

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

672 Flats/Penrose Group

Site Plan Review Committee Meeting #3

March 9, 2015

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Nancy Iacomini, Erik Gutshall, Steve Cole, Jane Siegel, Rosemary Ciotti, Chris Forinash

MEETING AGENDA

This was the first SPRC meeting for the 672 Flats site plan proposal. The agenda was to provide an introduction to the project and begin a discussion on the site background and history of planning in the area. The SPRC chair provided a brief introduction outlining how the process will work. Staff then gave a presentation on the history of planning in the vicinity, and current guidance governing the site. The applicant then presented an overview of the site plan and its components. Staff then provided an analysis of the site plan including preliminary issues. The SPRC then asked questions and discussed the project.

SPRC DISCUSSION

History of Site and Planning Context

- The 2006 Silverwood Homes site plan proposal had several issues, but the adjacency to the existing townhouses was an issue that should be mentioned.
- When the 2006 site plan was proposed, staff recommended 7th Street be used for services
- Is the N. Quincy Street Plan being used officially as guidance? Answer: no, not officially, but contextually.
- Is 7th Street public or private?
- 7th Street is a small street, and therefore it's not worth the pain to the neighbors to make 7th Street more pedestrian friendly by locating services in the alley
- What are we trying to achieve on 7th Street?
- Does trash collection occur outside in the current proposal? Applicant's response: yes.
- Disagreement with MTP policy on alleys—the context does not make sense for service uses located on the alley.
- The alley issue is the key to this site plan

Applicant's Proposal

- Concern about value-engineering of materials.

- What is the width of green space in the alley?
- Provide green alley concept landscaping
- Townes of Ballston should not be overburdened with trash, loading, and garage services right next door.
- Uncomfortable with service uses not located on the alley
- Can garage entrance and trash/loading be accommodated on the alley?
- 2 towers may be better than current configuration
- Provide better articulation on rear elevation
- Discomfort with architecture.
- Density proposed is too much for the site
- Building mass should be broken up by providing two 95' towers
- Concern about materials
- Concern about lack of tapering and also that density is too high
- Support for the proposed location of transformer vaults
- Ballston Sector Plan provides guidance for streetscapes
- What is the streetscape on the west side of Glebe between Wilson and Fairfax?
- Drop off on Glebe Road is an issue
- Glebe is envisioned as an urban boulevard
- Parking should not be provided on Glebe Road
- Concern about overspill parking due to retail parking modification
- Concern about retail parking

Other

- Where do people walk dogs?
- Concerned about school overcrowding
- The pedestrian overpass on Glebe should be provided
- What is the unit mix?
- Concerned about too many ADU's; does not think there should be an ADU bonus at this
- This site should be commercial use only; opposes residential land use
- There is a lack of open space

Requests for Follow-up Information

- Where else in the County are there 400' long buildings, and what is the height, context, and scale of those projects
- Traffic counts for the alley
- Traffic counts for 7th Street
- Would like to know what the building looks like without the bonus density
- Provide the history of the ADU bonus
- Provide shadow studies
- Provide a section through the block
- Provide current and proposed Retail Action Plan guidance
- Provide examples of other "R-C" projects in area

- Provide the factual basis for not wanting curb cuts on 7th
- Provide better exhibits on proposed coverage
- Refer to the Garfield Park project for treatment of alley
- How do services function on the alley if one-way north is maintained?