

## SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

### The Berkeley, 2900 S. Glebe Road (SP #431)

#### SPRC Meeting #3

March 13, 2014

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Steve Sockwell, Chair; Steve Cole; Erik Gutshall; Jane Siegel

---

### MEETING AGENDA

This was the third meeting for SP #431, the Berkeley. The SPRC Chair for this item, Steve Sockwell, gave a brief introduction which was followed by a staff presentation on the Four Mile Run Restoration Master Plan and Four Mile Run Design Guidelines. The applicant then presented the changes made to the project since the last SPRC meeting. These changes included the following:

- *Removal of all visitor surface parking spaces facing the stream.*
- *Addition of a pervious drive area to address fire access.*
- *New planting swale adjacent to the trail to assist with water runoff.*
- *Increasing the width of Four Mile Run trail along the redeveloped property to 12'.*
- *Addition of a public node along the trail with benches and litter control.*
- *Utilization of green roof technologies on top of the garage structure.*
- *Set aside area for future bike share location.*
- *Inclusion of native and noninvasive adaptive plantings.*
- *Addition of street parking along S. Glebe Road.*

Following the applicant's presentation, the SPRC discussed the following topics.

### SPRC DISCUSSION

#### Land Use & Zoning

- Four Mile Run Plan goals for the development along the stream were discussed. These included providing access to the stream itself. This could happen on this site using steps to traverse the retaining wall.
- Staff was asked to identify remaining unresolved issues. They included the following:
  - Treatment along the edge of the trail/stream
  - Vehicular and pedestrian circulation through the site
- LEED certification – are there any required credits?

- In order to achieve bonus density via LEED certification, the applicant is required to have a specific number of credits that address energy efficiency; the remainder of the points are obtained at the discretion of the applicant
- Proposal seems to be pushing forward affordable dwelling units over everything else

### **Site Design & Characteristics**

- Applicant should consider altering the height of the fence.
  - Applicant will look into it
- Staff has met with the Arlington County Police Department CPTED specialist on the issue of security. There are alternatives to fencing for providing security. Staff will work with ACPD on this to come up with additional suggestions.
- Can fencing be approved on a temporary basis (5, 10, 20 years)? It doesn't seem to be in keeping with the plan
- Applicant should explore how lighting could be used as a way to provide security instead of fencing
  - Lighting will be addressed when we discuss Building Architecture
- Applicant should consider providing garage access at western side of the site
  - This is the highest part of the site, will be difficult to turn in
- Proposal should work on how to provide a better visual connection to the stream while on the trail. Options may include greening the wall or raising the level of the trail itself.
  - Applicant indicates there would be limitations to this caused by the existing power poles and their ability to manage stormwater drainage relative to properties to the east and west.
- Lots of constraints exist on the site, why not reduce the number of units? It might result in a better site plan if you don't seek the maximum development possible
- Happy to see minor improvements, but two major issues remain: proposed fence (look at changing grade of trail) and all service entrances still face the stream
- Where is the majority of vehicular traffic accessing the site anticipated? Applicant should look for a way to avoid having so much traffic on the stream side of the building
  - Most cars would use Meade Street entrance; small deliveries and loading from S. Glebe Road curb cut

### **Building Architecture**

- South façade still reads as a back, it's not too front yet. We need to prepare for the future of the corridor
- Ground floor not appealing on both sides
- Site challenges may be more apparent when we walk the site
- Consider providing a building taper at the corners within the height limit
- Take more consideration of the design of the garage doors
  - Applicant maintains they will not be visible from the trail; however, loading doors will be visible
- Lot of work has been done and there are a lot of site constraints; we have to manage security concerns with a desire to use the trail

- How can you better integrate the community services provided on site into the design? Perhaps they could be more visible on stream side as a way to activate that part of the building

**Transportation**

- Transportation related questions were raised (for a future discussion) regarding how traffic will be managed on S. Glebe Road, street parking availability on S. Glebe Road between S. Meade Street and Mt. Vernon, and if turning lanes are being proposed on S. Meade Street to avoid traffic back-ups.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Next SPRC meeting will follow a site visit. Meeting date is TBD and location will be closer to the site.
- Provide an exhibit showing public access points to the stream (Applicant)
- Report back on alternative measures for providing security along the trail/stream edge of the site, after consulting with CPTED Specialist (Staff/Applicant)