undergrounding parking garages.
- Require that in very limited circumstances when above-grade parking garages do not detract from plan goals, they be wrapped on all four sides with active uses.

Setbacks

- Setbacks should be included among zoning ordinance amendments implementing the plan.
- In general, in order to have significance, setbacks should be set at a minimum distance of 15 feet.
- Setbacks/building heights along the 18th Street Corridor should be required to ensure a quality environment.

Ground-level Design

- The draft does not provide sufficient detail regarding the streetscape design standards under development by the Rosslyn BID. Prior to adoption, these streetscape standards and design elements should be subject to a public review process.

Architecture

- Architecture standards could result in insufficient variation in design. Renderings in the plan should show more design variation than in the draft.
- Standards seem to encourage all “squares and rectangles” and discourage any other kinds of designs.
- Not all buildings should have distinctive caps/tops. Some buildings need to be the “field” for others that are “objects.”
- A map designating certain sites as those where distinctive caps are required should be added to the draft.
- Materials standards should be added to draft. These standards should ensure high quality materials as well as significant variation in materials from building-to-building.
- Rooftop design standards should also be added to the draft so that the views from above (e.g., the observation deck) are not diminished by unsightly rooftops.
- An illustration of the proposed guideline on tower separation would be helpful.

Air Rights Development

- The draft plan expresses a negative view of air rights. This tone should be edited out.
- The draft plan should actually encourage air rights development by including the goal of establishing both a new GLUP designation for the area and a new zone either in the plan or in a soon to follow on study. It should also include height, form and design standards for air rights development.

Land Use

- An examination of the concept plan suggests that excessive space is devoted to streets. Consideration should be given to narrowing streets where possible.
- One example where there would be multiple benefits from street narrowing is the case of Ft. Myer Dr. The street is among the widest in Rosslyn. It would have sufficient lanes to accommodate all needs even with some loss of space in the cross section. Vacation and sale of the western part could enhance the development of the Ames Center block while providing revenue that could cover a significant portion of the cost of eliminating the Ft. Myer Dr. tunnel.
- Use mix seems about right, except for retail, which seems low. Tools for achieving the use mix are inadequate. The “two-tower” tool could actually encourage designs that would get around what otherwise seems to be a requirement. The “greater height” tool seems to conflict with the “peaks and valley” height plan. Consideration should be given to a uniform requirement on all redevelopment to provide new residential GFA either on site or in partnership with another developer.

Retail Uses

- The plan needs an analysis of the proportion of floorplates devoted to retail currently and at full plan build out.
- The stretch of Wilson Blvd. from Pierce St. to Lynn St. should be colored Red.
- The block of Key Blvd. from Oak St. to Nash St. should be colored red.
- Without sufficient explanation of market failures, the plan should differentiate the sector in three ways:
 - those specific street frontages that are identified as the principle retail areas
 - those specific street frontages where no retail or other activating uses are expected or desired
 - all other areas where retail may occur at the option of the property owner
- Form standards should require that ground level spaces in all areas where retail may occur to be built to accommodate any kind of retail. Standards should be uniform in the RCRD. These include floor-to-ceiling heights, ventilation, distance between openings, etc.

Transportation

- Street and Block Pattern
 - Add a new chart to the draft that shows the 18th Street Corridor on a block-by-block basis and lists the opportunities the block represents at full build out and the challenges to be overcome to achieve the build out.
- Street Classifications
 - A new pedestrian only classification should be added to the MTP.
 - The 18th Street Corridor should be classified for its entire length as either a Pedestrian-Bicycle Priority Street or a Pedestrian-only Street.
 - Develop a better explanation of the alignment of the pedestrian path on the Holiday Inn site and the alley on the Rosslyn Gateway site and why they should or should not align and added this to the draft.
 - Add Pedestrian-priority street classification that is included in the MTP to the definitions of streets in the Sector Plan.
- Street Sections
 - A full set of street sections should be included in the RTA draft.
 - Consider including space for retail liners on streets abutting Dark Star Park and other places where possible.
 - Minimum street section should be 60'. Street sections should not be narrower than required building separation.
 - A 60' street section is inadequate for the section of the 18th Street Corridor from Lynn Street to Arlington Ridge Rd.
- Bicycle
 - Wilson Blvd. cycle track should be continuous for its length in Rosslyn.
 - The plan should include “protected intersection design” standards to enhance cyclist safety and minimize vehicle-bicycle conflicts.
 - The plan should include a central bicycle parking facility. A facility with valet service, on-site repair, and showers and changing facilities should be included.
- Transit
 - Metro
 - Study of the potential for a new station on the Waterview site supported.
 - Requested analysis of the capacity of the current Metro station to accommodate the density planned in this new draft.
 - The plan needs to provide more fully a new Metro station to serve a new metro line through Rosslyn. Consideration should be given to reserving spaces on several development sites so that site plans could be developed and reviewed with the need for station sites in mind.
 - Buses

- Work should be coordinated with WMATA on street bus platforms.
 - Bus layover/staging site should be located outside of Rosslyn.
 - Consideration should be given to an off-street bus transfer station
- Sidewalks
 - Several sections have wider sidewalks than is typical in the sector. These should either be narrowed to the standard or an explanation should be provided.

Parks and Open Space

- Rosslyn Plaza
 - The RCRD already has a significant plaza like one that might be on Kent St. Duplication doesn't make sense, especially within two blocks of Central Place. It is much more logical to arrange the open space around and to complement the Esplanade.
 - The economics of any proposed development should be considered in locating the open space.
 - AED analysis was done, which concluded that Rosslyn Plaza would not be a successful destination retail location. It is not sensible to compete with other retail centers in Rosslyn.
- Boathouse
 - The Boathouse is seen as a transformational element in the plan and should be given greater prominence, emphasizing its importance to both Rosslyn and all of Arlington.
- Private Open Spaces
 - Private open spaces should be discouraged as they detract from the public spaces the plan calls for and threaten public spaces by draining off use and resources. Resources should be pooled across development projects to enhance public open spaces.
 - Community benefits should not be attributed to private open spaces nor used for the construction and maintenance of these spaces.

Sustainability

- Efforts should be made to incorporate district energy into Rosslyn through plan actions.
- Given the likelihood of tearing down existing buildings to make way for new ones, the issue of embodied energy should be reflected in sustainability policy tailored to Rosslyn. In particular, a higher LEED standard (e.g., minimum gold) for Rosslyn may be sensible.
- Efforts should be made to establish green street standards reflecting how much land in the sector is devoted to streets.

Community Benefits

- The sector plan should not provide for special treatment of Affordable Housing in community benefits as a share of total community benefits. At the same time, a policy that encourages/requires affordable housing contributions to remain in the RMSA would be desirable.
- The public infrastructure needs in Rosslyn are considerable. They should be funded not only from community benefit contributions but, importantly, from the biennial Capital Improvement Program. Starting infrastructure improvements as soon as possible would send an important message of the community's commitment to achieving the vision in the plan and could also spur redevelopment earlier.

Rebuttable Presumption

- The Rosslyn Sector Plan provides a clear vision for Rosslyn 25 years in the future. As a preferred community-developed vision, it does not have multiple visions – only one. Redevelopment projects undertaken during this 25-year period should move the sector closer to the vision and, in the end, should achieve the community's vision. Site plans on the other hand are proposals related to developing specific property and are generally expected to be consistent with the plan. Since site plans are site specific they often reveal conditions unknown during development of a sector plan or are developed at a time when knowledge of the future may justify site plans that depart from sector plans. As a result, flexibility is an essential attribute of site plan review. Applicants seeking modifications of Sector Plan requirements and guidelines, zoning ordinance requirements, or other Arlington County standards and policies, however, should be expected as a standard submission requirement to provide strong justification for the modifications they seek.