

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

1122 N. Kirkwood Road – Washington Boulevard at Kirkwood (SP #450)

SPRC Meeting #1

February 4, 2019

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: James Lantelme (Chair), Sara Steinberger (Co-Chair), Elizabeth Gearin, Nancy Iacomini, Kathleen McSweeney, Elizabeth Morton, David Ricks, James Schroll, Jane Siegel

MEETING AGENDA

- 1) Introduction
 - a) Overview of Site Plan Proposal (Staff)
 - b) Presentation of Site Plan Proposal (Applicant)

- 2) Land Use & Zoning
 - a) Relationship of site to GLUP, sector plans, etc.
 - b) Relationship of project to existing zoning
 - i) Requested rezoning
 - ii) Requested density exclusions

- 3) Site Design and Characteristics
 - a) Circulation and alley characteristics
 - b) Allocation of uses on the site
 - c) Relationship and orientation of proposed buildings to public space and other buildings
 - d) Streetscape Improvements
 - e) View vistas through site
 - f) Visibility of site or buildings from significant neighboring perspectives
 - g) Compliance with adopted planning documents

- 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/rooftop amenity space
 - iv) Street level activism/entrances & exits
 - v) Accessibility
 - vi) Unit mix
 - b) Ground Floor (Retail Equivalent) Spaces
 - i) Location, size, ceiling heights

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

PRESENTATIONS

- Staff provided a presentation covering basic site background and planning guidance, requested density and modifications, and preliminary issues identified for the proposal
- The applicant provided a presentation with an overview of the project, covering basic density, architecture, and site design elements

SPRC DISCUSSION

Clarifying Questions and Comments

- Would appreciate clarification on implementation of the east-west connector; the east-west connector can impact the site design
 - Staff wants to ensure the GLUP Study area projects can stand alone, with enough flexibility to allow the connection in the future
- There is concern with the neighborhood in how the sites relate to the high traffic volume that YMCA says they need to make property viable
- The GLUP Study typologies represent the preliminary stage vs the final stage of design
- The East-West connection is a benefit, and want to figure it out through the site plan process
 - Staff noted that property lines around the site area a constraint, as is the Ball family cemetery, in implementing the east-west connection with this project
- Easements for cemetery access will be important, would like to see more

Land Use and Zoning

- Would like to see clarification for what is included in density exclusions. [
 - Staff noted that density exclusions are generally considered for spaces located below grade, which do not increase the height or bulk of the building
- LEED Silver certification (for requested bonus density) needs 50 points, with only 42 shown on tracking sheet. How does the GLUP open space recommendation apply to the site?

Site Design and Characteristics

- Renderings of the interaction with the cemetery, and drawings that give a better picture of the topological change would be appreciated

- Looking for enhancement of the north alley, rather than a simple asphalt drive
- Compared to the APAH/American Legion site they've provided a more enhanced present condition on the north-south alley
- Staff noted the stormwater pipe relocation is identified as an area of significant concern, and existing pipe represents the headwaters of Spout Run while this proposal is to reroute around the project
- Are there other stormwater management options like a cistern? Would like to have more information for a future meeting
- Will relocation of the stormwater line impact ability to underground utilities?
 - The applicant stated overhead utilities will terminate at the corner.
 - Staff responded that we continue to evaluate the necessary undergrounding of utilities, but the corner pole does not have an impact on undergrounding to the north
- Would the County be willing to use the utility fund to improve utility undergrounding in areas adjacent to the site? Staff noted this question
- Has fire access been addressed?
 - The applicant confirmed yes, no major issues raised with the Fire Marshall
- Any limitation on truck access? (This issue is flagged for future transportation discussion)
- What are the landscape details for the sidewalk on the north alley? (applicant will clarify during future landscaping discussion)
- Staff suggested it would be helpful to have a small 3D model of the northwest corner area (between the site and the APAH/American Legion site) to illustrate topographical issues around the site
- Is the interior courtyard at the ground level? Hate to see open space walled off with no visual way into this space
- What kind of plants will be planted in this space? (applicant will clarify during future landscaping discussion)
- A neighbor stated that the sewer has never backed up or overflowed in 42 years
- Does the North alley preclude better design?
- Lyon Village would like to discuss concerns related to transportation and loading docks at a future meeting
- Don't believe the site plan meets or exceeds all the guiding principles outlined in the GLUP Study

Building Architecture

- Could articulate residential entrance better to make entrance clearer from the streetscape

- Could sight lines give views from front door to the central open space?
- Corner has a hard edge rather than a chamfered edge, would like to see some alternative for the corner
- The SPRC Chair confirmed architecture discussion to continue at the next meeting

Committee Member Closing Thoughts

- Topographical modeling will be helpful; concerned about juxtaposition of patios and doors in an area that may flood and how residents may not be aware of this in the future; would like to see more with respect to pavement materials
- Design of the residential lobby entrance could be called out more; concerned with clear width at corner of Washington Boulevard and Kirkwood
- Would like to discuss utility pole undergrounding, parking, and construction at future meeting
- Would like to highlight need for undergrounding of the pole, would like to hear more at the next meeting on this and other issues to find a comfort zone
- Rethink the lobby entrance to implement a sight line to the central open space; would like to see more details for pedestrian ingress/egress at the patios and along Washington Boulevard
- There are issues with the lobby entrance; would like to see more detail on the north alley, including future pedestrian circulation and lighting, and truck movements
- Looking forward to visualization of the east-west connection, would like birds eye views; hope to see full utility undergrounding at such a major intersection
- Concern raised over transportation issues and parking for the project
- Would like to see a more urban solution to the corner, and the depressed/fenced off area is not an urban condition; can slab be stepped so that it's raised at the corner? Corner is a major gateway to Clarendon and could be a lost opportunity
- Would like more information on the enhanced alley, transit access, affordable housing/unit breakdown; is there a dog run area labeled on the plans?
- Want to see enhancements to north alley; would like to know if inner courtyard can be oriented toward the street
- Comments to come, want to associate with comments on the corner condition; when are we going to address the request for bonus density? Why is this justified for 255 units? Would like a breakdown

NEXT STEPS

- SPRC meeting #2 is scheduled for March 11, 2019
- Anticipated agenda includes continuing architecture discussion, and to discuss open space and landscaping in the project