

MEMORANDUM

TO: Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission

FROM: Anthony Fusarelli, Jr., AICP DATE: July 24, 2017

Washington Boulevard and Kirkwood Road Special General Land Use
SUBJECT: Plan (GLUP) Study "Plus" – Response to Recent Process/Scope Questions

This memorandum addresses several questions and comments recently received by staff related to the overall process, scope and methodology related to the Washington Boulevard and Kirkwood Road Special GLUP Study. Where appropriate, references and Web links are provided via the responses herein to more fully address the questions and comments.

Specifically, this memorandum will address the following specific items, in order:

1. Is retaining the existing GLUP/Zoning for the study area an option for consideration?
2. Has staff modeled the potential outcome of retaining the current GLUP/Zoning of the study area?
3. Has the need for single-family dwellings been calculated, measured and included for evaluation?
4. Why is it appropriate to combine the evaluation of areas currently designated Semi-Public and Service Commercial into the same study? and
5. How can differences in building modeling assumptions be addressed through this study?

1. Is retaining the existing GLUP/Zoning for the study area an option for consideration?

The impetus for conducting this Special GLUP Study "Plus" was three separate GLUP amendment requests filed with Arlington County in 2016, for abutting properties within the study area. As the study area is located just outside the limits of the Virginia Square Metro Station Area, there is no established land use planning guidance to inform a staff recommendation, and Planning Commission and County Board consideration of these requests. Therefore, a primary question to be addressed through the Special GLUP Study is whether a potential GLUP amendment for any of the subject properties would be appropriate, and if so, to which GLUP designations?

As part of all Special GLUP Studies, retention of the existing GLUP designation comprises at least one of the development scenarios that is studied and evaluated by staff and the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC). Correspondingly, the existing GLUP designation is one of at least several general land use scenarios that are equally evaluated in determining the most appropriate option(s). Ultimately, at the conclusion of the study, a County Board action would be required to advance a potential change to the GLUP (if that was in fact the resulting recommendation from the study).

Otherwise, absent such a County Board action, the existing GLUP designation would not be changed at that time.

2. Has staff modeled the potential outcome of retaining the current GLUP/Zoning of the study area?

As mentioned in the response to Comment #1, staff has modeled the development that could potentially result in a scenario where the existing GLUP/Zoning across the study area is retained. In fact, for the second LRPC Meeting of this study on December 20, 2016, the staff presentation showed two distinct build-out scenarios under existing GLUP/Zoning conditions: 1) One scenario assuming Unified Commercial Mixed-Use Development (UCMUD) with C-2 zoning (and County Board use-permit approval) for properties along Washington Boulevard, and 2) One scenario assuming residential development with County Board approval of site plan and C-O-1.0 zoning applications along Washington Boulevard.

In both scenarios, the YMCA site and portions of the American Legion site (currently designated Semi-Public) were modeled to depict development consistent with R-6 zoning. In this case, the maximum residential development potential within R-6 zoning (assuming semi-detached or duplex units approved via special exception use permit) was modeled for these portions of the study area. Slides 45 – 58 of the December 20, 2016, LRPC Meeting presentation illustrate the modeling schemes that were completed to depict potential future development of the YMCA site and portion of the American Legion site per the existing GLUP and Zoning.

https://arlingtonva.s3.dualstack.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/12/20161220_LRPC_WashKirk_GIVEN.pdf

3. Has the need for single-family dwellings been calculated, measured and included for evaluation?

Based on the scope of this study, staff was tasked with initially modeling various scenarios that included combinations of GLUP designations listed in the study scope and process document (https://arlingtonva.s3.dualstack.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2017/04/Washington_Kirkwood_Special-GLUP-Study-Plus_draft_20161220.pdf). For different sections of the study area, the scenarios collectively depicted a range of housing types, including duplexes, townhouses and multi-family residential units. Input from LRPC on the scenarios during prior meetings have identified those scenarios with a mix of multi-family residential and townhouse buildings across the study area as being most favorable for additional study and potentially a better fit for the overall location. Consistent with the established approach for Special GLUP Studies, this evaluation is based primarily on the apparent appropriateness of potential development forms (and level of support by the multi-modal transportation network) within the surrounding context, and does not involve attempts to define and calculate the need for any particular type of housing product under consideration.

4. Why is it appropriate to combine the evaluation of areas currently designated Semi-Public and Service Commercial into the same study?

Consistent with input provided by LRPC at the first and second meetings of this study process, evaluating the areas designated Semi-Public and Service Commercial as part of the same study provides the ability to consider the area holistically and plan for the future of the area in a coordinated manner. With three individual parties having applied for Special GLUP Study requests for abutting properties within this particular study area, looking at the area overall especially makes sense from a planning perspective when exploring possibilities for future connectivity, public open space, and building height and form. Undertaking separate studies, based solely upon the difference in existing GLUP designations across the study area, would undermine and/or preclude the ability to

focus on how any coordinated improvements could be achieved across sites through potential redevelopment.

5. How can differences in building modeling assumptions be address through this study?

Based on input received at the third and fourth LRPC Meetings, staff has conducted additional building form and massing modeling to explore the potential implications of applying different assumptions from those that have informed staff models to date. Specifically, staff's latest modeling included downward adjustments from 1,100 square feet per residential unit (gross average) to 950 square feet per unit, and also reduced bonus density assumptions from approximately 40% bonus density to 20% bonus density. These updated models will be presented and discussed at LRPC Meeting 5 on July 25, and are depicted in the (draft) staff presentation available here:

https://arlingtonva.s3.dualstack.us-east-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2017/07/20170725_LRPC_WashKirk_DRAFT_2.pdf