

Staff Responses to JV Questions dated December 8, 2016:

Some questions on the extension of the site plan and related public ROW vacations, that can either be answered ahead of the CB meeting or in staff presentation or Q&A:

1--TIME EXTENSION: The original site plan was good for four years and this extension is for three years.

A. For context, is a four year original term and three year extension (if an extension is requested) customary? If not customary, what are the variables entering into the decision on either timeframe?

Staff Response: The original site plan term was five years. Three years is our standard, but for very large or complex mixed use projects (another example is SP #438, Clarendon West) the Board has allowed a five year term to respond to market conditions. There are several examples of the Board extending site plan terms; SP #417, Wakefield Manor in June, 2016 is a recent example.

B. Is there a fee or charge for the applicant either for the request to extend or the actual extension, if granted? If not, is there a policy reason why we would not want to consider such a fee to help defray staff time in reviewing the request?

Staff Response: The request to extend the site plan was processed as a minor site plan amendment to amend Condition #1, which provides for the expiration date for the site plan. The applicant did pay the standard fee for a minor site plan amendment.

C. Would another extension be considered beyond this three year extension? Under what circumstances? At what point would the County declare, "start over; your original time is up because you have failed to perform"? Please cite any examples of when the County has nixed such an extension request.

Staff Response: There are a few examples of site plans that have expired; recently, SP #421, 1900 Crystal Drive, was allowed to expire due to changing market conditions and the developer not wishing to extend the term of the site plan.

D. Is the approved site plan assignable to another developer and under what circumstances?

Staff Response: The property in question is owned by JBG Companies. Since land use entitlements (such as site plans) run with the land, if the property was sold the site plan would remain valid. As long as JBG Companies owns the land, it can be assumed they would be the developer.

2--SLUG OPERATIONS: Explain how the site plan "recognizes the importance of slug operations in Rosslyn." How will the County "adjust curb space management to accommodate slug operations as needed" in the context of potential impacts to the Rosslyn transportation network related to the widening of I-66?

Staff Response: The RSP contains the following guidance with respect to slug lines in Rosslyn:

- Relocate slug line stops from the existing access along the northern edge of the Rosslyn Gateway site when it is removed upon site redevelopment (approved but not yet commenced) (P.110).
- Locate slug lines proximate to regional highway connections appropriate to their route (P. 110).

In addition, on P. 118 under "Priority Enhancements to TDM Policy" the plan recommends to "Implement physical improvements and awareness promotions to encourage greater number of "slugging" carpools."

Arlington is continuously evaluating and tweaking the management of our curb space, balancing different uses and activities from on-street parking and bus stops to space for slugging activities. This will continue as I-66 changes and as the Rosslyn Gateway site gets developed in the future. For slugging activities, one of the best strategies is to consider time of day allocations of space as slugging activities are highest during the evening rush period and outside of the evening rush there is very little need for the curb space allocated to the use.

3--COMMUNITY LIAISON: Condition #11 provides for the developer to appoint a community liaison and to furnish this person's name and telephone number.

Would staff and applicant support the surgical insertion of "and email address," so that the second sentence of #11.a. would now read "The name, EMAIL ADDRESS and telephone number of this individual shall be provided..."? Requiring an email address could make for easier and more convenient communication and provide a written record at the same time. NOTE: I would suggest this modest change to this standard condition for all site plans going forward.

4--TOWING: Site Plan #59/Towing of Impermissibly Parked Vehicles includes several standard requirements.

A. How might this standard language need to be changed, either for this site plan or going forward, depending on adjustments to the County towing ordinance under current Board consideration?

B. At 59.n., similar to my email point at #3, COMMUNITY LIAISON above, I suggest the inclusion of email as follows:

"Requirements for signage....and the name, EMAIL ADDRESS and telephone number of the developer's on-site representative responsible for towing-related complaints, as well as the telephone number AND EMAIL ADDRESS of the Arlington County Office of Citizen and Consumer Affairs;"

NOTE: As noted above, I suggest this change to this standard condition for all site plans going forward.

STEVE, GABRIELA: Assuming you see no issues with these suggestions, please draft language that accommodates this intent in the conditions noted.

5--POWER DOOR OPENERS/#64: This condition states that "the developer agrees to install power door openers for the main pedestrian entrances to the residential/hotel building."

Why wouldn't this be a condition for the new office building, as well?

Staff Response to Questions 3 - 5: For the questions related to towing, community liaison information, and power door openers, staff has updated the conditions to reflect the current standard site plan condition language. The updated language for the community liaison information contains reference to email addresses.

For the towing condition, this condition was removed from the standard conditions for the 2013 update. As a result, staff is recommending removing this condition.

For the power door opener condition, staff updated to the current standard language and added a reference to make this required for the office building as well as the residential/hotel building.

6--PARKING METERS/#66: Here, "The developer agrees to contribute the cost, up to a maximum of \$40,000, for installation of multi-space parking meters along the project's frontage."

While developer contributions for transportation management (#37), affordable housing (#52), Gateway Park (#65) and #71 (Offsite Transportation Improvements) will now escalate, calibrated to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) given that the contributions "are made more than 36 months after [original] site plan approval," no such CPI escalator is included for #66. What is the policy basis for such a distinction? If the omission was inadvertent, please draft amendment language to provide for such at #66.

Staff Response: Condition #66 is not a standard condition, and was negotiated specifically for this site plan. As such, the dollar amount was agreed to be fixed. Staff does not recommend changes to the community benefits package for this update given that no changes to the PDSP and site plan are proposed.

7--NORTH ROSSLYN C.A.: Board Report notes concerns by the host civic association. I recall seeing no correspondence in this regard. Please provide.

Staff Response: Staff contacted the president of the North Rosslyn Civic Association when the application was submitted in October, 2016. In follow-up emails on November 28, 2016, staff received correspondence from Mr. Mark Antell and Ms. Terri Prell acting on behalf of NRCA both expressing that the civic association opposes renewal of the site plan for the reasons generally stated by Turnberry and Georgetown Vista residents.

8--TURNBERRY TOWER CITIZENS AND RELATED COMMENTS: Commenters have noted a number of what they consider to be inconsistencies between the new Sector Plan and the four-year-old site plan, as well as other concerns. The message that we received from a Mr. Sloan this morning is particularly well-articulated. I'm mindful that the 2012 Board (with only one current holdover) approved the original site plan, but I hope staff can speak to these collective concerns.

Staff Response: Please see separate document prepared by staff dated December 8, 2016 responding to concerns articulated by Mr. Sloan.

Comments from L. Sloan received January 9, 2017:

-- It seems odd that the Phase Development Site Plan (PDSP) was not advertised as it apparently was supposed to be, especially given the corporate/legal strength behind the effort. What do you know or think happened that you can say publicly? Oversight, or other?

Staff Response: This was an oversight regarding advertizing of the PDSP. Condition #21 of the PDSP requires that a Footing to Grade Building Permit for Phase I be issued prior to July 21, 2017. This has been advertised properly for the January meeting, and Condition #21 of the PDSP is recommended to be updated commensurate with Condition #1 of the Final Site Plan for Phase I.

-- The phasing of the JBG proposed Rosslyn Gateway project actually is an important aspect of the proposal and of serious civic concern given that:

o Phase III is on the Rosslyn skyline and therefore will be most visible yet apparently not likely to be done for 10-20 years. Thus, the current white striped building (pix attached) would stick out like a sore thumb amid the other new buildings. JBG wants to hold onto the current building to generate rent.

-- By doing so, JBG itself is stymying the potential of the Rosslyn skyline and gateway: its three-building design may be in part to maintain the current office building for a long time, and if so, thus, affects its design: resulting in two proposed tall skinny buildings on the skyline (Phase II hotel/residential) and Phase III TBD.

-- If JBG were willing to tear down the current office building (Phase III) sooner, the possibilities for this premium gateway, skyline space could be more premier, and better in many ways, including one building, rather than two on this Key. Bridge/Georgetown/Potomac River facing parcel. One building also would eliminate the need for the air space between the planned two buildings, thus adding occupiable space and recusing the need to use current easement space for building footprint.

Staff Response: A number of site plans approved in Rosslyn and elsewhere in Arlington are of a large enough size that presents economic and feasibility challenges to implementing their redevelopment all in a single. In such cases, the County Board has taken action to approve such projects knowing that project build out could be incremental and the full vision of a project might not be realized for several years. In terms of the suggestion for an alternative design approach involving one single building instead of two more slender buildings in the northern half of the block, staff believes the design as approved in 2012 is a preferable solution to the Rosslyn skyline for several reasons, including:

- *The composition involving one office building, one residential/hotel building, and one residential building support a thorough mix of uses on this block, advancing use mix goals of the Rosslyn Sector Plan;*
- *The building orientation of the residential/hotel and residential towers in the northern half of the block (and the space between them) provide a greater sense of depth, permeability, and layering for this portion of the Rosslyn skyline when viewed from points to the north;*
- *The three building approach and corresponding variety of building heights is supportive of the "Peaks and Valleys" building heights policy set forth in the sector plan; and*
- *Replacing these two towers on the northern half of the block with a larger, single tower (most likely to be oriented east-west) would very likely result in a building with proportions most suitable for office use, would present a much larger, expansive façade plane to the north, and could reduce the variety in building heights on the block, which are all potential outcomes that would be less supportive of sector plan goals.*

o We learned on Dec 5 that for economic reasons, JBG apparently now may want to switch its phasing and start with Phase II (hotel/residential building) before doing Phase I (office building).

Staff Response: Staff is not aware of any new proposal by JBG to alter the phasing of the approved PDSP.

-- Will the County staff prepare new Board reports for Site Plan #419 and the easement vacation? We sure hope so, and that such will include all the comments received from Dec 1, 2016 through the deadline for comments for the January Board meeting 2017.

-- The public should be told specific deadlines for filing comments for inclusion in the Board reports. Ditto re comments on the extension request for the Phased Development Site Plan.

Staff Response: Generally speaking, comments from individual citizens/residents are not included with staff reports, but are made part of the official case file. Typically only formal correspondence from the civic associations and other community, homeowners and business associations are included. However, concerns expressed in individual correspondence are summarized and addressed in the "Neighborhood" section of the staff reports, and this is provided for this site plan amendment request. For individual correspondence to the County Board, citizens may submit comments or correspondence up until the date of the public hearing. Staff will contact the residents and inform them of this information.

-- The public should be provided, or told how to access, the JGB applications for extension of all three items (Site Plan #419, vacation of easement, and PDSP).

Staff Response: The applications for the site plan and PDSP are on file with the Zoning Office. Citizens can come to the Zoning Office to access the files, or can contact the project manager for the requests (Matt Pfeiffer) directly, who can obtain a copy for them.

-- Is there a way to address the situation that draft Board reports and draft final Ordinances that the Board votes on at its public meeting are written well before testimony is heard at the meeting and the drafts exclude such?

Staff Response: Draft ordinances that the County Board will vote on are contained in the staff reports prepared for the Board hearing. These reports are posted on the County web site two Fridays prior to a Saturday County Board hearing. For the January 28, 2017 County Board meeting, staff reports will be posted the afternoon of Thursday, January 19, due to the holiday.