
Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission (ZOCO) Meeting Summary, November 10, 2015.

PC Members in Attendance: Erik Gutshall (chair-ZOCO); Rosemary Ciotti; Steve Cole; Nancy Iacomini; James Schroll

Staff: Richard Tucker, Deborah Albert; APS staff: Jennifer Xu.

Western Rosslyn Area Plan (WRAP) Zoning Implementation. This meeting was a continuation of the discussion of proposed Zoning Regulations from the October ZOCO meeting. Proposed amendments are to the S-3A, RA4.8 and C-O zoning districts. Proposed amendments to C-O are an alternative proposal from that previously drafted as part of the C-O Rosslyn districts. Comments from ZOCO and community members present are summarized below.

Proposed amendments to S-3A zoning district

- Is “policy guidance” used elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance? Staff confirmed that many zoning provisions refer to plans, however, there is no single terminology used for such reference; some terms, such as “policy guidance” are intended to be generic, whereas others, such as “Guiding Principles,” also used here, are specific to language used in a plan document.
- APS staff requested additional amendments, to parking provisions for schools. CPHD staff indicated that revisions to parking provisions are not within the scope of implementing the WRAP, however, could be addressed separately if determined to be a priority.

Proposed amendments to RA4.8 zoning district

- Would allowing approval of a project with less than 100% affordable units consistent with the Affordable Housing Master Plan (AHMP) and the other goals of the WRAP lead to a situation where a project could be approved with no affordable units? Or where the goals of the WRAP and the AHMP are competing? Would it make sense to include a floor, such as no less than 5%?
 - The alternative to setting a floor is that the County Board has no discretion at all, which might make people feel better, but in reality, in order to approve such a development, would require the County Board to make a public statement about not including affordable housing, which is unlikely.
 - One member indicated a level of comfort that the 100% included in the proposed text makes the intent clear and specific.
- A community member inquired as to whether there is a difference with regard to maintenance of “public open space” vs. “publicly-accessible open space.” Staff confirmed that these details are worked out as part of the site plan process, and that the intent of the term “public open space” is simply more clear than “publicly-accessible.”

Proposed amendments to C-O zoning district

- Use of “be applied to” in line 133 seems redundant.
- Is it implicit in this section that you have to earn up to 10.0 FAR with community benefits? Staff was urged to ensure that this intent is discussed and made clear in the staff report
- A community member asked staff to clarify that height in the C-O district is to the top of the occupiable space, exclusive of mechanical penthouse. Staff walked the committee through the building height definition in §3 of the Zoning Ordinance that 1) defines building height as exclusive of mechanical penthouse and 2) articulates which structures are allowed above the height limit.