

**July 15, 2019 Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) | 7-9:30pm**  
Parks & Natural Resources Conference Center (2700 S. Taylor Street)

**Agenda:**

**Met Park Phases 6-8**

Amendments to the Pentagon City Phased Development Site Plan (PDSP) and  
Master Transportation Plan (MTP)

**PART 1: INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS BY STAFF AND APPLICANT:**

- No clarifying questions posed from stakeholders following initial presentations

**Part 2: PENTAGON CITY PDSP ANALYSIS - USES**

- Are there specific parameters/standards for exactly how the uses are to be distributed?  
A. Crystal City Sector Plan has more detailed regulations whereas the Pentagon City PDSP includes more broader guidelines covering this area.
- How does the PDSP set limits on residential density? What happens if other property owners want to introduce specific uses (beyond what PDSP permits)? A. Staff plans to revisit the issue of density and uses as part of the upcoming PDSP Study – anticipated to begin later this fall. Absent of this study, each parcel has a very specific use and density allocation currently available to them based on past amendments to the PDSP. Most parcels have been fully build-out, while much of the remaining density is allocated for Met Park and Pen Place.
- What can we confirm about Brookfield and or Pen Place? A. CPHD Staff shared preliminary information regarding the schedule/purpose for the PDSP Update (12<sup>th</sup> Street Study). Staff did not want to speculate on what each site may be considering, however, Nancy I. confirmed that some elements of the Brookfield application may be available on the internet.
- How did we arrive at this specific number of units? Where else can they be relocated?  
A. Residential use has already been considered within the surrounding areas and is built into adopted policies governing adjacent areas such as Crystal City sector plan, Columbia Pike Form Based Code, and elsewhere in the County. Upcoming PDSP Update (12<sup>th</sup> Street Study) may also bring some of the residential density back to this area if it is determined to be appropriate.
- Why are certain tables in the presentation capturing properties outside of the PDSP?  
A. The Pentagon City metro station area is larger than just these PDSP parcels and helps us obtain a full picture of the residential uses in this neighborhood. Focusing solely on the PDSP is misleading if we're trying to accurately address the supply/demand of housing in Pentagon City.
- Are there parking maximums found in the PDSP? A. No. Additionally, the County Board may modify those regulations on a site plan level if such reductions can be mitigated.
- Is staff comfortable with the 2,000 parking spaces proposed for these two buildings? Are we at a place to adjust them or revise for future projects? A. Parking is still being evaluated and staff is not in a position to revise the minimum standards for office at this time.

- 11,00 housing units in the pipeline – do we have population projections for next 10 years? How does this pipeline compare to the anticipated need (to keep up with the County’s need)?
- How were each station area defined around each metro station? *A. Staff will follow up on how exactly the boundary for the MSA was developed.*
- How will the flex spaces be accessed by general public? Now that they are converted to office (instead of residential)? Does the Public Access Easement apply/extend to the flex spaces? *A. The flex spaces shown in the proposed plan will continue to be publicly accessible.*
- Can we expect to have a redistribution of uses occur later? Potentially with the PDSP Update study? *A. Uses/density will not be redistributed as part of this current PDSP amendment (the residential density is only proposed to be converted and remain on Parcel 3 as office). The subsequent PDSP Update may consider if additional residential uses are appropriate within the Pentagon City area.*
- Nancy I. summarized the feedback provided for this topic and confirmed the stakeholders were comfortable proceeding to the SPRC discussions with an open mind about how a different use mix could be accommodated on the Met Park block while meeting PDSP goals/objectives.

**Part 2: PENTAGON CITY PDSP ANALYSIS - HEIGHT**

- Appreciate sculpting of the building - have any shadow studies been done to indicate impacts on the open space in the middle? *A. Shade analysis has been completed and indicated that 22 story residential building (as called for within the approved PDSP) had similar impacts on light to the interior of the block as the proposed 22 story office building.*
- 22 stories are perceived differently if the right sculpting is included (makes a difference on how they engage the neighboring properties). How does it compare to the 1900 Crystal building? *A. Architect walked the group through the sculpting approach implemented with Phases 6-8.*
- How does this comply with the PDSP guidelines (since we are exceeding the residential 22 story cap)? We realize an office building of this scale will be 50 feet taller than the residential building that was planned. A total height of 300 feet seems excessive along 15<sup>th</sup> Street (that close to the neighborhood). We should also consider the height in terms of feet (not stories). *A. Nancy I. and staff confirmed the C-O-2.5 zoning calculates height based on stories but agrees we should not ignore the absolute height as measured in terms of feet (acknowledging the difference between residential and office in this case).*
- Open space improvements are a good tradeoff for height and access to the interior of the block. What is the impact across the street (particularly to the south). Are there significant shading issues on Eads Street? *A. Applicant indicated they did not find significant shade issues to the south. However, shade studies were not captured for buildings immediately to the east.*
- Some of these appear too boxy when stretching such a long span on this block. *A. The approved PDSP actually envisioned significant building footprints in phases 6-8 when residential use was anticipated. PDSP also called for building heights to be varied within Pentagon City.*
- Curious as to what the building footprint might be just for the tallest portions of the buildings in each phase (compared to the overall building footprint as measured at each buildings’ base). *A. The applicant will provide those figures at a subsequent SPRC meeting.*
- This latest iteration does not seem to block certain views which were prioritized earlier (internal cross streets and pedestrian connections are maintained).

- The way buildings are integrated into the community can have a huge impact and certain treatments may minimize or mitigate the effects of scale for a 22-story building (additional sculpting opportunities could be revisited in the SPRC to help with this).
- Nancy I. summarized the feedback provided for this topic and confirmed the stakeholders were comfortable proceeding to the SPRC discussions with an open mind about how a taller building can address appropriate heights through sculpting and other treatments which will be the subject of subsequent SPRC discussions.

Part 2: PENTAGON CITY PDSP ANALYSIS - **DENSITY**

- Can we verify how the PDSP density has been calculated? Has density been transferred from the park and the roadways overtime? *A. Since the mid-1970s, as new streets and parks were created, the density from those areas (where buildings may no longer be built) was transferred to the rest of the PDSP and distributed over time.*
- Did the other property owners waive their right to build up to FAR 2.5 (on a particular block)? Or can they still do that today (which would exceed the overall FAR limit for the entire PDSP area)? As an example, could Pentagon Row replace their existing buildings and build up to their own 2.5 FAR? *A. In each case, the answer is no. The FARs (as shown in the presentations) are calculated over the entire PDSP area and not on an individual parcel.*
- Are there any density exclusions proposed for Met Park? *A. Exclusions are proposed for daycare facility and building service areas (vertical shafts, mechanical areas, etc.) The fact that they are proposed, however, does not automatically mean they would be supported by staff.*
- TDRs were only approved (and certified by the County Board) for Pen Place, correct? *A. Yes.*
- Can staff confirm if a new law (introduced in 2006) precludes the calculation of density if that density is based on converted Right of Way? Could staff obtain a legal opinion on this? *A. Staff indicated this was an issue for the County Attorney's Office.*
- Nancy I. summarized the feedback provided for this topic and confirmed the stakeholders were comfortable proceeding to the SPRC discussions where additional focus would be given to the density conversion (from residential to office) and how remaining density would be achieved through a community benefits package.

Part 2: MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN ANALYSIS:

- Are we considering changing the street typologies with this MPT Amendment as well? (Given the change in use and reconfigured vehicular access/loading/purpose of the planned internal street.) *A. Staff is still evaluating street typologies which need to be discussed further internally and will be considered later in the SPRC process.*
- Nancy I. confirmed the stakeholders were comfortable proceeding to the SPRC discussions where transportation would be the subject of a future meeting and additional review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dead residential or office compounds are bad ideas. Use conversion improves the use mix (just like residential going into CC helps that area). I like the design, how the building may be experienced by adjacent properties, and the direction its going in.