

## SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

### SPRC Meeting #3—November 9, 2015

**Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Jane Siegel (Chair), Rosemary Ciotti, Erik Gutshall, James Schroll**

---

### MEETING AGENDA

This was the third and final Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) meeting for a site plan proposed for the Washington Vista Apartments at 1411 Key Boulevard, a site plan for a six-story 63-unit condominium building. There is also an associated proposed General Land Use Plan (GLUP) change from “Low-Medium” Residential to “Medium” Residential.

The meeting began with a presentation by the developer on revisions to the architecture (including that they have committed to using the metal panels instead of the cementitious panel) then proceeded into a presentation about transportation. A discussion by the SPRC on transportation issues followed. The developer then made a presentation on open space and community benefits, followed by discussion by the SPRC and wrap-up.

The following was the agenda for the meeting:

- 4) Transportation
  - a) Infrastructure
    - i) Mass transit facilities and access
    - ii) Street systems (w/existing and proposed cross sections)
    - iii) Vehicular and pedestrian routes
    - iv) Bicycle routes and parking
  - b) Traffic Demand Management Plan
  - c) Automobile Parking
    - i) Proposed v. required (tenant, visitor, compact, handicapped, etc.)
    - ii) Access (curb cuts, driveway & drive aisle widths)
  - d) Delivery Issues
    - i) Drop offs
    - ii) Loading docks
  - e) ~~Signage (parking, wayfinding, etc.)~~
- 5) Open Space
  - a) Orientation and use of open spaces
  - b) Relationship to scenic vistas, natural features and/or adjacent public spaces
  - c) Compliance with existing planning documents and policies
  - d) Landscape plan (incl. tree preservation)
- 6) Community Benefits
  - a) Public Art

- b) Affordable Housing
  - c) Underground Utilities
  - d) ~~Historic Preservation~~
  - e) Other
- 7) Construction issues
- a) Phasing
  - b) Vehicle staging, parking, and routing
- Community Liaison

## SPRC DISCUSSION

### Transportation:

- Lucia De Cordre stated that she liked the plantings in front of the townhouses, and thought that Nash Street should have a more urban look. She asked if the trash area next to the driveway was the applicants'.
  - The applicant replied that the trash area belonged to the neighboring property and the proposed trash area for this site was internal, as is the standard.
- Jane Kim, DES Transportation Planner, pointed out that the applicant's proposed lane allocations could change based on the Civil Plans for the approved 1401 Wilson site plan.
- Erik Gutshall asked about bike parking for the project.
  - The applicant showed the bike parking on the outside racks by the front door, and that there was a door directly to the bike room from Key Boulevard. The exterior door was placed where it was because of the street grade. There will be internal access to the building from the bike room.
- Katie Elmore stated she liked the dooryards, and recommended planting on Key Boulevard to soften it. Asked if there would be a north/south crosswalk across Key Boulevard at the corner of Nash Street. People would naturally want to cross there.
  - The developer responded that a crosswalk at the corner there would lead to a driveway on the 1401 Wilson site (once it is constructed). There is a crosswalk crossing Key Boulevard to the north at Oak Street, and one further to the south at the south leg of Nash Street (towards Wilson Boulevard).
- Diane Gorman stated that she also was pleased with the plantings along North Nash Street, and liked the planting area on Key. Asked the applicant if the proposed crosswalk across key could be shifted to the South, or a new crosswalk added.
  - Applicant responded that the 1401 project was going to remove the existing crosswalk, but they will also talk with DES to see if it is possible.
- Bill Gerhardt asked if the sidewalk flattened at the Key Boulevard entry. Stated that it would be difficult for handicapped people if the grade was not level. Also asked if the ground floor on Key Boulevard was residences.
  - The developer responded that the illustration took some artistic license, and that the street/sidewalk, and that there is a level landing in front of the entry, the

sidewalk would not be leveled or flattened. It would have a maximum 2% grade. The developer also stated that the ground floor on Key Boulevard consisted of the lobby, bike room, and other support areas (no residences).

- James Schroll asked where the bike runnels would be, and also where pickup/drop-off locations on the street. Would there be a curb cut at the lobby entrance?
  - Applicant responded the bike runnels would be on the public path, and would work with the staff on loading/unloading spaces and putting a curb cut for pickups/drop-offs (not for a crosswalk) in front of the building entrance.
- Tom Korn asked if the townhouses had steps to the stoops. And can there be continuous tree pits?
  - Most of them do, the most number of steps is 2. The developer stated that the tree pits will be the typical 5' x 12' but will try to provide some variety in the planting, and a continuous soil panel underneath.
- Rosemary Ciotti wished to emphasize the grade issue, and reiterated the suggestion for a curb cut at the entrance. Also, be aware that ADA requires an on-street handicap space to be as near the front door as possible. Make sure that where this parking space is that furniture and plantings do not conflict with doors opening.

#### **Open Space:**

At this point the applicant made a presentation about the proposed public walkway and open space (private courtyard). Staff had stated that they found a way forward to comply or obtain an exception from the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) due to the extremely steep grade.

- Rosemary Ciotti asked if all residents had access to the Courtyard, or just the ones whose units front on it.
  - The developer replied that all residents would have access to the courtyard, there was a corridor from the elevator lobby. There will be no public access to the courtyard.
- Discussion about tree replacement. The developer said they could not meet the tree replacement guidelines on site, and would have to pay in to the tree replacement fund.
- Lucia De Cordre requested that the trees be laced off-site in Rosslyn. Also, is there any green roof or artistic treatment on the roof?
  - Applicant responded a portion of the roof would be green, the mechanical units would be hidden by a trellis, and there would be an artistic design on the roof similar to the Key Boulevard Apartments down the street.
- Erik Gutshall stated that the proposed public path is similar to 18<sup>th</sup> Street as envisioned in the new Rosslyn Sector Plan—lots of stairs and grade changes. Does staff have a uniform design for public access ways such as this? For instance, have only one kind of runnel. Would like staff to research the 18<sup>th</sup> Street proposal and see if it applies here.
- Katie Elmore and Diane Gorman stated that it seemed the steps were particularly steep as they approach Key Boulevard.
  - The developer stated one of the images in the handout was incorrect and that there would be landscaping between the stairs and the building. Also, they

would take a look at “spreading” the steps out, but had the grade to deal with as well as adhering to applicable codes.

- Tom Korn suggested that there could be more canopy trees in the courtyard.
  - The developer responded that they would look into it.

### **Community Benefits:**

The developer stated that they would have four (4) two-bedroom affordable dwelling units on site, and that 27% of the bonus density is going to the affordable units, within County guidelines. Doug Myrick of County housing staff passed out a leaflet explaining the County’s affordable for-sale program. The target recipients will be households at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI).

- Stan Karson stated that he was disappointed that the existing 32 market-rate affordable (MARK) units would be replaced with only 4 on-site units. Stated that affordable housing is lacking in Rosslyn.
- James Schroll suggested to the developer that they make it clear that the units are on-site.
- Lucia De Cordre stated the Rosslyn BID would like to see a contribution to the Rosslyn boathouse or Gateway Park.
  - Staff stated that the applicant could only contribute to those specific projects if they requested bonus density through the community facility provisions in the Zoning Ordinance, which they aren’t doing in this case.

### **Wrap-Up:**

- Lucia De Cordre wanted the applicant to make sure lighting did not affect neighboring properties.
- Erik Gutshall asked the applicant to make sure all their slides are consistent, since there were some discrepancies in those used for this SPRC, and to make the property boundaries more visible on exhibits.
- Katie Elmore was concerned in the loss of MARKs and encouraged the developer to think about contributions to the Boathouse or Gateway Park.
- Diane Gorman thought that the plan had improved since the first iteration. Would like a compromise on the landscaping on Key.
- Bill Gearhart emphasized the need for level access to the lobby. Important for elderly or handicapped.
- James Schroll wanted staff to look into the 18<sup>th</sup> Street standards. The Key Boulevard frontage is an interesting one, Nash not as interesting but better than at the first SPRC. Thinks the north façade of the building needs work, though.
- Tom Korn was pleased with the building, applicant has responded well to comments. At the PC, would like the ground floor plan, including the bike room, better delineated.

- Rosemary Ciotti stated that the building had grown on her. Would like to know for Planning Commission about the potential student generation.
- Stan Karson reiterated that he was disappointed in the loss of market affordable units on the site. Would like more detail in the staff report for PC about the affordable housing package and how homeownership will work.
- Erik Gutshall asked staff if the landscape is a modification.
  - Staff stated that it was.
- Jane Siegel thanked the applicant for working with the SPRC, and stated she would like to know how the affordable housing package furthers the goals of the Affordable Housing Master Plan.