

## SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

SP #441 2000 Clarendon Boulevard (Bush at Courthouse)

SPRC Meeting #2, February 22, 2016

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Rosemary Ciotti (Chair), Steve Cole, Elizabeth Gearin, Erik Gutshall, Jane Siegel

---

### MEETING AGENDA

This was the second Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) meeting for a proposed rezoning from "C-2" and "RA8-18" to "RA4.8", and a site plan for a 15-story, 178-foot tall residential building with 90 (revised from 91) residential units and 1,900 square feet of ground floor retail.

The staff presentation responded to requests by the SPRC from the previous meeting, including the location of area parks and public spaces, and the potential student generation from the proposed project (seven students total). The developer presented requests made at the last meeting, including a shadow study, diagrams of the buildings setbacks, changes to the building made since the last meeting (including moving the podium in five feet two the west to create a planting area between the building and shared property line with the Odyssey, and lowered the podium by five feet), as well as a detailed architectural presentation with material samples. The chair asked Tammy Bagnato, representative of The Odyssey HOA, to state the HOA concerns. Ms. Bagnato requested that the developer also show 5 O'clock shadows, show the diagonal setback between the proposed tower and the existing Odyssey, and stated her request that the developer show what the proposed building will look like from the nearest unit in the Odyssey and from the direct east.

The following was the agenda for the meeting:

- 4) Building Architecture
  - a) Design Issues
    - i) Building form (height, massing, tapering, setbacks)
    - ii) Facade treatments, materials, fenestration
    - iii) Roof line/penthouse form and materials
    - iv) Street level activism/entrances & exits
    - v) LEED/Earthcraft/Green Home Choice Score
    - vi) Accessibility
    - ~~vii) Historic Preservation (if applicable)~~
  - b) Retail Spaces
    - i) Location, size, ceiling heights
    - ii) Storefront designs and transparency
    - iii) Mix of tenants (small v. large, local v. national)

- c) Service Issues
  - i) Utility equipment
  - ii) Venting location and type
  - iii) Location and visibility of loading and trash service
  - iv) Exterior/rooftop lighting

## SPRC DISCUSSION

### Building Architecture:

- Commissioner Gutshall requested that staff compile information on building separation distances for next SPRC. Also stated that perspectives can be misleading.
- Martha Moore asked if the building overhung the street.
  - The developer replied that the building did not hang over public sidewalk or street.
- Commissioner Ciotti stated that she was pleased that the developer has responded to comments and made revisions to the building.
- Commissioner Gutshall asked if the applicant had made any changes to the rear (south) elevation. That elevation seems not as well-detailed as the other facades. The rear wall will be very prominent.
  - The developer replied that they had the maximum percentage of window openings allowed by code on the South facade, and that they were satisfied with the design of that façade and so did not change it. Also thought the street facades more important.
- Commissioner Siegel asked about roof lighting and if units can be combined.
  - The developer replied lighting will be unobtrusive. There is both indoor and outdoor activity planned. Staff stated they would look into if the Dark Sky lighting condition was a standard condition, and in any case would suggest that condition to the developer. There is a condition that is used, but staff wasn't sure if it was in the standard conditions.
  - The developer also stated that units could be combined.
- Commissioner Cole asked if building lighting is shown on the application.
  - Staff stated that building lighting was examined by staff post-approval with the Final Landscape Plan.
- Commissioner Ciotti suggested the developer should use stone on the base of the building like the staff architect recommended. Also asked if the pool was accessible.
  - The developer replied that they would not use stone as a base because of its tendency to trap water and stated that they would like to use the gray brick. The developer also stated that there is a ramp to the pool area.
- Martha Moore suggested that the applicant move the tower further away from the rear property line in order to increase window size.
  - The developer stated that that increasing window size would have an impact on the LEED score and energy efficiency of the building.

- Question if public art could be placed on the east wall to make the facade more interesting for the pedestrian path.
  - The developer replied that the county's guidelines for public art usually require greater accessibility and visibility.
- Bill Gerhardt asked if the loading could be moved off of Clarendon Boulevard.
  - The applicant stated that the parcel is landlocked.
- Tom Korn asked if the green roof and other landscaping would be maintained by the condo association.
  - Staff stated that the landscape plan requirements would require them to perpetually maintain the landscape and green roof, as well as street trees.
- Commissioner Ciotti asked if the planting strip shown were in planters.
  - The developer stated that the planting in front of the retail area were in shorter planters than those on the east side of the building.
  - Staff stated it was unusual to place planters immediately in front of the retail area. It might preclude outdoor café installation.
  - The developer replied that they think the grade is too steep to be desirable or practical for an outdoor café use.
- Martha Moore asked if the utility vault would have the same problems as other recent site plans.
  - The developer replied that the vault is under the sidewalk, and Dominion may not require it to be as large as shown on the plans.
- Commissioner Gearin suggested that the planting areas be planted in layers.
  - The developer stated he would work with staff.
- Tom Korn asked about the applicant's retail plan.
  - Retail would have venting for food service. The developer stated that the retail would be higher class than some surrounding, and he would rather let the space be vacant while waiting for the right tenant.
  - Staff stated that now that the developer had removed the residential unit that faced Clarendon Boulevard the developer was in compliance with the Retail plan.
- Commissioner Gutshall asked staff to clarify the retail regulations for streets marked Blue on the Retail plan.
  - Staff replied that Blue streets had a lower transparency requirement, but an applicant could exceed the minimum.
- Commissioner Cole asked why the retail wasn't closer to the Odyssey's.
  - The developer replied that the garage entrance is the lowest spot on the site, and is ideal for the garage location.
- Commissioner Ciotti encouraged a storefront system for the fitness room on Clarendon Boulevard.
- Bill Braswell stated that while it was a larger issue and not for the PC, CPHD and AED should develop a small business retention plan for local small business that might be displaced.
- Tammy Bagnato stated that the Odyssey would like to see more green space on the property.

- Commissioner Gutshall asked staff for next time to explain what happens when AED and the developer meet to discuss retail strategy.
  - Staff responded that they would have that information for the PC.
- Martha Moore asked if the delivery hours will be changed.
  - Staff stated that delivery hours were in the standard conditions and the developer had not discussed amending them.

The Chair then opened the floor for questions from the public.

- The developer stated that sidewalks would be a minimum of 16 feet, eight inches.
- Statements from residents of the Odyssey that deliveries, vehicles and pedestrians would conflict.
- Question about possible generator or other mechanical noise/
  - The developer stated all generators or noise-making mechanical equipment would be enclosed (unlike in the nearby office building).
- Question about the impact of the garage exhaust on the pedestrian path.
  - Developer replied that the fans would only run when carbon monoxide levels were high, but per Codes the gas is not at a level dangerous to health. He would try to place the louvers as high as possible above the path to impact it as little as possible.
- Question if there is space for people with dogs or for people to smoke.
  - There is no dog relief area, and people would probably smoke just inside the loading dock area.
- Commissioner Gutshall suggested that staff bring the Odyssey staff report and conditions to the next SPRC, and post them online. Also what setbacks would be by right versus site plan?