



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22201
(703)228-3525 • www.arlingtonva.us



CHRISTOPHER FORINASH
CHAIR

NANCY IACOMINI
VICE-CHAIR

MICHELLE STAHLHUT
COORDINATOR

GIZELE C. JOHNSON
CLERK

September 9, 2015

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

SUBJECT: 2. SITE PLAN #297, PENTAGON CENTRE PDSP, 1201 South Hayes Street and 1200 South Fern Street. PL Pentagon LLC c/o Kimco Realty Corporation to amend the Pentagon Centre Phased Development Site Plan to permit reallocation of residential uses to Phase I and changes to building height, building layout, open space, block configuration, above grade parking, project phasing, and land use mix in the C-O-2.5 zoning district under ACZO §7.12, §15.5. Applicant requests to amend the Pentagon Centre Urban Design Guidelines to reflect proposed PDSP and site plan amendments. Major amendment to the Phase I Final Site Plan of the Pentagon Centre PDSP requested to permit conversion of approved office space to residential with adjustments to retail GFA to include 693 dwelling units, 36,100 sq. ft. of retail uses, and a 426-space, 7-story above grade parking garage in the C-O-2.5 zoning district under ACZO §7.12, §15.5. Property is approximately 731,873 sq. ft.; located at 1201 S. Hayes St. & 1200. S. Fern St.; and is identified as RPC# 35-004-001. The proposed density is 2.5 FAR for commercial uses, 115 UNITS.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Planning recommends that the County Board:

- A. Approve the attached ordinance for an amendment to Site Plan #297 of the Phased Development Site Plan for Pentagon Centre to reallocate residential uses to Phase I and modify building heights, buildings layouts, and land use mix, subject to revised PDSP conditions and urban design guidelines.**
- B. Approve the attached ordinance to approve an amendment to Site Plan #297 to change the approved land use of Buildings A and C from office to residential, reduce above grade parking in Building D and increase above grad parking in Buildings A and C, modify building footprints, and add public open space, subject to revised final site plan conditions.**

P.C. #48.A.B.

With the following amendments;

- 1. The proposed 15th street cross section be amended to include a minimum 5 foot bike lanes excluding gutter pan.**
- 2. Direct Staff to prepare a report on past, present and projected vehicular traffic and transit (both bus and Metrorail) ridership for the area known as 22202 – Pentagon City/Crystal City/Aurora Highlands/Arlington Ridge – areas. This report would be the subject of a public forum with both the Planning Commission, inviting the Transportation Commission and results forwarded to the County Board.**
- 3. References to bus shelters and stops within the site plan be changed to transit stations.**

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard these items at its September 9, 2015 public hearing. Arlova Vonhm, Department of Community Planning Housing and Development (CPHD)-Planning, gave a presentation on the background and details of the proposed project. Other staff present included Tom Miller, Current Planning Supervisor, CPHD, Steve Cover, Director, CPHD, and Robert Gibson, Department of Environmental Services (DES)-Transportation.

Evan Pritchard, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC introduced the project for the applicant Kimco Realty, and George Dove, WDG Architecture, presented the context and proposed changes to the architectural features of the project. Dan Avrit, Parker Rodriguez Inc. gave an overview of the landscape design for the site.

Public Speakers

There were two public speakers for this item.

Arthur Fox, Arlington Ridge Civic Association (ARCA), thanked Geoff Glazer for outreach to ARCA and the SPRC process for improvements to the project. There are no major objections to the requested amendments to the 2008 PDSP or its eventual buildout. ARCA's support for the amendment was conditional on the applicant's commitment not to seek bonus density. ARCA supports Kimco's plan on developing the block's interior street system into an area oriented toward pedestrians, unlike Hayes and 15th Streets which are high volume boulevards. With regard to the Phase I Site plan, Building A is the architectural center of Pentagon City. While they are not pleased with the above ground parking garage or its appearance, the construction was approved in 2008 and the architecture did not rise to the level of objection. Mr. Fox also called attention to the alleged community benefits being proposed by the developer, which only benefit the developer and their tenants. The County accepts such benefits under the ruse of community benefits. He has asked for years that before any new development is constructed, the County should conduct a comprehensive, holistic study of how much density and traffic congestion can be accommodated in 22202. Mr. Fox indicated that ARCA had not taken a formal vote on the proposal but it has been discussed by its membership on more than one occasion.

Jim Huryz, Fairlington resident, echoed Mr. Fox's comments with regard to community benefits. He also said that Fairlington was never designed to be a high traffic cut-through operated by non-neighborhood residents. The proposed Abingdon School will cause traffic. Other Arlington neighborhoods were designed to provide residents with a suburban environment. Staff outside of Arlington inflict smart growth on residents leaving residents to have to spend more on taxes.

Planning Commission Reports

Commissioner Schroll reported the Transportation Commission discussed the above grade parking and noted that it was part of the 2008 approval and understood the limitations. There was discussion about width of bike lanes and concern the gutter was located in the bike lane. There was additional discussion about cycle tracks on 15th Street.

Commissioner Sockwell reported the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) took eight months to work through the general guidance and principles from the 2008 approval. SPRC discussed the architecture and applicant was responsive to requested changes. The above grade parking was discussed and the problem is that the urban guidelines suggest it is discouraged but in 2008 there was an understanding about above grade parking and applicant is proposing relatively modest changes. Major issues outstanding include architecture, retail uses, above grade parking, land use, and consistency with PDSP guiding documents, are outlined in the SPRC chair memo.

Planning Commission Discussion

Above Grade Parking

Commissioner Gutshall asked for a summary of the 2014 County Board amendment and a condition regarding an open space plan that was part of the recent approval as well as an understanding of what parts of the approval are "baked in". Is the above grade parking structure standalone to the extent that is baked into the PDSP and not up for review? Is it within the Board's purview to review in the amendment request? Lastly, where Building D is bifurcated, everything to the left is open space during Phase A of construction of Building D.

Ms. Vonhm responded that in the original Building D approval, half of the building would be demolished to allow for construction of South Grant Street through the center of the site. In 2014, the applicant, in anticipation of coming forward with this project, asked to phase that construction in order to start construction of the east half first. It was a request to allow below grade improvements prior to final approval of the requested amendment. As such, the footprint of the first phase is consistent with the current proposal. The other change was to eliminate second floor office. Initially there was ground floor retail and second floor office in Building D but instead they have created a double height for first floor retail. Instead of building the entire building at one time, they propose an interim open space next to the structure before construction of the second half. Mr. Gibson responded that the open space would only be in place during the first phase of construction of Building D and that once Building C was constructed, the remainder of the parking garage would have to be completed as well. In addition, the site and garage access proposed in the 2014 amendment would be constructed ultimately different than where South Grant Street is currently proposed.

Commissioner Cole asked about a note that was shown to be stricken from the existing PDSP conditions on page 41 of the staff report. The note referred to Phase III Building D and the conversion of the upper four stories to residential uses. Ms. Vonhm explained that this note was proposed to be removed because the amended project would not include the adaptive reuse of the parking garage for residential purposes any longer. Under the current proposal, the garage would be demolished in Phase III and replaced with a hotel building.

Implications of the Change in Use from Commercial to Residential

Commissioner Sockwell suggested it is a fair question of what is happening in terms of overall planning in the larger study area related to transportation impacts and community benefits.

Retail Action Plan

Commissioner Gutshall referred to page 40 of the Urban Design Guidelines related to phasing and asked staff how the conclusion that the change of the phasing for delivery of the residential does not impact or invoke a change in the delivery of the open space in light of the fact that we are basing the comparison on what was approved in October 2014 and that approval provided 26,000 square feet of open space onsite. Ms. Vonhm said the timing related to the provision of a large open space was always anticipated to be Phase III because that is when the bulk of the site would be available for full redevelopment. The change would put residential uses, that were already approved as part of the larger PDSP, on the site in locations that were originally approved for office. The proposed change in land use also changed building footprints and the relationship between Buildings C and D. Because the footprint of Building C expanded, the opportunity for open space next to that building is no longer there. At the same time Building D was reduced, which created space for an adjacent open space in that location. Under the requested amendment, open space would be provided earlier, in Phase I, however it would be slightly smaller than originally approved. The big open space can't be provided until the Costco site leaves. Commissioner Gutshall said part of the major open space is not where existing retail is but where existing surface parking. Ms. Vonhm responded part of the area to eventually become open space also includes the Costco building. Commissioner Gutshall asked if there was a connection between open space and residential instead of open space and office. Ms. Vonhm responded there were never plans to include open spaces large enough for playing fields until the final phase of development, and residential uses were proposed to be included in Phase II in the original approval. Commissioner Gutshall asked about putting Building D underground. Ms. Vonhm said it was part of the original approval that is not changing.

Commissioner Ciotti said SPRC discussed signage at length and was concerned it has not been resolved. Mr. Pritchard responded there was originally some signage included but understand that they would need to go to the zoning administrator and meet the zoning ordinance requirements for signage.

Consistency of the proposed PDSP

Commissioner Siegel said a 40 year plan is a long time and posed a question that in 40 years if Costco decides it finds a new urban form, if developer came back and said they want to build Phases 3 and 4 sooner, would it entail the undergrounding of parking. The design guidelines and guiding principles firmly discourage above ground parking and she is having trouble understanding what that means. Ms. Vonhm said the only phase that allows above ground parking is Phase I. All subsequent phases require underground parking. Commissioner Siegel

asked the developer if that would be a problem in the future. Mr. Pritchard responded they have designed the plan so that if Costco is still around in 40 years, they have provided a large ground floor retail area that could potentially accommodate it and have assumed all retail parking would go below grade.

Transportation

Bus Stops and Bike Lanes

Commissioner Hughes said this is the terminal of the Metrobus 16 lines (Columbia Heights West – Pentagon City Line) and asked if the stops are envisioned to be consistent with the transit stop planned along Columbia Pike. He also indicated that these lines have strong ridership with many people queuing at Pentagon City to board these routes. Mr. Gibson said the shelters are double wide shelters to accommodate those higher volume lines. In future phases, additional shelter would be provided. The new Metroway route serving Arlington and Alexandria will also stop at Pentagon City Metro Station. Commissioner Hughes asked if double wide shelters were the same as the transit stops proposed along Columbia Pike. Mr. Gibson indicated that they would not be.

For the 16s and Metroway routing the County's on going planning could identify alternative transit facility needs in response to the County Board's direction to stop the planning for the streetcar. Staff does not currently know what those needs are. The Metroway line in Crystal City and Pentagon City will temporarily route along Hayes until 12th Street South between Eades and Fern opens up, and then the routing will be changed. The stations and stops associated with routes serving Pentagon City Metro Station will change over time. Commissioner Hughes asked if the proposed shelters will have electronics built in. Mr. Gibson said that level of detail will be specified at final engineering.

Bike Lanes

Commissioner Shroll said that at Transportation Commission, there was a discussion regarding bike lanes and gutter pans and asked if that has changed.

Mr. Gibson said that engineering the proposed curb section was along 15th Street section. It does have a five foot bike lane and does include the gutter pan as approved in 2008. Commissioner Shroll said that is not ideal. Mr. Gibson followed up and said it would be desirable to achieve at least a four foot bike lane outside of the gutter pan. 15th Street is a wide roadway with a constructed median and DES will take a look to see if it's appropriate to take away some of the hardscape median to achieve the bike lane. Commissioner Forinash asked about the lane widths. Mr. Gibson said they were ten foot lanes. Commissioner Cole asked for a reminder of the standards for bike lane width in the County. Mr. Gibson said the minimum is the five feet being provided which includes the gutter pan in this case however, wider lanes are desirable when they include the gutter pan.

Transportation Demand Management

Commissioner Ciotti asked about the transit screen in the lobby but it is not in the conditions. Mr. Pritchard responded the applicant will still agree. Mr. Gibson said the current standard is the hard map displays with map pamphlets.

Transportation Study

Commissioner Cole asked about ongoing transportation studies. Mr. Gibson responded that as a follow up to the Crystal City plan, there are new continuous vehicle counters that have been deployed as a follow up to the Crystal City planning effort. Using this count data and other traffic counts the County has been provide traffic count summaries for multiple locations within 22202 since the Crystal City plan was approved. There is not a broad transportation study for this area because everything else is already planned and has been taken into account as part of the Crystal City plan or subsequent site plans. The 2008 transportation studies for the project does not go broadly across the zip code.

Commissioner Cole said there was no additional density planned and existing studies are inadequate. Mr. Gibson there is no broader PDSP under review or sector plan or large scale projects that are ongoing for changing the densities in the area. Commissioner Cole asked if the River House will have an impact on the larger density in the area. Commissioner Cole said there has been concern for some time that we are planning without adequately understanding the capacity of our roads and transit systems to meet the demand. There are thousands of residential units planned and roads now are not free flowing all the time. When everything planned is added including some unplanned proposals like River House, there is an underlying anxiety that our systems may be stressed beyond their ability to meet the demand. What is our knowledge of our system to accommodate an increase the entire multi-modal system. He understands that the response is that there is no integrated study and no comprehensive understanding about transportation capacity or demand. Mr. Gibson said the County's stated policy is working coordinating transportation planning with comprehensive planning when those planning efforts occur. Like with transportation planning that was done with the Crystal City plan, it is an iterative process. With unplanned density, we have yet to go through that iterative process. Commissioner Cole said Pentagon City does not have a plan. Mr. Miller has said it has amended over the years and was last examined under Pentagon Row, Pen Place and also when the Crystal City Sector Plan. Commissioner Cole said he wants a comprehensive report on existing information. Mr. Gibson responded that as part of the CCRC process there is comprehensive traffic reporting.

Commissioner Iacomini said that knowing the traffic comments received said we're looking narrowly and not the entire 22202 area. She will propose a motion that staff prepare a report that could bring together the data from all the PDSP, site plans, and traffic counts to present in a big way so that everyone can see the big picture as it is currently known.

Commissioner Siegel agreed that a large framework is needed so that it can inform site plans that are being reviewed and said the CCRC was tasked with developing metrics for major transportation changes anticipated with the Sector Plan, BRAC, etc. Mr. Gibson said the County has the capacity to address the questions and it involves developing a work plan and outlining a scope and work with the community.

Commissioner Sockwell asked about a question sent by Carrie Johnson and asked if staff has any view of the impact of a change in use mix on the existing transit or metro usage patterns.

Mr. Gibson said trips generated by the proposed Phase I residential development would be fewer than those associated with the approved Phase I office development and that staff was confident the existing transportation network could support the proposed residential development.

Accessibility

Commissioner Ciotti asked about the power doors at the entrance to the interior shops. The applicant said they would be fixing those. Commissioner Ciotti suggested moving away from high maintenance touch pads.

Open Space in Phase I

Commissioner Iacomini said a good thing is green space in Phase I even though most comes in Phase III and asked if the green space will be completely passive. Mr. Avrit, landscape architect for the project, said it was primarily passive currently. They were considering movable chairs and tables. Commissioner Iacomini asked them to consider something more permanent in four seasons. Mr. Avrit said they are trying to make it usable for multiple user groups. There is a lot of traffic moving through that space.

Commissioner Sockwell said the open space is under the Phase I final site plan conditions and there is no provision for community input and should provisions be built in for more community input. Ms. Vonhm said the proposal and conditions were reviewed by the County, and DPR was more concerned about the large opportunity in Phase III and given the size and lack of active recreation, it was not identified as an area with additional planning proposed and would be handled through landscape plan review.

Encroachment on Building C

Commissioner Cole asked whether the balconies of the apartment buildings encroach over public space and never got an answer. Ms. Vonhm said DES Real Estate said there were different requirements between public streets and public sidewalks. In this case, it is a public sidewalk. For public sidewalks, as long as it is above 16.5 feet above grade, encroachment is not required. There are drawings in the 4.1 set that show that distance. It was sufficiently high enough to not require approval by real estate. Commissioner Cole said his recollection that for Phase III and Phase IV for Met Park and for the Post Office site there were requests for encroachment at the second level and the third level. In the drawings for this proposal, it looks like the encroachment occurs at the third level. Ms. Vonhm said those other projects may have been a street easement and not a sidewalk easement.

Community Benefits

Commissioner Cole said he the applicant is getting credit or transferring money to the County to compensate for the benefit. Ms. Vonhm said these are site plans in addition to the standard. Sometimes projects have special characteristics that have an additional set of benefits proposed.

Commissioner Cole asked why this applicant should be expected to have community benefits that are in excess of the standard community benefits. Ms. Vonhm said everything in black was required in the initial PDSP and site plan approval in 2008. New ones came out of SPRC or changes that occurred along the way that are helpful this time around. Commissioner Cole asked if there is a basis for the monetary value of benefits. Ms. Vonhm said the number was at the discretion of the County Manager. At the time there was discussion of a sprayground or money for Metro transit improvements.

Commissioner Cole asked about the basis for the total amount of money for community benefits not community amenities for the site plan approvals that the applicant is currently seeking.

Ms. Vonhm said in neither proposal was there a request for bonus density. He presumes there is an amount that the applicant is expected to provide in terms of community benefits.

Mr. Gibson said that in Crystal City and Rosslyn where community benefits are defined as an element in order to help gain density or in other cases, those benefits provide bonus density, in this case there is neither bonus density or zoning ordinance requirement for community benefits for gaining density. These are simply benefits of the project which the community benefits from.

Commissioner Cole said the rooftop solar panels benefit the applicant and will use those in marketing. The façade renovation along South Hayes Street also benefits the applicant. An issue that continues to arise is the extent to which the benefits benefits the community or the applicant. It suggests that the way we are thinking about community benefits – the community is not receptive to the way we are thinking about benefits. In this case, there is no additional density or additional monetary benefits and it comes just from corporate largesse.

Commissioner Siegel said it is important to be clear as possible about a community benefit or benefits to the applicant and some benefit both.

Commissioner Gutshall said when he thinks of community benefits it means things the applicant would not do on their own volition. He asked if the new public open space would be in relation to the approved 26,000 square foot open space adjacent to Building D.

Mr. Gibson said the 26,000 open space is only under the approved PDSP as a temporary open space that goes away if the remaining parking gets built. This site plan must be acted upon to ensure that parking does not get built. That open space is to ensure that there was not a torn up parking lot and not a built out space with amenities and features. Commissioner Gutshall asked about the trigger for Phase B. Mr. Gibson said that without this plan, supporting parking for the office building and build the second phase of parking deck. Commissioner Gutshall asked if that was Phase II or Phase I office.

Mr. Gibson said in Phase I with the office buildout as part of Phase I they would have to build Segment B of the parking deck and that's when it would have to be built. Until then, Segment A would have to be in place to support existing retail.

Commissioner Gutshall said that suggesting new public open space as a site plan benefit is a stretch.

Commissioner Cole said ARCA reached an understanding with applicant there would be no additional density and asked staff if the County is party to the agreement. Ms. Vonhm said she is aware of the conversation but the County is not party to the agreement. Commissioner Cole asked Mr. Fox about the agreement between ARCA and the developer. Mr. Fox responded there was discussion at one of their meetings about bonus density. He pointed out how the swap could be done if the residential density went up slightly but the office square footage went down slightly, they would not need bonus density. ARCA was against bonus density awards. It's not a

legal binding agreement. It is a gentlemen's agreement. Mr. Fox added that the membership had a meeting in November 2014 devoted entirely to this project and it is not controversial.

Planning Commission Motion

Commissioner Sockwell made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Phased Development Site Plan Amendment including the adoption of the Pentagon Centre urban design guidelines and the approval of the site plan amendment for Phase I of the PDSP as set forth in the staff memo of September 2, 2015. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Iacomini.

Commissioner Gutshall said he would not support the motion because although the applicant has worked hard to improve Building A and Building C, overall fundamentally this PDSP fails a simplistic test of Arlington values. Those are accurately captured in the guiding principles which say unequivocally that parking should be underground and the recognition that the 2008 PDSP was a lengthy negotiation process. The market has changed, the applicant has come forward to renegotiate. The County has an obligation to also assess the changes in the County. This is a significant change and the whole thing should be open, and the County Board should look hard at the social contract between the residents and the developers.

Commissioner Schroll offered an amendment to the main motion that the proposed 15th street cross section be amended to include a minimum five foot bike lanes excluding gutter pan. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted 10-0 to support the motion with Commissioners Siegel, Ciotti, Iacomini, Forinash, Cole, Harner, Sockwell, Gutshall, Schroll, and Hughes in support.

Commissioner Siegel said she has thought about how to support approval of the proposal and has stumbled over the explicit directive language in the guiding principles which will not be implemented for up to 40 years. My obligation is to honor the community process that happened when this was first put forward. The guidelines are not being ignored and are aspirational. She would have liked to see more and better circulation, better screening of the above grade parking sooner, however she will support the motion.

Commissioner Iacomini made a motion to amend the main motion that the Planning Commission advise the County Board to direct Staff to prepare a report on past, present and projected vehicular traffic and transit (both bus and Metrorail) ridership for the area known as 22202 – Pentagon City/Crystal City/Aurora Highlands/Arlington Ridge – areas. This report would be the subject of a public forum with both the Planning Commission, inviting the Transportation Commission and results forwarded to the County Board. Commissioner Siegel seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gutshall asked if there was any sense of how this would fit into staff's work plan. Commissioner Iacomini said it is a report and not a new study. Much of the data is in hand and it is a matter of putting it together in a larger format. With the aid of scoping, it is feasible.

The Planning Commission voted 10-0 to support the motion with Commissioners Siegel, Ciotti, Iacomini, Forinash, Cole, Harner, Sockwell, Gutshall, Schroll, and Hughes in support.

Commissioner Cole said that it is all too obvious when he hasn't been happy with the work they were getting out of staff and it is probably not all that obvious when I feel the work is good, so I want to make it clear that Ms. Vonhm's work has been exceptional. Responsiveness, clear knowledge of the application, the original PDSP and everything about this application deserves note. Also, he is completing his seventh year and the original PDSP was his first project on Planning Commission, and he will support the approval again.

Commissioner Harner said he also experienced this PDSP the first time, and at that time was disappointed at the time. It is unlikely in 40 years this gigantic piece of land will likely come back for modification. This proposal is big improvement and following many of our planning principles. He is also disappointed in the above ground parking. Everything west of Grant Street is a good plan, but east of Grant Street is very suburban and does not hold the edge and hopes it will improve.

Commissioner Hughes made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend to the County Board that references to bus shelters and stops within the site plan be changed to transit stations. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted 10-0 to support the motion with Commissioners Siegel, Ciotti, Iacomini, Forinash, Cole, Harner, Sockwell, Gutshall, Schroll, and Hughes in support.

The Planning Commission then took up the main motion as amended. The Planning Commission voted 9-1 to support the motion with Commissioners Siegel, Ciotti, Iacomini, Forinash, Cole, Harner, Sockwell, Schroll, and Hughes in support and Commissioner Gutshall opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,
Arlington County Planning Commission
Christopher J. Forinash

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Forinash", written in a cursive style.