

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

600 N. Glebe Rd. – Harris Teeter/ASC Site Plan (SP #72 & #315)

SPRC Meeting #3

July 22, 2019

SPRC Chairs: James Schroll (Chair), Daniel Weir (Co-Chair)

Meeting Agenda

1.) Introductions

2.) Presentations

- a.) Project updates/changes since SPRC #2 (Applicant)
- b.) Architecture; Community Benefits; Phasing/Construction (Applicant)
- c.) Open space design process updates; SPRC comment summary; architecture; next steps (Staff)

2.) SPRC Discussion

- a.) Architecture
- b.) Community Benefits
- c.) Phasing/Construction and Wrap Up

3.) Public Comment

Introduction

- The SPRC Chair provided a summary of the SPRC function and topics to be discussed, and asked for introductions around the table.

Presentations

- The applicant provided an overview of project updates made to-date in response to SPRC and staff comments, including topics such as architecture, building massing, parking, and streetscape design.
- The applicant provided a presentation on architecture, community benefits, and phasing/construction. The presentation provided updated building elevations and 3-D perspectives, as well as a slide on transparency. The phasing presentation covered the demolition and construction of the new buildings and the tentative timeline for build-out.

- Staff provided an update on open space design open house and online survey dates. Additionally, staff covered architectural comments for the applicant, as well as a summary of SPRC issues to-date and next steps in the site plan review process.

SPRC Discussion

Architecture

- What are the façade materials? Please walk us through the materials. What does staff think of the materials?
- Is the sidewalk wide enough on Glebe? Would you get seating areas along Glebe?
- I would like to see more of the glass facade be transparent. I would like to see more than 37%. I also echo staff's point about adding active ground uses along Tazewell.
- The more we can do to activate the dead end of Tazewell, the better.
- The materials should afford enough contrast so that vision impaired can wayfind, and be able to distinguish windows from doors.
- I think the Building 2 entrance into garage is a lost opportunity. It should be someplace great to arrive.
- I concur with comments about activating ground floor. When this item gets to Planning Commission, please be able to demonstrate accessibility.
- I think the architecture is not good.
- I associate myself with the comments on activating the ground uses on Tazewell.
- I would like to see more trees
- How long will the materials last? Will the color fade?
- Could you give us some examples of the materials (Longboard) being used locally on existing buildings?
- Is Tazewell a shared street or plaza? Slide 33: Is the color really bright orange on the façade? Have you thought about your garage and whether it can be converted to a different use in the future?
- Will there be electric vehicle plug-ins in the garage, and if so, what percentage?
- I associate myself with the comments about the visual signal of the garage being a lost opportunity.
- The bollards — Is there any way to envision them as more interesting?
- I like the way you broke up Building 1. Is there any way to break it up the middle more?
- Are you going to have a hotel? Will there be nearby parking for the small businesses?
- I think the redesign of Building 2 is a big improvement. We want modestly sized floor plates and slender towers. We would like to see a view through Building 3 — go back to having two towers. The current configuration is a downgrade of the proposal.
- The applicant should preserve the trees between the Hyde Park property line and the site.
- Why not design the heat pumps on the rood? For instance, a curvilinear arrangement?
- The architecture strikes me as too busy. At the Mazda site, the developer took ownership of the project with appropriate architecture. I wish there would be a sense of order with the architecture.
- I appreciate getting the slides showing perspectives. Slide 33 illustrates our concern about light for Hyde Park. Trees should be left for screening between the properties. I also preferred the two-tower treatment.

- It would be great to have a pedestrian connection to/from Hyde Park.
- What will come with a “flagship” Harris Teeter? Where are the store entrances? Are there plans for any ride-share drop-off? Show how the architecture conforms to the buildings down Glebe Road.

Community Benefits

- What trees are being removed? There shouldn't be a plaza at the end of the open space. There shouldn't be any hardscape.
- When is the park delivered in the phasing? What happens if Building 2 is never built?
- Are you going to have continuous tree pits?
- Are you putting in a left turn signal?
- Is there going to be a place to park e-scooters?
- It's a shame that there aren't on-site affordable units for such a central site. How many units are going to be fully accessible? It's a community benefit to put in more than the minimum required accessible units. 2010 ADA standard should be a minimum. Building architecture sticks out like a sore thumb.
- What is the LEED score? Is there any way to make green roofs?
- I want to see a tree survey at Planning Commission.
- The RTA for the GLUP Amendment shouldn't have been approved. The County Board should have pulled it. The County should have asked Buckingham to review the concepts first. Do not pave the park. There should be more landscaped open space on the ground. It would have been nice to have public art or an art gallery.
- I'm concerned about losing trees around the perimeter.
- I would like to acknowledge the applicant for adding more green space.
- How is the project contributing towards sustainability?
- I'm disappointed in the project not delivering more for sustainably.
- What is the Green Building Fund?
- Please look at improving the rood treatment
- What is the affordable housing contribution?
- Please save the American Basswood trees
- Could you add a bike/pedestrian connection by the Hyde Park property line?
- What are the unique offerings and amenities of the Harris Teeter?

Phasing/Construction & Wrap up

- How does the construction play out in the phasing?
- Add some more green to the Hyde Park end of the site.
- I would like to see some more permeability to break up the block.
- The delivery of the open space should be protected by site plan condition.
- On Tazewell — parking isn't the only thing we want lining the street. There should be active ground-floor uses.
- I associate myself with the Tazewell street activation.
- The biggest building should be near the Maxwell. The open space should have pollinators.
- Is there a reason that Building 2 & 3 can't be constructed simultaneously? I echo comments about permeability and access from Hyde Park.

- I think this is going to be a model site in terms of the mix of uses, so I hope this provides universal design, clear wayfinding, and accessible features for intersections.
- BCA submitted a written list of concerns that remains our position.
- For Transportation Commission, what will be bike/ped. access to store? Please reduce the parking.
- The project is overpacked, under-fenestrated, and Building 2 and 3 should go together.
- You need great canopy and great window displays.
- Thanks to the applicant for working with staff on architecture. Maybe the architecture is too busy. I would like to see more transparency on Glebe.

Public Comment

- I share the concern about quality of architecture. There's a tradeoff between high-cost architecture and affordability. I'm particularly concerned about the cladding. The uglier the architecture the lower the rent. The applicant should show the transparency calculations at Planning Commission. Who owns the park? The owner should make a commitment in writing to have off-peak parking on Glebe Rd.
- There should be more setback from Hyde Park.
- Thanks to applicant for inviting APAH to participate. We look forward to the open space and preserving the tree on our property.
- Compliments to applicant and staff for the work so far, but I'm still concerned about Building 3 needing slender towers. I want to protect the trees at the edges of the site. Preserve the root line by pulling in the below-grade garage. Lastly, traffic generated by this project is still a concern.
- I encourage the applicant to be more creative with the architecture; design the long facade of Building 1 in a more coherent way. Why can't all the parking be underground? Randolph shouldn't be a speedway into the garage.
- Having two towers will result in taller buildings. I don't want higher towers. There are differences of opinion within the Hyde Park -- it's not unanimous that higher towers are preferred. For the architecture: the facade should be improved with the appropriate use of colors. Lighter colors would be more context-sensitive.
- I appreciate the appropriate setback on Building 2 as a Ballston Crest owner. I am concerned about the MOT plans for construction.
- Green roofs; save the trees; reduce parking.