



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

November 10, 2015

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

SUBJECT: 1. SP #46, Carpool, CFO AV, LLC to amend a site plan by adding site area to construct an approximately 330,000 sq. ft. multifamily building with approximately 8,000 sq. ft. of ground floor retail on the new site area in the C-O-A zoning district. The proposed density is 6.25 FAR. Modifications of zoning ordinance requirements include: number of parking spaces, percentage of compact spaces, height, LEED Gold bonus density, exclusions of vertical shafts and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan. (ACTION)\

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Planning Commission recommends that the County Board:

Adopt the attached Ordinance to approve the subject site plan amendment request to add site area to the existing site plan SP #46 and to construct an approximate 333,000 square foot residential building that includes approximately 8,000 square feet of retail space of 22 stories of the additional site area with 264 underground parking spaces with modifications of use regulations for number of parking spaces, compact parking ratio, height bonus density for LEED Gold, exclusion of vertical shafts from gross floor area, and all other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development with the following amendments:

- 1. Direct staff to discuss with the applicant the potential usage of the bike facility by non-residents of the buildings and if appropriate, develop a condition.**
- 2. Direct staff to look at having full ADA-compliant with two wings for each curb cut crossing Fairfax and crossing Quincy and Randolph.**

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission heard these items at its November 2, 2015 public hearing. Peter Schulz, 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

P.C. #32.A.

Steve Cover, Director, CPHD, and Jane S. Kim, Department of Environmental Services (DES)-Transportation.

Tad Lunger, McGuire Woods LLP, on behalf of the applicant, CFO AV Carpool, LLC, gave an overview of the proposed project. Dennis Carmichael, landscape architect with Parker Rodriguez, Inc., explained the streetscape design and retail courtyard. Dan Perkins, Hickock Cole Architects, explained the layout of the building and exterior design.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

There were no public speakers for this item.

REVIEW PROCESS

Commissioner Schroll reported the Transportation Commission (TC) discussed Carpool. The TC recommended approval of the project with one amendment to recommend that the size of the bike lane not be decreased in size in comparison to other bike lanes proposed in the plan.

Commissioner Gutshall reported the SPRC met four times on the proposal. Several points were addressed by the developer during the course of the SPRC process. He introduced suggested topics for discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission discussed the request for height modification, density of the project and neighboring Webb Building, the need for an update of the Ballston Sector Plan, clarified questions regarding street easements, future opportunities for density and at-grade entrances. On transportation topics, Planning Commission suggested maximizing bike lane width, moving a mast arm in order to create a better pedestrian-friendly urban design at the corner, discussed the proposed parking ratio and needs, as well as the need for a County level residential parking study. A full transcript of the deliberation is appended to the PC letter.

Ballston Sector Plan Update

The Commission discussed the need for an update of the Ballston Sector Plan which is almost 36 years old and is the oldest of the sector plans. It often provides guidance that is no longer relevant and there are design problems, particularly with streetscape. Ballston is not fully built out and the area would benefit from an updated Sector Plan.

Transportation

Bike lanes and facilities

On Transportation topics, the Commission asked about maximizing bike lane widths and staff responded that based on input from the Transportation Commission, staff was continuing to look at maximizing bike lane width. Commissioner Sockwell also suggested and later made a motion to include a major bike storage facility at this site since it is located at the intersection of two major bike paths. The Commission also clarified that a new left-turn lane on Northbound Randolph is being created.

Parking ratios and Residential Parking Study

The project is proposing a 0.8 space per unit residential parking ratio and shared use of the neighboring office parking garage (known as the Webb Building) for overnight residential

parking prior to implementation of an Enhanced Transportation Demand Management (TDM) system, which becomes effective only in the case where the office parking garage spaces are no longer available. The applicant added the Webb Building is operating at a 1/3 ratio although the office building is 60% leased, and they are bound by conditions to provide 66 additional parking spaces for the life of the Webb Building, and in the event the Webb Building is redeveloped and the parking become unavailable, the applicant would be required to provide provisions through the site plan amendment process for said redevelopment.

In response to the discussion on parking ratios, Commissioners pointed out this situation demonstrates the need for a residential parking study and a citizen task force to participate in that study. Staff responded the resident parking study was in the very early stages of data gathering and expects to begin public participation in the beginning of 2016.

Traffic Mast Arm and ADA ramp

In reference to the plaza and seating wall, the Commission discussed the location of a traffic mast arm that in turn results in a flared ADA ramp as opposed to a ramp with a wing in each direction. The Commission suggested moving the mast arm further west and that the contribution to capital project improvements be used to create a two wing ramp and a more pedestrian friendly urban design.

Other

Additionally, Commissioner Ciotti clarified that future redevelopment of the Webb Building would include at-grade entrances, and Commissioner Gutshall suggested the inclusion of a condition requiring presentation to the community the final design of the rooftop uses and establishment of a community liaison.

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

Commissioner Gutshall moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the County Board that they adopt the attached Ordinance to approve the subject site plan amendment request to add site area to the existing site plan SP #46 and to construct an approximate 333,000 square foot residential building that includes approximately 8,000 square feet of retail space of 22 stories of the additional site area with 264 underground parking spaces with modifications of use regulations for number of parking spaces, compact parking ratio, height bonus density for LEED Gold, exclusion of vertical shafts from gross floor area, and all other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development. Commissioner Schroll seconded the motion.

Commissioner Sockwell asked unanimous consent that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board direct staff to discuss with the applicant the potential usage of the bike facility by non-residents of the buildings and if appropriate, develop a condition. There was no objection and the amendment was added to the main motion.

Commissioner Ciotti made a motion to recommend that the County Board direct staff to look at having full ADA-compliant with two wings for each curb cut crossing Fairfax and crossing Quincy and Randolph. Commissioner Cole seconded the motion.

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

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

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.

Commissioner Forinash: So the matter is now before the Commission. I'll turn first to Commissioner Schroll for the Transportation Commission report. Thank you.

Commissioner Schroll: Thank you, Commissioner Forinash. The Transportation Commission, as staff indicated, heard this this past Thursday into the wee morning hours. Not too much discussion. Yeah, we didn't get home 'til 2 a.m., those of us who stayed the entire time. Not too much discussion before the Transportation Commission. As staff indicated, we did approve or recommend that the Board approve the project. There was one amendment and it can be best seen on the applicant's presentation slide 25. Most of the street cross-sections do increase the size of the bike lane but the Quincy cross-section decreases it so the Transportation Commission did recommend that it not decrease by 2 feet and 2 inches here and that staff look at ways to maintain the size of the bike lane. But other than that, happy to answer any other questions about the Transportation Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Forinash: Great, thank you, Commissioner Schroll. And Commissioner Gutshall? So the SPRC report?

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We did have four SPRC meetings on this as well as a site walk-through. There should be a hard copy at everyone's seat with my SPRC report. Basically, I think that we were able to efficiently move through our standard agenda and review all the items. We had discussion focused initially on the height, on the additional height. We had some comments on architecture. Part of one of the modifications addressed in SPRC was the extension of that twist in the building façade all the way down to the Plaza level. There were some discussions about-- actually, a lot of discussion about Fairfax Drive and the boulevard concept and how that has evolved from what was in the initial Sector Plan on--to where we are now. And there was also some discussion about the pedestrian crossing on Fairfax Drive, the Plaza in general, and then we got into some discussion of construction issues. And then there was also kind of an interesting discussion that we had about the future of the Webb Building. I think that that was somewhat secondary to the main point of this site plan amendment for the SPRC. But essentially, there were no--at the end of SPRC, of the last meeting, there were no significant outstanding issues. So I have here a--what we could use as an outline but I really think it's up to individual commissioners that have specific questions 'cause there were no outstanding issues that required--that I'm aware of, that required deep conversation.

Commissioner Forinash: Thank you, Commissioner Gutshall. And someone should let the Beatles know that they're being followed here in the lower right. I don't know if that's Yoko or--I'm gonna suggest that since you have prepared this outline, that we step through it. At least to give some organization to comments--or questions, rather than just opening it up. So if it's all right with you, I'll go ahead and proceed through it in that order. If there are categories of questions or concerns that aren't represented here in 1 through 7, folks should go ahead and you know there's something you wanna ask a question about or raise, go ahead and let us know. Otherwise, we'll just start off with

Section 1 for questions and discussion. All right, so under land use and zoning. Commissioner Harner?

LAND USE AND ZONING

Commissioner Harner: Thanks and I apologize, I was not at the site plan. But it appears, though, that this is well within the Retail Action Plan but could you let me know what the designation is for this street and verify that that's the case?

Mr. Schulz: Yeah, it's a gold street, which allows for--its retail destination. Kind of the equivalent of what the entertainment main street was at the time. The applicant has actually agreed that all three spaces, you know, will have the ability to be vented for restaurant uses.

Commissioner Harner: Which is great. And we have the ceiling heights that are in the gold street?

Mr. Schulz: That's correct, yes. They're within the--yeah.

Commissioner Harner: Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole?

Commissioner Cole: Mr. Schulz, clearly one of the significant issues in this site plan proposal is the request to modify the height. Can you talk about whether this is a new circumstance in the C-O-A zoning district? Are there other places where the height has been modified by the County Board or not? Why don't you just start with that?

Mr. Schulz: Yeah, there were, going back to my notes, at least two buildings, if not three, that were--that had height modifications. Up to 219 feet was the highest. And I should mention that those were approved in the 1980s when we didn't even have, you know, lead bonus density. They gave various reasons such as grade and those were the entire buildings going to year 19--

Commissioner Cole: Can you tell us what those buildings were? What they are?

Mr. Schulz: Let's see, Liberty Center, although that was approved most recently in the 2000s. The Alta Vista, that's 246 feet, constructed in the '70s. The Spire at Fairmont is 246. The justification for that was architectural reasons and they were dedicating space for a metro plaza. And I believe there was another one that was--Richmond Square Apartments were 216 feet, which is actually 3 feet below the 219 limit. Yeah, those were the three.

Commissioner Cole: Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Mr. Schulz, I have a question. I haven't seen--I can't think of having seen a site plan where adjacent parcels of this size were consolidated, where there was such an existing site plan and a parcel that's not under site plan that's adjacent has been pulled in of this size. I can think of smaller pieces of land pulled in, including Red Top. Is there--in general, does the county support that as a rule when there's adjacent property consolidation? Are we looking for particular benefits to--I don't mean community benefits but are we looking for characteristics of that kind of consolidation to be in favor of it? Is there any sort of standing thought by the county on consolidations like this?

Mr. Schulz: Well, the Sector Plan does encourage sites to be consolidated and there is precedent where an existing older site plan had area added to it and The Spire that I just mentioned was another '60s site plan that got wrapped into site plan 331, the one that has the Continental and the Western Hotel, although that's yet unbuilt. But the C-O-A zoning district and the GLUP designation were set up to encourage the larger the site, the more FAR one gets. And so that was an explicit intent.

Commissioner Forinash: Great. Thank you. Other questions under the general heading of land use and zoning? Moving on to the next section, site design and characteristics, including streetscape. Commissioner Iacomini?

SITE DESIGN AND CHARACTERISTICS

Commissioner Iacomini: Thank you. I would like to go ahead and ask the question about how much density is left for the Webb Building if it--and I know it's in the report but just to talk it through.

Mr. Schulz: Sure. As of now, as it is, it's 185,000. The existing gross floor area of the building, ignoring any potential bonuses, that's what area density that it does have.

Commissioner Iacomini: Could you elaborate a little bit about the balance of office and residential on the site and how that's called out in the zoning code and where we are now with what's there?

Mr. Schulz: Sure. In this particular site, it is the combined site density. The C-O-A zoning district was intended to balance residential with office development at a time when office development was predominant. So it's set for any site no more than 3.0 FAR of a 6.0 FAR site could be office. This is 2-something. It isn't in my report. I don't remember off-hand, but 2-something FAR of the office portion of the site. So, you know, the intent was to have a mixed use and, as I said, they also gave extra FAR if you had a all-residential site as well, which the applicant could take advantage of in the future should they choose to redevelop the Webb Building.

Commissioner Iacomini: Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole?

Commissioner Cole: We've never gotten used to these new microphones, have we? I've--they're a constant source of frustration for me.

Commissioner Forinash: Speaking of which, while you clear your throat, let me remind us all that a transcript is being made of this. It's not determined whether we will forward that on with our letter, as we have a couple of times recently, but we're having the transcripts prepared to aid in preparing our letter so please do speak clearly and make sure your microphone's on.

Commissioner Cole: I will try not to fade at the end of my sentences, okay? A couple of things about this. I want to just start out with just a general statement and sort of in response to the observation that you just made, Mr. Schulz, which is that the C-O-A district was created to incentivize residential and it's, in a sense, it's a reflection of the antiquity, maybe that's older than antiquity, of the Ballston Sector Plan. Because we still have debates about whether or not Ballston is mixed use and Virginia Square is mixed use and, you know, because we do hear people say, "Oh, Virginia Square was supposed to be residential and Ballston was supposed to be office," and we had that in recent site plans in the last 18 months or so. And so I just would observe that with a now approaching 36-year-old Sector Plan, that it provides minimal guidance to begin with and, frankly, an anachronistic and often undesirable guidance in this person's--this Commissioner's view. It's high time to renew the Sector Plan. Arguments will be made that so much of it's been built out that we don't need to do that but I think that that's probably not the right kind of thinking because the fact of the matter is there's an awful lot that hasn't been built out and how the street--and we know that the sector does suffer from some design problems, particularly at streetscape. So to that extent, there is still a huge amount to be gained by renewing the Sector Plan for Ballston. Of all the sector plans, I think it is currently the oldest and we really need to move towards the situation in which we have a regular program of renewal so that sector plans don't get this old. You know, we may develop them for 30 or 40 years but that doesn't mean we have to wait that long to renew them. With that said, a couple of specific points about the site design here. If you could bring up the image that showed Phase I and Phase II of the site plan. It's interesting here that the applicant is utilizing the perimeter of the site, largely the entire perimeter of the site, short of a small section along Randolph Street to underlie the density requested for Phase I. The question that I have is does this preclude phase II from being constructed--if it's reconstructed with a new building, does it preclude phase II from being reconstructed on the Phase I land? And a reason--an essential reason for my asking this, so you understand, is that the Webb Building currently does not present itself to the street the way that we tend to think that contemporary urban design would want it to be presented. There is this planting area in the front of it that is quite significant relative to most other urban buildings these days. And so I wanna know whether or not that land can be used for phase II development.

Mr. Schulz: Yes. I'm not speaking for the applicant but what they're showing as Phase I, I think it's just because they wanted to show the streetscape improvements that they're making. In the staff report and we've made it clear to the applicant that the Webb

Building, if it's redeveloped, would be expected to adhere to the standards of modern urban design as well as whatever is adopted at the time including the streetscape standards. So it does not preclude at all.

Commissioner Cole: Let's go a little bit further then. If this Phase I and Phase II is not what's being used to underlie the density request but is simply to show where the landscape improvements are being made, let's talk about the land that is being used to underlie the density request. Let me first turn to the applicant, if I might, and ask the specific question, which is, "Is this drawing not accurate of the land underlying the density request or is it accurate?"

Mr. Lunger: So the land underlying the density request includes the entire site. So Phase I and Phase II just shows where the construction improvements are gonna be during this phase of development. But the entire site is connected from a density standpoint as we bring in the Carpool site into the existing Site Plan 46.

Commissioner Cole: Okay. All right. Then a second question that I have is related to the use of--I'm trying to understand conceptually what it means here to have the entire site as part of this site plan with this second building already on this site plan's land. Maybe--you know what I'm--the applicant just said that the entire parcel, both Phase I and Phase II underlie the density request for Phase I building.

Mr. Schulz: Right.

Commissioner Cole: So the land underneath--

Mr. Schulz: It doesn't have, really, not the land underneath. It's the comb--think of it as when you see a blank slate, a two-building site plan, you know, the entire site is added together to give the density and the developer allocates the density however they wish. You have an 82,370-square-foot site here. What we could kind of think of this is, is almost a two-building site plan where the second building is gonna be delayed by 10 to 15 years. But the combined site remains a comb--you have that 82,370 square feet sort of in a pot all along. Now some of it will now be allocated to this new building, therefore the density generated by this 82,370 would go, you know, what the balance of it go to the new--any building on the Webb Building site.

Commissioner Cole: And I, unfortunately, missed your response to Commissioner Iacomini's question earlier about how much GFA remains.

Mr. Schulz: A hundred and eighty-five thousand, which is the existing GFA of the Webb Building, the entire building.

Commissioner Cole: And is there anything that precludes the applicant--the owner, when that building does redevelop, from coming in and asking for significant density increases above the 185,000, well beyond what might normally be approved in the spirit of, say, the current Marymount development at Glebe Road and Fairfax Drive or the

Ballston Corridor development which has some extraordinary density added to it as well for--

Mr. Schulz: Well, there's several ways they could redevelop and those particular situations, yes, they had sort of maximized all of the traditional bonuses that we have, lead bonus, affordable dwelling unit bonus, sometimes I think community facilities bonus, and that there were alternate ways that they needed to get the density where they have here. They're not locking themselves out of using the traditional bonuses and needing to dip into these unusual extraordinary bonuses. For instance, the applicant here would still be entitled to use an affordable dwelling unit bonus of 0.25 FAR.

Commissioner Cole: Other conventional bonuses would be available to them.

Mr. Schulz: That's correct.

Commissioner Cole: Both the standard bonuses and the, you know, sort of other kinds of bonuses that allows them to earn above it. But there are even a third type of, as you-- as I think we both acknowledged, of bonuses which is truly extraordinary which is the kind of bonus that was earned by the Marymount development.

Mr. Schulz: Right, right.

Commissioner Cole: Is this site precluded from that kind of--

Mr. Schulz: Nothing in the current Sector Plan or the General Land Use Plan would preclude the use of any particular--

Commissioner Cole: Anything in the conditions?

Mr. Schulz: No. There's nothing in the conditions of the site plan that would preclude them from asking for any kind of--you know, an applicant, of course, can ask for any kind of bonus that they wish. There's nothing in the conditions that would preclude them from taking advantage of the standard bonuses or asking for whatever, you know, a transfer of development rights if they so choose.

Commissioner Cole: So they could actually come in with a request for a building twice as high as of the Webb Building?

Mr. Schulz: In theory, yes, they could, yeah.

Commissioner Cole: Or larger? Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Schroll?

Commissioner Schroll: I have a clarifying question for staff. On page 7 of the staff report, this first real paragraph there talks about a--the applicant is dedicating 1919

square feet to the County but it is now encumbered by a street easement. Where on the site is that?

Mr. Schulz: It's in one of the 4.1s. They are--it's the current Webb Building now, which has a large street easement around it and it is along--the two portions, I think, are along Fairfax Drive. The rest of what is the current street easement on the--there are no easements right now on the Carpool site. The street easement on the Webb Building site, back in a time when we called everything street easement, they will convert to sidewalk easement because that's what it really is. It's a easement for the sidewalk and not for the street purposes. But they will be dedicating on Randolph and Fairfax two areas that are in the actual bed of the street in fee simple to us.

Commissioner Schroll: Okay, that's helpful.

Commissioner Forinash: Can I ask if the applicant has an exhibit that might illustrate the location of those easements? I don't see it in the presentation materials.

Mr. Lunger: We do and we submitted encroachment applications with our 4.1 application. Do we have 'em in the reference slides?

Commissioner Forinash: Great. Why don't we give you a minute to find that and we'll move on to other questions. Commissioner Ciotti?

Commissioner Ciotti: I just have a follow-up on the presentation on the Webb Building that it will be expected to come--when it comes in for redevelopment, it will be expected to comply with all the standards, streetscape plans, and planning documents of the time. You know, it's--my question is it's so elevated. Is it gonna be able to be, when it comes in for redevelopment, to come down to grade? Or is the garage under there?

Mr. Lunger: So one of the things staff has proposed is, you know, we have the existing Webb Building which was approved by Ordinance back in 1964 where the County Board accepted a street easement dedication and allowed and approved by Ordinance the Webb Building's garage to extend under that street easement so they specifically accepted a surface easement as opposed to a fee dedication along Quincy and along--excuse me, along Randolph and along Fairfax Drive. And so what staff is putting into the conditions is what they have explained to us with--so what staff has explained to us in very clear detail is that if we come in and redevelop the Webb Building, they will either expect us to remove the garage from under the street easement and dedicate it in fee to the County as a fee simple dedication for a public street and utilities dedication. Or they'll expect us to pay them for the amount of density that the garage creates, if it's going to remain.

Commissioner Ciotti: If I could follow up. But what's from the pavement up? Are you going to be able to bring the entrance down to grade to make it compliant with standard sites now?

Mr. Lunger: Yes, exactly. So if we just--so if we redevelop the Webb Building, we will--and everybody decides it's the best thing to do is to remove the existing underground structure, that's exactly what we will do. Just bring everything down, sure.

Commissioner Forinash: But to be clear, it would require the removal of the underground garage or the reconstruction of the underground garage?

Mr. Lunger: That's correct. And it's such a huge piece of land actually, I mean, it's over 56,000 feet. There's plenty of room for garage space. We're only down two levels there and we're at, like, 30% utilization rates on the whole project.

Commissioner Forinash: Thank you. Further questions? Do you have the--okay, this is addressing Commissioner Schroll's question about the location of the easements or the--sorry, the fee simple transfer related to easements, correct?

Mr. Schulz: You see the two small spots where it says "right of way dedication," and the rest of that was--and then the rest will be an easement for a sidewalk and utilities. On this side, on the Webb Building side, like--there's no mouse. It's not computer. But on the left side, you see there was an extremely large street easement granted in the '60s in which the garage encroaches. The existing garage doesn't go under the street, it just goes under the sidewalk. So that will be transferred to a sidewalk easement and then, when the Webb Building redevelops, we expect the garage that encroaches to be demolished and then the plinth lowered and, you know, there probably--I mean, they could probably strip, you know, strip clean the whole site. And then, you know, modern, you know, at-grade development.

Commissioner Forinash: Thank you, Mr. Schulz. Other questions or discussion around site design and characteristics? Moving on to building architecture. Form--you'll see the list that Commissioner Gutshall provided of the specific issues related to architecture that were discussed at SPRC. Mr. Gutshall?

BUILDING ARCHITECTURE

Commissioner Gutshall: I had a question for staff on the rooftop uses and lighting. So Condition 56, the Rooftop Lighting Plan. We had sort of adapted this condition and for Red Top Cab and for some others, to have a little, slightly different language to allow the civic association to have an opportunity to see--to have a meeting with the civic association, right, and have an opportunity just to comment on the final design and use of the rooftop use. You're nodding your head so I think you know what I'm talking about, right? Yeah. And so when we--when Red Top Cab came through last month, we--I was glad to see this, the modified condition there. This is currently, right now, I think that this building probably doesn't have, at least it wasn't expressed at SPRC the immediate concerns of the neighbors but I am thinking long-term here, you know, this project could be sold off separately and then Webb Development--Webb Building could come in for redevelopment by another owner so we really have to think of these in the long term and being good neighbors. And if staff--did staff have a conversation with the applicant

about that revised language to accommodate the rooftop use but do it in a way to make sure that we're compatible with the neighborhood?

Mr. Schulz: No. I had seen that it was done at Red Top Cab but I didn't--this was the standard--this is kind of the standard language for that condition. I didn't bring it up with the applicant just because it was the standard language and I don't recall Ballston Virginia Square expressing concerns. However, I--it's probably okay to do, I mean if the developer agrees to. But it should be that they don't get a sign-off on the plan, that they just share that with them. But staff ultimately is responsible.

Commissioner Gutshall: I think it was very consistent with the way, like, for the preconstruction meeting where you basically just--the applicant would be required to document that they've met with the neighborhood. And the one key thing that, and actually I think the real key for this moving forward for the long term, is the provision for a community liaison so if there ever were issues, hey, somebody's throwing beer pong balls off the roof or something like that, you know, that there's a way to get in touch with somebody. I think it's very worthwhile language and I would encourage both staff and the applicant to pursue that. Again, thinking of the long haul here for the life of the site plan, not because there were immediate concerns expressed at SPRC. Thank you.

TRANSPORTATION

Commissioner Forinash: Other questions for discussion around building architecture? Next session, transportation. I have a couple of streetscape--it's not sidewalk but street configuration questions for Mr. Schulz. One was, I think, already addressed or at least mentioned by Commissioner Schroll in the context of the Transportation Commission discussion, which is the bike lane and other streetscape elements on Quincy Street. It sounded like--well, actually, it didn't sound like anything. What is staff's take on that position by the Transportation Commission?

Mr. Schulz: I have Jane Kim from the Department of Environmental Services Transportation Planning Division with me.

Commissioner Forinash: Good evening, Miss Kim.

Ms. Kim: Hi. We are actually as, since the Transportation Commission hearing, we are in discussion with the applicant's civil engineer to see if we can maximize the cross-section of North Quincy to incorporate wider bicycle lanes. If there's any room there, they will go to the bicycle lanes. I believe the, for instance, one of the parking lanes on the other side of the street is slightly larger than the minimum 7 foot required so we can allocate any extra space back to the bike lane so we're taking a look and trying to get as wide of a bike lane as we can, while still keeping with the sidewalk and design as has been approved by SPRC.

Commissioner Forinash: And Commissioner Schroll, did the--remind me of the language of the Transportation Commission. Was it to keep the bike lane at its current 7-foot-plus width or was it just to restore width as much as possible?

Mr. Schulz: I believe the language was to revisit the cross-section on Quincy Street to, you know, maximize the bike lane.

Ms. Kim: The--as--if I can speak, the big addition to the section is the inclusion of on-street parking on the Carpool frontage on Quincy where there's currently no on-street parking today. So that is where some of the roadway width has gone on the portion that is south of the pedestrian nub. So there's a pedestrian curb extension and then there's, I think, two on-street parking spaces on that side. And so we're looking to just maximize that section.

Commissioner Forinash: Can you direct me to an exhibit that shows that? I'm looking at the applicant's presentation, page 25, which I understand is further north than the section you're talking about with on-street parking but I'm not seeing where we have width for on-street parking.

Mr. Lunger: And Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, we did listen to the Transportation Commission's recommendations last week and are confident if not certain we can pick up a foot on our side of the street and so if DES has more room on the other side of the street that they don't need, I think, you know, we're definitely gonna get to the 6-foot range for the bike lane and maybe even get, you know, to the 7 foot, depending on what DES can pick up on the other side of the street.

Commissioner Forinash: Great. That's great to hear. Commissioner Schroll?

Commissioner Schroll: I just wanna thank the applicant and staff for listening to the Transportation Commission and working to an agreement there. I certainly appreciate it and I'm sure my colleagues on the Transportation Commission do as well. So thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Thanks for bringing up this exhibit. The dimension I'm not seeing and I could do some math to figure it out is the width of that planting strip. It looks like, if it corresponds to section B on applicant's page 25, it says 4 foot minimum. It looks like before the on-street parking starts, it's somewhat wider than 4 feet, the planting strip. Is--in the sense it's a continuous strip, are we confident that it can actually support the long-term health of the trees that are drawn?

Ms. Kim: The minimum planting strip for--that our urban forester and our landscape architect has recommended is 4 feet wide so.

Commissioner Forinash: Four foot width and then there's the soil volume.

Ms. Kim: Yeah. It's the continuous panel that is more important than the depth so. The tree pits have a 5-foot minimum, a continuous panel has a 4-foot minimum.

Commissioner Forinash: So if it's an isolated pit, a rectangle that the tree is in, it has to be at least 5 feet minimum dimension and otherwise, in a strip like this, 4? Okay. Thank you. The other question I had about street configuration was the next--actually, not the next one from this. Page 26 in the applicant's presentation about Randolph Street. I'm just confused again about where some width is coming from and I think this is another question for Mr. Schulz and Miss Kim. That in the existing section notes, it adds up to 35-1/2 feet and in the proposed section notes, it adds up to 31 feet so I guess the question is where's the other 4-1/2 feet going?

Ms. Kim: The extra width comes from the street. The lanes currently are 12-1/2 feet wide and so we are narrowing the lanes to our standard, more acceptable, narrower lanes.

Commissioner Forinash: But it's not extra width. It's actually--the current section shown is 30--it's half-section, I guess--is 35-1/2 feet and the new section's 31. So you're not taking width away, you're throwing more into the street or something. We're not adding vehicle lanes there, I imagine.

Ms. Kim: No, we're not. I mean--

Commissioner Forinash: So what are we adding that's taking up that 4-1/2 feet?

Ms. Kim: We're adding sidewalk and planting strip.

Commissioner Forinash: On the other side of Randolph Street?

Ms. Kim: No, on the side of the Webb Building.

Commissioner Forinash: Am I doing the math wrong?

Mr. Schulz: So just to provide some clarity, I think Ms. Kim was referring to the Quincy Street section. If we go to the Randolph section, could you pull that up? I think the travel width--that the traveling widths are quite a bit larger than 12-1/2 feet. I think you guys just got mixed up.

Commissioner Forinash: If you do pull up page 26 from the applicant's materials, I'm not sure if it was in the presentation tonight or not. Yeah, there. So if you add up those dimensions at the top, it's 35-1/2 feet. If you add up the dimensions at the bottom, it's 31 feet. So my question is, there's 4-1/2 feet of width unaccounted for in that bottom drawing. Where's it going?

Mr. Lunger: Right. They went from 17-1/2-foot travel lanes to 11-foot travel lanes and they added a turn lane and added a 4-1/2-foot planting strip.

Commissioner Forinash: So there's a left-turn lane now in that section of Randolph? That's what's not shown perhaps.

Mr. Lunger: Exactly. And again, the lanes are just enormous. They're 17 feet and--

Commissioner Forinash: True. I'm not arguing that there's certainly width available for it. But it's the turn lane, I think, that's missing from this diagram that makes it a little hard to understand.

Mr. Schulz: Yeah, turn lane is missing from the--

Commissioner Forinash: So is there--there's not a turn lane now. There is essentially a 17-foot-- Mr. Lutostanski, if you want to, you can--

Mr. Lutostanski: Can I say something?

Commissioner Forinash: Please.

Mr. Lutostanski: John Lutostanski from Bowman Consulting. You're looking at half of the section right there. Actually, what you're missing is that the existing lanes are 17 feet--there you go. The existing lanes are 17 feet wide. Very, very wide lanes and so what we're gonna do, is we'll be adding a turn lane down the middle. And then there's a 4-foot planting, the continuous planting strip, and then the 9-foot minimum sidewalk. And that's--so this is the whole section minus the far side and that's what--

Commissioner Forinash: That gives me what I need, which is we're carving out formal space for a left-turn lane on Northbound Randolph where, right now, it's an informal condition with a sort of double-wide lane that people can use however they choose. Okay, that's helpful. Thank you, all three of you, all four. Other questions on transportation? Commissioner Sockwell?

Commissioner Sockwell: I could not make most of the SPRC meetings either so the question I ask may be pretty obvious but is the bicycle storage facility only for residential use?

Mr. Lunger: That's a good question. I don't know why it would not be for retail employees or anything like that. We hadn't thought--I don't think we've thought about isolating the garage for residential uses.

Commissioner Sockwell: It strikes me that because the particular site of the facility really is at the intersection of two major bike paths, this would be an obvious place for either retail employee or for public use if the facility is not completely parked up. A hundred and thirty-two spaces, while it's not an enormous number, is a substantial number and it also strikes me that at that particular juncture, you're gonna have a lot of

cycle usage and there's not a lot of storage space, particularly at grade. So I think it's a real opportunity to actually accommodate some more bicycle parking. And, to the extent that there might be some public usage, I would encourage staff to sort of talk with the applicant and explore conditions or circumstances under which you might actually have some signage or some direction for the public to use the secured space. I mean, the whole notion that it's secured, you know, it--you can look at that two ways. One way is that it's secure for the residents but another way is, is that it's secure for people just using the facility. And since it's got a shower and skylights and whatnot, it sounds like it's gonna be a pretty attractive facility and an opportunity that probably should be explored a little bit more. Thanks.

Mr. Lunger: Definitely. You know, we haven't--it's something that's new. It's new with this project and definitely, I think, worth thinking through and, you know, we haven't got all the answers yet but we think it's gonna be a very positive amenity for sure.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Gutshall and then Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner Gutshall: Yeah, I'd like to follow up on that and thank you, Commissioner Sockwell, that's an excellent suggestion idea and something we've talked about in other site plans asking, you know, to try to work--or even in our sector plans, trying to work in a community storage facility. I like the idea a lot. So I have a follow-up question for staff or, I dunno, perhaps Mr. Lunger, as the attorney, might know better, which is, "Is the developer precluded in any way by zoning ordinance or otherwise from leasing those spaces if you wanted to make those available to the public?"

Mr. Lunger: No.

PARKING

Commissioner Gutshall: Great. On another topic, Mr. Chair, if I may, I'd like to ask about the parking ratio. So at the time of SPRC and still now, I gather, the County is undergoing its survey and study of parking ratios--residential parking ratios. And I don't believe, Mr. Schulz, that study has been presented yet. It's complete, is that correct?

Mr. Schulz: No, it's not.

Commissioner Gutshall: It is mentioned in the staff report, though, and obviously there's some information that's been made available from the initial work of that that goes towards staff's support of the 0.8. What I would be interested to know, because at SPRC, I think there was a fairly strong emphasis placed on the notion of an enhanced TDM. Could you just review quickly, if you wouldn't mind, what components of the TDM here are used to support the lower parking ratio? And I might also add there's also the--just for everyone's clarity, there are a small--I don't remember the exact number--a small number of spaces that are also of office parking in the Webb Building, surface spaces that are being lost.

Ms. Kim: So traditionally, for the lower parking ratios and the relation to enhanced TDM is that enhanced TDM kicks in for the number of spaces needed to get the parking ratio up to whatever the standard is generally for this type of development one to one. So if--for this development, they're short 66 spaces to get to that ratio and so we have actually, because this is a unique situation where the developer owns both the Webb Building garage and this new garage, we're looking at this shared parking opportunity before we look at enhanced TDM measures. So if you look at Condition number 32 in the draft staff report, it states that "developer also agrees to make office parking spaces located at the Webb Building at 4040 Fairfax Drive available to residents of the residential building for overnight parking. The developer further agrees to construct knockout panels with pedestrian doors between the proposed new garage and the existing garage at 4040 Fairfax Drive." So in the event that those 66 spaces cannot be accommodated in the Webb Building, the TDM Condition number 42 kicks in the enhanced TDM which is additional SmarTrip, Metrocard, Bikeshare membership, whatever the tenant would choose. And that is for a 30-year period of time.

Commissioner Gutshall: So the enhanced TDM only kicks in if the 66 spaces are not available for some reason?

Ms. Kim: Right, which we have no indication from the applicant at this point that that would apply.

Commissioner Gutshall: Is the punch-through of the garage, is that gonna be--I mean, before it was a punch-through panel that was--a punch-out panel, right? Is that--are you just gonna construct it now already punched out?

Mr. Lunger: That's a point of clarification. So we'll bring in the panel so we've aligned the levels of the garage so that they can line up and accommodate a jointly managed garage. So we've spent the design time and money and we're putting in the design components now to allow the garages to be co-utilized and co-managed at a future date if, for some reason, the garage operates over capacity.

Commissioner Gutshall: So right now, those 66 spaces would be essentially next door to the, effectively, to the residents if they need them? Is your expectation that you won't even need them?

Mr. Lunger: So I mean, everybody talks about utilization rates and the County's had a multi-year, multi-building data collection exercise and the County zone numbers are showing we're at a utilization rate in every quarter of, you know, 66%. So we're well above that and we have the opportunity of having done our own utilization study of existing residential buildings and we came in, you know, very similar, right around at 0.7% so we believe we're over-parking this garage. We think, you know, that trend will continue and if, for some reason, they invent something new that people need parking spaces for, we'll have room in the Webb Building because, right now, the Webb Building is serious--is literally operating at about a one-third ratio.

Commissioner Gutshall: Is the building fully leased?

Mr. Lunger: The building is 60%? Sixty percent leased and the garage is thirty percent occupied, at its peak time, at its worst times.

Commissioner Gutshall: Sure. So for staff, how does--how do you envision--how does this get enforced? I mean, how do we know at some point, you know, 5 years after construction is complete, how do we know where the 66 spaces are and what the utilization rate is and what's going on?

Ms. Kim: So part of the TDM condition includes yearly monitoring and the participation in surveys and so, from that information, we'll be able to monitor the actions of the applicant with respect to the garage.

Mr. Lunger: And to clarify. The County makes us pay for those surveys. So it's not us doing the surveys. We write the County a very big check and they go fit* it out and they spend more than they should on the survey. But it's the County's surveys, not our surveys of the garage utilization rate.

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole, is it on the same topic? And then Commissioner Ciotti on the same topic.

Commissioner Cole: I do want to follow up on this because it's--there are several issues that I think are important here. And I wanna start with the 0.8 parking ratio. In the discussions that we've had in Ballston Corridor, the request for parking ratio in that site plan, is significantly less than the 0.8 but it was also acknowledged that the lowest parking ratio approved to date is 0.89. And I thought I heard you say that 0.8 was approved for the Red Top Cab site. Is that correct?

Ms. Kim: I believe so, yes.

Commissioner Cole: You believe so? But you're not certain?

Mr. Schulz: That's how the planner had represented it to me, yes.

Commissioner Cole: And what--were there any accommodations made for the 0.8 at the Red Top Cab site in case the demand was greater than that?

Ms. Kim: They had an enhanced TDM condition for the net lost number of spaces with the additional SmarTrip carshare and bikeshare provision.

Commissioner Cole: But they didn't have to provide parking spaces to the extent--

Ms. Kim: No. They--

Commissioner Cole: Okay, so--okay. In terms of the compensation to the people who might wanna have a car but wouldn't have a car presumably, I wanna understand what these accommodations are. In particular, the first one says a SmarTrip card or successor fare medium plus \$65. Is that \$65 a month? Is that \$65 a year?

Ms. Kim: It's a one-time.

Commissioner Cole: It's a one-time payment?

Ms. Kim: Yes.

Commissioner Cole: And do you have any idea of roughly how many rides on Metro one might get for that?

Ms. Kim: I'm not sure what the average number would be.

Commissioner Cole: Do you know what the average--

Mr. Schulz: You know, Metro fares are, of course, based on distance so it depends.

Commissioner Cole: No, I do--I am--but there's an average, no doubt.

Commissioner Cole: It's a week. It's a week's worth of Metro is what they would get. And it's not indexed for the increase in Metro fares over time.

Ms. Kim: That's correct.

Commissioner Cole: Do you--doesn't it make sense to index this so that the value of this stays pace with the cost of--

Ms. Kim: The value is tied to, I believe, the CP--what is it? The CPI.

Commissioner Cole: Is the point made aware that--where it says that?

Ms. Kim: It is. It's under the main condition. It's on page 76, "All dollar-denominated rates shall be adjusted [inaudible] inflation by the CPI calculation."

Commissioner Cole: And do we know that Metro rates have been tracking the CPIU as opposed to their own sort of--we're seeing a big head nod here that it's actually going up much more quickly than the CPIU.

Ms. Kim: I am not aware.

Commissioner Cole: So I would suggest that staff review the actual pattern there. It also seems to me that \$65 in lieu of a year parking space is not very much. The second

thing is, it says "1-year carshare membership." Can you actually drive a car if you have a 1-year carshare membership if you don't spend any more money?

Ms. Kim: I'm not sure how the actual program--

Commissioner Cole: You can't get in a car is what my colleague down here is saying. You must actually pay more for it. So the carshare memberships gives you the privilege of renting the car on a day-to-day basis but it doesn't actually get you a car. So it seems to me that the--that there's a significant gap in equivalence between the TDM measures that are designed to encourage people not to have cars and what they're forgoing if they have a car which is regular access at little daily expense.

Ms. Kim: I believe there's also the factor of market desires. There are going to be more than likely a certain number of residents that will live in this building that do not own a car, do not have an interest in a car.

Commissioner Cole: Again, the whole purpose--but the whole purpose of this, that's what the 8--0.8 is suggesting. That 20% of the people in here will not have cars. These provisions are designed to accommodate the needs of people in the event that the 0.8 is wrong.

Ms. Kim: Or is also for most enhanced TDM conditions, it's to further incentivize these people to continue their practices of not having a car.

Commissioner Cole: But these only kick in if the demand for parking spaces exceeds what's possible in the building. That means we've missed on the 0.8 and therefore we need more parking spaces in order to reduce the amount of parking spaces that we might need. For example--or that might be available, rather. If the Webb Building gets redeveloped, it's possible that part of the garage could be out of commission during that redevelopment. I imagine it would be. And yet, the only way that these people get compensated if we're--if they had parking spaces in the Webb Building garage, the only way they get compensated for the loss of those parking spaces is this way. So it's all designed to compensate for people when the 0.8 is wrong. And this seems totally inadequate to me that, in lieu of a parking space, they get \$65. Or in lieu of a parking space, they get the privilege of spending their own money to get--use a carshare.

Commissioner Forinash: Although I believe it's in lieu of paying for a parking space.

Commissioner Cole: Is it?

Commissioner Forinash: Yeah, well, I think our standard conditions require the unbund--in rental apartments, require the unbundling of parking from residential--what's it called? Rent.

Mr. Lunger: Right. And so--and just--

Commissioner Forinash: Mr. Lunger, just approach the microphone a little bit closer.

Mr. Lunger: So, and again, contemplating the fact that the Webb Building might be redeveloped at some point in the future, we would have to come back in for a major site plan amendment and we'll know very well what the utilization rate is when we come back in for that application. And so if, again, for some reason, parking usage increases by the county's own numbers, 14%, we're at capacity. If parking increases by 20%, you know, we're 6% under--or over capacity. But at that point, if we're gonna be taking parking spaces out of commission in the Webb Building, the County's gonna be able to require us to make those provisions at that time through the site plan process.

Commissioner Cole: So these provisions don't affect that, then?

Mr. Lunger: That's right. Also this governs the interim situation where the Webb Building is not redeveloped.

Commissioner Cole: Or some other circumstance arises that takes some of those parking spaces out of commission?

Mr. Lunger: Right. But we're gonna be required by a condition to continuously provide the 66 spaces as long as the Webb Building exists.

Commissioner Cole: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: One of your team, Mr. Lunger, wanted to add something.

Andrew McIntyre: Good evening. Andrew McIntyre at Penzance. One of the other things that I would just wanna just offer up and I'm sure most people know this is that we are really focused on trying to put a building into place that is gonna meet market demand. If we do not get this right, we're gonna have bigger financial implications, other than just, you know, the \$65 card. People who want to park and they can't park here because we no longer have parking, we're gonna have a building that won't be occupied. Now the balancing act is every time we build a parking space at \$45,000, \$55,000 a space, that we don't need as a community, is just more money that we're adding to the cost of housing in Arlington. And so the reason these utilization studies are so important and the reason we focus on 'em is because we're trying to get the numbers right and bring down that cost and make sure that we're not building things that just sit there vacant at the bottom of these pits--or at the bottom of our parking garages, and that's what we're finding we're doing. And so we--I don't think that we're getting out into uncharted territory here but we're very sensitive to the fact that we don't wanna lose business to our competitors because they have parking, we don't.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole, on this specific--

Commissioner Cole: One final comment related to that. And it has to do with the ongoing residential parking study. When there was an office parking study, there was a

citizens' task force that was working hand-in-hand with staff on that. Is there an anticipation that there will be a similar task force for the residential parking study? The residential parking study was generated by a recommendation from the Planning Commission originally and I think our expectation was that there would be a citizen task force that would work on that along with--

Ms. Kim: Yeah, that is the expectation. The residential parking study, I believe, is still gathering data on existing utilization rates through the R-B Corridor and Crystal City areas of the County. And they are working towards getting a citizen group together as well.

Commissioner Cole: Okay, 'cause, you know, we--we're very sensitive, you know, as you no doubt are aware, for office parking the change has been to establish maximums, not minimums. And if that makes sense for the residential parking as well, you'd find support for that here. At the same time, we generally have to consider existing policy when we look at things. And existing policy's one to one here, so.

Commissioner Forinash: If I may, I know Commissioner Ciotti wants to jump in on the same topic but I'm actually concerned if there hasn't been any sort of public participation or engagement around the residential parking study that we're already essentially extending policy flexibility to developers to go below the minimum without, frankly, without any enhanced TDM or other mitigation. The way that we ended up framing it and I was on the Commercial Parking Task Force was that, you know, the costs of mitigating, whether that's providing parking or whether that's enhancing the pedestrian streetscape so that people can arrive at your building comfortably on foot, the costs of mitigating arrival and departure of people coming to your building are to be borne by the applicant to a large degree. So I fear that what we're doing here is essentially giving away the lever that we have that is County policy, enunciated Board-driven policy around minimum parking requirements, and not getting the level of mitigation, as Commissioner Cole detailed, that we need to mitigate the impacts of people coming to and from these buildings. So what's the timetable for getting this data out in the open and getting this policy change in front of the policymakers?

Ms. Kim: I'm not sure as to the exact timetable but I believe that they are looking to get a group together early next year, 2016. I could--I'm not completely sure what the schedule of that task force would be but I know that the conversations are constantly ongoing and we, as staff, in the absence of a policy, are trying to, at the very least, be somewhat consistent across these plans with the enhanced TDM condition language and things like that.

Commissioner Forinash: Careful, 'cause we're not in the absence of a policy. We do have Board policy, right? And what we're seeing is a--

Ms. Kim: Yes, in the absence of a new residential parking policy.

Commissioner Forinash: I mean, you know where my policy biases lie on this. But what we're seeing is an erosion of that policy without new guidance from the Board. So I'm growing more concerned that the data hasn't been made publicly available to get the kind of consensus that we need to make these changes to how we require or don't require parking in buildings. Could you--so is this a joint effort between CPHD and DES or is this entirely DES driven at this point?

Ms. Kim: It's currently DES driven, yes.

Commissioner Forinash: Okay. Could you take a message back to Mr. Leach, that I would like to hear very soon from him on this?

Ms. Kim: Yes, I will.

Commissioner Forinash: I'll be conveying that directly too.

Ms. Kim: And I also wanna mention that in addition to the shared parking and enhanced TDM language, the applicant has agreed to pedestrian improvements including the improvements at the signals for either or both intersections. The general contribution is a half signal and they are contributing a full signal contribution of \$350,000 and, additionally, they are improving the pedestrian experience with the extended curb extensions and other infrastructure improvements.

Commissioner Forinash: And I understand all that. But I also, well, I have articulated my position. Miss--Commissioner Ciotti, you wanted to follow up on the issue of parking.

Commissioner Ciotti: Yes, do I understand that it's standard operating procedure now that the apartment and the parking are unbundled?

Mr. Schulz: Yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Ciotti: So they're unbundled. Now, do you rent those spaces to the residents that are renting apartments?

Mr. McIntyre: The spaces are available to the residents as they rent the units but they're not obligated to rent the residential parking spaces.

Commissioner Ciotti: I'm sorry--so they're avail--if somebody moves in, they're not obligated but they can but you don't charge them an extra fee?

Mr. McIntyre: No, we charge for the parking spaces below grade.

Commissioner Ciotti: I can't hear. Can you pull that closer? Thanks so much.

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, we charge for the parking spaces below grade and the residents that move in have the option to rent those parking spaces.

Commissioner Ciotti: Okay. So how much do you typically rent the parking spaces for?

Mr. McIntyre: That varies and is really market driven. I think you'll see up and down the quarter varying rates. We would work with our operating team at the time to price it so it's competitive.

Commissioner Ciotti: So can you give me, you know, you operate a lot of buildings so what are your ranges?

Mr. McIntyre: I believe the standard going rate's around \$100, plus or minus.

Commissioner Ciotti: Right. So--great. If there--there's so much extra parking within two blocks of where you're gonna put this building and there--for rent, for the same amount of money. So the one thing that I'm sure I'm not telling you is that across the street, down the street, there's endless amounts of parking for rent on a monthly basis. Anybody would be happy to have anybody's business and it's competitive, especially what we have in Ballston is a lot of people only drive on weekends or every other weekend. And we have a huge carshare and now Go Car--think it is Go Car--that's available. So personally, I agree with our Chair that we have to get our policy right and it has to be transparent. We must have community citizen participation. However, tonight, I'm comfortable with this. In the interim, hopefully, we can shorten this time until we can enunciate a clear policy. But Ballston is well over-parked and for tonight I'm comfortable with this and yet, at the same time, we have to nail this down in a transparent fashion. And the other question I had, it's not County policy now that we have electric charging stations in the garage, as far as I know, but are you going to?

Mr. McIntyre: Yes, it's our intention to provide carsharing stations--or the ability to charge. I mean, the technology is evolving so whether or not we have an official charging station or the plug-in ports available for the electric cars, we do plan to provide facilities for electric vehicles.

Commissioner Ciotti: Something. Okay. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Forinash: Further questions or discussion on transportation? Open space, Plaza, street trees, et cetera? Commissioner Gutshall?

PLAZA, TRAFFIC MAST ARM

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hopefully, this is kind of a quick question and answer. So on the Plaza, and actually, it's a little bit the Plaza and the retaining wall that makes up the planter. Could we bring up, if you don't mind, on the section there, the--yeah, that's good. So the seating wall that is near Fairfax Drive there, that separates the sidewalk, that's very near the ramp to the crosswalk across Fairfax Drive. At the--by my memory at the last SPRC when we discussed this, we were gonna

see some more detail on this. Is that detail available and, in other words, that seating wall does seem to be, like, right into the ramp there. And I know you've said that--the applicant has previously said that they did not expect that to be a problem but, by my eyes, again just looking at it, it looks to be very close to the ramp. Closer than I can think of seeing anywhere else.

[1:53:43] **Mr. Lunger**: Well, yes, and the seat wall does come to the apex at the top of the ramp and typically on ramps they have a flared section. You know, the flare is what comes out laterally. We have a flared section on the east side, going towards Quincy, but not on the west side. And the reason for that is we have a traffic mast arm right there. So we don't wanna do a flare there 'cause that would, a, encourage people maybe to try to walk there and then they might bump into that. And b, it's just unnecessary. So what we're allowing for is people to make that navigation, north-south, across North Fairfax Street, but not to, quote, unquote, "bump into" the traffic mast arm. And the seat wall is the barrier that sort of precludes that and then the planting behind the seat wall, we think, also kind of tames the entire environment in a certain way so that it doesn't seem like it's just a bunch of, you know, traffic signal boxes and mast arms, which is, in fact, what is there.

Commissioner Gutshall: So for staff, how do you guys--how do we evaluate whether this makes sense that this is not a safety hazard in the making?

Ms. Kim: So the ramp shown is a compliant ramp with just the one wing. It's a type of VDOT-approved ramp that is available for use in circumstances like this where the other wing wouldn't--there's no path that way so you wouldn't provide a ramp for that path. So I believe the--

Commissioner Gutshall: So there's--I'm sorry, so there's planting material? This is why I thought we were gonna get sort of a more detailed--

Ms. Kim: Yeah, there's planting material.

Commissioner Gutshall: So there's mulch or something, plant--ground, unpaved ground, right up next to the ramp?

Ms. Kim: Correct.

Mr. Lunger: Yes. If you look carefully on the plan, the ramped area is a rectangle and then immediately to the left or west of that is the traffic mast arm, which, instead of being in paved area, we're saying that would be in planted area with ground covers.

Commissioner Gutshall: I think I would just comment to my colleagues that I don't see--I see this as a--when you think of, you know, on a Friday evening, people are out, you know, at restaurants and bars and what not, and you got groups of five or more and passing you and trying to cross. I think it's, to me, this is just not smart urban design. But if I'm in the minority, I'll let it go. I just don't get it. I don't see it.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole?

Commissioner Gutshall: I appreciate the applicant's answering my question. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole?

Commissioner Cole: This is a question for staff related to Mr.--to Commissioner Gutshall's comments. If I understand correctly, the applicant will be donating \$350,000 for resignalization of this intersection?

Ms. Kim: Yes.

Commissioner Cole: Couldn't that design move that traffic mast so that a broader, more pedestrian, handicap-friendly ramp could be located there?

Ms. Kim: The contribution would be for capital projects so the capital project improvement could consider the redesign of that flared ramp area, yes.

Commissioner Cole: And that's--so that contribution must be used on this intersection? It's not just a general contribution?

Ms. Kim: It's for either this intersection or the Randolph and Fairfax intersection. The--this intersection also has a half-signal contribution from the funeral home site so it can--the contribution can be used for either--

Commissioner Cole: So there is a full contribution for this whole length of this intersection?

Ms. Kim: Right. It's actually two half contributions for each of--

Commissioner Cole: That equals a whole, though, as far as I'm concerned.

Ms. Kim: Right.

Commissioner Cole: Yeah, that [inaudible] hasn't been built, that's true. Neither has this. It just seems to me that when we have the opportunity to redesign this in a way that is more pedestrian-friendly, more friendly to those who need particularly accessibility accommodations, why don't we build it into the site plan? Is there a reason not to do that?

Ms. Kim: No, we can--and we can--

Commissioner Cole: And I do understand that a half--a single wing is compliant with VDOT requirements. I get that. But in terms of the spirit of Arlington, why don't we

wanna do it right? And if we're gonna be rebuilding the signalization for this intersection, why not do it right the first time?

Ms. Kim: We can take another look with the architect to see if we can improve the safety concerns that Commissioner Gutshall has presented with kind of the transition between the planted area and the ramp and the space between the signal arm and the end of the ramp.

Commissioner Cole: Okay. Also related to this, the sidewalk narrows in part because of the seating area on the street side of the sidewalk. Can you tell me what the dimension is of this?

Ms. Kim: The dimension between the two seat walls is 12.3 feet.

Commissioner Cole: Not between the two seat walls.

Ms. Kim: Okay.

Commissioner Cole: I'm interested in what the concrete--what appears to be concrete paved portion is, the clear sidewalk there.

Commissioner Cole: Somebody--well, the grade's not clear 'cause it's encumbered by tables down, further down that way.

Ms. Kim: It's still 12 feet. It's 12 feet. The clear sidewalk width in that area is 12 feet.

Commissioner Cole: Can you show me a drawing that shows that?

Commissioner Cole: And the standard, as I recall, is 16 feet 8? Am I correct?

Ms. Kim: I believe the 16 feet 8 is for the entire sidewalk width, including the tree-planting area. So the 12.3 plus the width of the seat wall plus the planting strip and then the 8-inch bit, like, paver border would be compliant.

Commissioner Cole: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Harner, you had a follow-up?

Commissioner Harner: Thanks, Commissioner Forinash. I'd just like to ask either Mr. Lunger or Mr. Lutostanski if they have any knowledge of why this traffic mast could not be moved a little further west or relocated in order to make that a little more comfortable in that zone.

Mr. Lunger: So we can definitely look at that and, you know, we're hearing you, so we'll take a second look at that before this goes to the Board. See if we can't solve it. But, you know, there's a lot of things happening. A lot of alignments have to happen between

the Quincy Street, the Quincy Street turn lanes, how everything falls out, and so I think what we've done is put the crosswalk where the County wants it and then the mast arm and the crosswalk, it all has to kind of come together and this is where the mast arm landed. And so, based on this design, this is just sort of how things wound up and we can go back and see if we can't--you know, if we tweak something on this side of the intersection, then, you know, 200 feet down on Randolph Street, it's gonna change something. So this was our, I think, part of our overall best design for the 200 feet or so we were planning on the alignment of Fairfax Drive and so, again, this is where the mast arms lined up. Again, the County's asked us to pay for, not only our side of the intersection but the Bernstein side for the Black Box Theatre if he never gets a tenant in there and that doesn't happen for a number of years and so we're proceeding with the whole realignment and--

Commissioner Harner: Yeah. I mean, I--no, I really appreciate it and thanks to Commissioner Gutshall for bringing it up because if you just look at the intersection on Randolph Street, you've got the full blend* on the apron and the mast arm is off to the side so if there's no reason why the--you know, we can't move that mast arm to get something equivalent, it just seems like that would be--

Mr. Lunger: Right. And again--

Commissioner Harner: Excuse me, Quincy.

Mr. Lunger: And again, we put the mast arm where we were told to put it, so. Right, so I think--

Commissioner Harner: So maybe you put it somewhere else that you're told to put it.

Mr. Lunger: If there's another place to put it, we're happy to put it there as well, obviously.

Commissioner Harner: Thanks.

Mr. Lunger: Sure.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Gutshall, same topic?

Commissioner Gutshall: It is and just to conclude my thought on it, which is the mast arm, certainly the preference would be to relocate the mast arm but I actually think that the seating wall exacerbates the condition. It's one thing to have a mast arm which, you know, yes, people could bump into it. I don't think the seating wall really prevents people from bumping into a mast arm and I don't think that's a--the most dangerous aspect of it. I think it's very likely that somebody could trip over the seating wall because it's right in an area where you're expecting to be able to--again, when you have--if it's just a few people there, this would not be an issue. But when you have crowds, people with strollers, people in wheelchairs, and people get pushed to the side, I think that it's a--

look at it as just a--as a tripping hazard, frankly. So I think the seating wall is an independent issue of the mast arm.

Commissioner Forinash: Further questions or discussion on open space? Community benefits? Construction issues? Commissioner Schroll?

CONSTRUCTION PHASING

Commissioner Schroll: Just wondering if the applicant can walk through some of the phasing of the construction, which streets you're thinking to shut down, when. I know there's the standard circulation conditions but if you could walk through sort of the circulation deciding the construction phasing, that would be helpful.

[2:03:38] **Mr. Lunger:** We've worked with our general contractor, John Moriarty & Associates, who is certainly familiar with our [inaudible] requirements regarding means of traffic and site circulation. They've put together a draft site utilization plan which we shared during the SPRC and we could certainly make it available. But it's our full intention to provide a covered and secure walkway during the vertical structure development construction. And at which point in time that structure was complete and we're able to reopen the sidewalks, we would but at all times we would maintain a continuous pedestrian flow around the site.

Commissioner Schroll: Okay, that's helpful. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussion on construction issues and phasing? Or any remaining issues? Commissioner Gutshall?

SITE PLAN CONDITIONS

Commissioner Gutshall: I had a question on site plan conditions. It's a general broad question for staff. As I understand from the staff report, the conditions that are in the staff report, these apply only to the proposed redevelopment at 4000 Fairfax Drive and that there are, it says, I believe it says, Conditions 1 through 15 of the original site plan 46 would apply to 4040, the Webb Building. Is that correct?

Mr. Schulz: Right, the original site plan conditions including the Marymount, TDM, and things like that, will still--we wanted to make sure that it didn't--that adopting the--it's a procedural thing. Adopting this didn't invalidate all of those conditions. Now, however, throughout the staff report, while the conditions are largely for the 4000 site, there are areas where it does apply also to--where staff has marked out where this applies also to 4040 including the landscaping, the construction of sidewalks, et cetera, that would apply to those site. And the TDM too, which actually, since your staff report, we've updated a little bit.

Commissioner Gutshall: So once they're in totality, though, site plan is gonna have duplicate conditions 1 through 15. This is a little bit pedantic but I think it could be

important in terms of how--one, because I think, as a comment, I would suggest that when something comes forward next time in a similar situation, I actually would find it useful in particular, I didn't realize that the Marymount TDM was in there when I was reading through the conditions. I did see that in the staff report. But just knowing what the whole package is. But I do wonder and I assume that the County attorney has obviously looked at this. Is there not an issue with having two number ones and two number twos?

Mr. Schulz: No, no. As long as the headings are correct. Yeah, we worked on them with this just to make sure that--and it's like any other--we've--any other site plan where there's been a major revision, a multi-building site plan where there's conditions for each particular set. So this doesn't--it's interesting to note just as a side fact that the Webb Building's Conditions 1 through 15, totally different from the, you know, it was approved in 1964. One of the conditions was to have a fall-out shelter and things like that. So they don't duplicate it. Their 1 through 15 conditions, totally different from what we have.

Commissioner Gutshall: Understood. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Thank you. Remaining issues or questions? Commissioner Iacomini?

Commissioner Iacomini: I know I'm gonna hate myself for asking this but if we could just go back to the drawing--

Commissioner Forinash: The one that's on the screen.

Commissioner Iacomini: It's on the screen. Why does it say traffic light pole to remain?

Commissioner Forinash: In the upper right, there are two arrow leaders pointing to what looks a lot like nothing, one of which is labeled traffic light pole to remain.

Commissioner Forinash: Mr. Lutostanski's thinking, "I cannot believe I put the drawing up--"

Mr. Schulz: According to John, it was--they had not had the discussion to move it at the time they did this drawing.

Commissioner Iacomini: Okay, good. I just didn't want us to have a remnant of a traffic pole left just in case so that it was, you know, in the sidewalk.

Commissioner Forinash: I think that's resolved. Further questions or discussion before we move to a motion? Commissioner Gutshall?

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE

Commissioner Gutshall: Yes, Mr. Chair. I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the County Board that they adopt the attached ordinance to approve the subject site plan amendment request to add site area to the existing site plan SP number 46 and to construct an approximately 333,000 square foot residential building that includes approximately 8000 square feet of retail space of 22 stories of the additional site area, with 264 underground parking spaces with modifications of use regulations for number of parking spaces, compact parking ratio, height, bonus density for LEED Gold, exclusion of vertical shafts from gross floor area, and all other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development.

Commissioner Forinash: Do I hear a second?

Commissioner Schroll: Second.

Commissioner Forinash: Seconded by Commissioner Schroll. Discussion? Or amendments? Commissioner Sockwell? You've been gone so long, I keep forgetting your name now.

Commissioner Sockwell: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask unanimous consent that the Planning Commission recommend that the County Board direct staff to discuss with the applicant the potential usage of the bike facility by non-residents of the buildings and, if appropriate, develop a condition.

Commissioner Forinash: Without objection, added to the main motion. Further discussion or amendments? Commissioner Ciotti?

Commissioner Ciotti: I ask unanimous consent to recommend to the County Board that they have two curb cuts at each corner at Quincy and Fairfax, and Randolph and Fairfax.

Commissioner Forinash: Is that not the case?

Commissioner Ciotti: It looks like there's only one ADA curb cut at Quincy.

Commissioner Forinash: Are you speaking of the one north there across--

Commissioner Ciotti: Yes. The--with two wings but it only goes in one direction. It goes across Quincy.

Commissioner Forinash: So right, so that's the issue we discussed about the location of the new signal pole.

Mr. Schulz: There is another on the right to--on Quincy and Fairfax, heading east-west.

Commissioner Forinash: Right. They're two wings if that's the right term.

Commissioner Ciotti: But there's not one heading across Fairfax.

Commissioner Forinash: There's a ramp--

Mr. Schulz: There is.

Commissioner Forinash: And there's one wing but not a second wing because of the location of the pole.

Commissioner Harner: Objection.

Commissioner Forinash: [inaudible] objection to that unanimous consent request.

Commissioner Harner: And Commissioner Forinash, I objected just so that we could clarify this perhaps. I just wasn't clear on your unanimous consent request.

Commissioner Ciotti: So I would like to make a motion that we recommend to the County Board that they direct staff to look at having full compliance with two wings for each curb cut, crossing Fairfax and crossing Quincy and Randolph.

Commissioner Forinash: Motion was made. Before a second?

Commissioner Cole: Curb cuts are--is a very general. Aren't you really talking about pedestrian ramps?

Commissioner Ciotti: We're talking about ADA pedestrian ramps. Yes, you're quite right. Crossing--

Commissioner Forinash: Right. ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps.

Commissioner Ciotti: With Transportation, mm-hm.

Commissioner Forinash: Do we hear a second?

Commissioner Cole: Second.

Commissioner Forinash: Seconded by Commissioner Cole. Discussion? Does anyone require a restatement of the motion to amend? No? Yeah, Commissioner Gutshall?

Commissioner Gutshall: Plan of clarification. Is there an issue--can we slide this document--is there an issue down at Randolph Street? Or are you just stating that just for clarity?

Commissioner Ciotti: Just for clarity. Because it wasn't clear to me. I couldn't see the-- and so, just for clarity sake and to be 100% sure, sort of as one of our commissioners would say, belt and suspenders.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to amend, raise your hand. Opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

Commissioner Ciotti: Thank you, everyone.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussion or amendments? Hearing none, let's call the main motion, which I will not restate in all of its detail but it's a motion to recommend that the County Board--a motion supporting the staff recommendation to recommend that the County Board adopt the site plan amendment with two amendments to that motion. The first on working with staff to create a condition, making the bike facility available for non-residential use and a second calling for full ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps at each lag of each intersection. Commissioner Harner?

Commissioner Harner: Thanks, Commissioner Forinash. And just a few quick comments. Would like to thank the applicant for a really nice project and thank you, Mr. Gutshall for shepherding us through. I'm just looking at the Ballston Mall application and it seem we're now--perhaps we'll have a new family of buildings in Ballston that are in the more of the white and clear glass range. I almost grabbed this, thinking it was a part of your application. But it looks like it'll be a great addition to the Fairfax Drive and I'll really look forward to that. The--I would like to also state that I feel it would be very, very important to now look at updating the Ballston Sector Plan. I'm always wanted to ask Mr. Schulz if the stone tablets are still available that you've made those impressions from. But I think that we have an opportunity now to look at Ballston and, especially with Ballston Mall coming along, that this, looking at that Sector Plan, we ought to think about prioritizing that in the county CPHD work plan. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: And I'll just note that this is my approach to Ballston on my bike and occasionally by car, coming south down Quincy Street and I certainly look forward to the--I think I said this at one of the SPRC meetings--to seeing this as part of the entry into the Ballston-Virginia Square area and eventually something other than a Mercedes parking lot on the caddy corner from this site as well. Commissioner Gutshall?

Commissioner Gutshall: I did also wanna thank the applicant. I think they came in with a fairly strong project so that made the SPRC easy. They did listen to the comments that we received and responded diligently and that was very helpful in the process. And for anyone keeping score at home, we finished SPRC 3 months ago.

Commissioner Forinash: That was pointed.

Commissioner Forinash: All right. Any further comment before we call the motion, already restated. All those in favor of the main motion as amended, raise your hand.

Opposed? Motion carries nine to--did you raise your hand for both? Commissioner Cole? You kept your hand up when I said opposed.

Commissioner Cole: Yeah, I'm opposed.

Commissioner Forinash: Okay. So there was one vote opposed, correct? So the motion carries 10 to 1. Thank you.