



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING, HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

Planning Division

#1 Courthouse Plaza, 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201
TEL 703.228.3525 FAX 703.228.3543 www.arlingtonva.us

MEMORANDUM

TO: Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission

FROM: Elizabeth Weigle

DATE: April 7, 2016

SUBJECT: Rosslyn Sector Plan Implementation

The purpose of the upcoming **Tuesday, April 12** ZOCO meeting is to review preliminary Zoning Ordinance amendments associated with implementation of the Rosslyn Sector Plan. The amendments reflect input received at the February 24, LRPC/ZOCO meeting and from the general public.

Background

On July 23, 2015, the County Board adopted the Rosslyn Sector Plan (the Plan). The Plan included several short-term action items, including amendments to the GLUP, MTP and Zoning Ordinance to implement the vision of the Plan. Specifically, the Plan recommends that the Zoning Ordinance address building height (including provisions for flexibility), density and step-backs. In addition to the recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, guidance for implementation was also provided by the County Board in the resolution adopted with the Plan. The preliminary draft was informed by the recommendations of the Plan, the County Board's resolution, and the feedback heard at the February 24, LRPC/ZOCO meeting and through letters and emails from the public.

Public Review

At the February 24, LRPC/ZOCO meeting, staff presented a conceptual framework for the zoning approach to building height and step-backs. The presentation focused on the level of flexibility, ranging from allowing for modifications for single-tower sites below 300 feet to codifying only a maximum height for the district. The majority of participants involved in the discussion at the meeting preferred less flexibility and suggested that the map should be codified and strong findings should make an increase in height a rare request. Several participants emphasized that the zoning should ensure the Plan is upheld, including the importance of goals such as neighborhood transitions, and that the burden to justify a variation from the Plan should be on the applicant rather than the SPRC. A minority preferred more flexibility to allow the County Board to consider site- and project-specific circumstances and permit creative solutions that meet the

intent of the Plan. Comments were also received on the GLUP and MTP amendments and will be addressed prior to bringing the amendments forward for consideration.

In addition to comments received at the LRPC/ZOCO meeting, comments were also received by email and letter. These comments encouraged flexibility and minimal codification of the Plan elements.

Attachment B includes a compilation of all comments received thus far. Comments provided by email and letter also addressed the process, in requesting that input be balanced and comprehensive. Staff will continue to update the comment-response matrix to include all comments received through ZOCO and other stakeholder meetings and those submitted in writing through letters and email.

Preliminary Zoning Ordinance Amendment for Discussion

To facilitate the vision of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the "C-O Rosslyn" district is proposed to be amended. Specifically, the Plan recommends that the Zoning Ordinance address building height (including provisions for flexibility), density and step-backs (page 155 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The zoning district is further proposed to be comprehensively updated to improve clarity and reflect current policy where needed, addressing elements such as the purpose, retail uses, and landscaping.

Building Height & Step-Backs

Currently, "C-O Rosslyn" permits building heights up to 300', with provisions to exceed that height at Central Place. As was presented for the 2/24 meeting, staff developed the preliminary considerations for evaluating the appropriate zoning approach for building height and step-backs, reflecting guidance from the Plan and the County Board resolution adopted with the Plan. The approach should: 1) Uphold the vision, goals, and recommendation of the Plan; 2) Provide predictability and clarity for developers and community members; and 3) Afford the ability to address project- and/or site-specific conditions and provide creative solutions.

Upon further analysis and consideration of the input received thus far, the preliminary approach to building height and step-backs involves the following key elements:

- The by-right and base special exception height remain unchanged from existing "C-O Rosslyn";
- The County Board, through site plan approval, may approve height up to heights recommended in the Plan based on a set of findings that reinforce the Plan; and
- Further, the County Board, through site plan approval, may approve height above heights recommended in the Plan when a project equally or better meets the findings, up to a maximum height of 470' above sea level.

The preliminary zoning text is intended to ensure that development projects must

demonstrate that they meet the vision, goals and recommendations of the Plan through a variety of elements. First, the text emphasizes the importance of building height, neighborhood transitions and step-backs and the intent behind recommendations in the Plan. The text references the Building Height Map and states that these are “up to” amounts dependent on meeting the findings included. In this way, the Zoning Ordinance emphasizes that the goals are more important than the exact numbers on the map. The findings were drafted to include the key goals of the Plan and were informed by the considerations raised at the February 24, LRCP/ZOCO meeting. Second, in order to allow a site plan to exceed the height on the map, the County Board must make an additional finding. Together, these provisions will ensure that any height request meets the vision and goals of the Plan. Lastly, the height maximum is set at 470’ above sea level. This is consistent with the maximum height evaluated during the sector plan process.

Building Height Map

In developing the approach presented in this memo, staff considered the full range of input received and the perceived pros and cons of codifying the Building Height Map. In the resolution adopted with the Plan, the County Board gave clear direction that the property owners should be able to offer alternative creative solutions or proposals consistent with the stated goals of the Plan, to be considered as part of the site plan review process. Therefore, the Zoning Ordinance should allow for some flexibility in building height. Rather than codify a map and allow for multiple ways to modify it, staff proposes that referencing the map and codifying goals of the Plan more strongly enforces the Plan recommendations related to height and is consistent with the County Board’s resolution.

Single-tower sites below 300 feet

Rather than call out the single-tower sites as having different criteria than other height modifications, staff concluded that it is appropriate to reinforce that all projects must meet the core goals of the peaks and valleys approach. In the proposed text, the County Board must find that projects are consistent with the Plan, which would include the Plan’s recommendations for single-tower sites.

Density

"C-O Rosslyn" currently permits a floor area ratio (FAR) of 3.8 for commercial/office uses and 4.8 for residential or hotel uses by special exception. The district further permits the County Board to approve additional density up to a maximum 10.0 FAR when the proposal offers important community benefits identified in approved plans for the area and meets the other special exception criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends maintaining the maximum of 10.0 FAR, except in following two instances which are addressed in the proposed changes to "C-O Rosslyn":

- *Transformational Infrastructure:* The Plan recommends that the County Board should have the ability to consider, in specific instances necessary to accomplish transformational infrastructure elements identified in the plan, additional density above 10.0 FAR (page 154 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The Plan further

states that the additional density should be consistent with the Plan's building height and form guidelines.

Through the planning process, it was identified that certain sites in Rosslyn along the 18th Street corridor may have difficulty redeveloping without additional density. The proposed changes would allow the County Board to approve density above 10.0 FAR for a site plan if it finds that additional density is necessary to accomplish new segments of 18th Street N. The proposed text would preclude, however, approving additional height above that recommended on the Building Height Map for additional density achieved through this provision, consistent with the recommendations of the Plan.

- *Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)*: The Plan references the use of TDR to exceed 10.0 FAR in the criteria listed for height flexibility (p. 168 of the Rosslyn Sector Plan). The proposed changes would allow the County's [TDR policy](#) and the provisions of §15.5.7.B. to apply in the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District (RCRD). Development projects that earn density through a TDR would also be eligible to request additional height under the zoning provisions described earlier in this report, consistent with the intent of the height flexibility described in the Rosslyn Sector Plan. Based on the modeling done during the sector plan process, staff expects that opportunities to use TDR in Rosslyn will be limited.

Other Proposed Changes

Additional changes are proposed to reflect the policy guidance of the Rosslyn Sector Plan and to improve the clarity and formatting of the "C-O Rosslyn" District. These changes include:

- *Purpose*: This section is proposed to be updated to incorporate the goals of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, to remove language that does not relate to the purpose, and to clarify that "C-O Rosslyn" applies to the RCRD.
- *Landscaped Open Space*: Currently, "C-O Rosslyn" requires that 20% of a site be landscaped open space. This can be modified by site plan. The Rosslyn Sector Plan discourages the provision of small on-site open spaces when they detract from the overall urban design vision for Rosslyn. In such cases, the Plan recommends that redevelopment projects contribute to the creation of one of the parks envisioned in the Plan. Therefore, the landscaped open space requirement is proposed to be removed so as to not inadvertently encourage spaces that may not contribute to Rosslyn's park and open space network. On-site open space needs should be evaluated and determined during the site plan review process.
- *Retail Uses and Streetscapes*: These sections are proposed to be removed. The ground floor use and streetscape recommendations in the Plan are intended to be used as guidance, and staff proposes that they not be codified in the Zoning

Ordinance.

- *Other Changes:* References to policy guidance are proposed to be updated; outdated zoning text is proposed to be removed where no longer needed; and the text is proposed to be reformatted for clarity.

Next Steps and Preliminary Timeline

Feedback from the 4/12, ZOCO meeting as well as input from other stakeholders will inform revisions to the preliminary draft of the Zoning Ordinance amendment. The next ZOCO meeting to discuss the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments related to Rosslyn Sector Plan implementation is scheduled for May 10. County Board hearing dates are tentatively expected to occur in Fall 2016.

Key:

Black / no underline = existing text

Green/underline or strikethrough = existing text that was moved

Red/underline or strikethrough = proposed text

Article 7. Commercial/ Mixed Use (C) Districts

§7.1. Commercial/Mixed Use (C) Districts Use Tables

§7.15. C-O Rosslyn, Mixed Use Rosslyn District

Purpose

The purpose of the C-O Rosslyn, Mixed Use Rosslyn District is to encourage a mixed-use development of office, retail and service commercial, hotel and multiple-family dwelling uses within the ~~Rosslyn Metro station Area and the~~ area designated as the Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District on the General Land Use Plan. ~~When a lot is located in the area designated Rosslyn Coordinated Redevelopment District on the General Land Use Plan, site plans may be approved by the County Board. Determination as to the actual types and densities of uses to be allowed will be based on the characteristics of the site and its location, and on the extent to which the proposed site plan for development, redevelopment or rehabilitation of the site meets the standards of this section and accomplishes the policies and recommendations contained in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum and other plans and policies established for the area by the County Board.~~ The goals of this district are to:

- ~~A.~~ Advance the future vision of Rosslyn established in the Rosslyn Sector Plan;
- ~~B.~~ Support a diverse mix of uses, including workplaces, housing, retail, and visitor destinations;
- ~~C.~~ Create a high quality public realm with an emphasis on walkability and public parks and open spaces;
- ~~D.~~ Implement a peaks and valleys approach to building heights that, among other goals, protects priority public view corridors, supports an appealing environment at the ground level, creates an attractive, distinctive skyline with varied heights, and ensures sensitive transitions to surrounding neighborhoods ;
- ~~E.~~ Transform Rosslyn’s transportation network, including an enhanced system of complete streets, improvements to transit facilities and operations, and safer, more attractive and more accessible pedestrian and bicycle networks; and
- ~~A.~~ Create premier office space suitable for regional and national headquarters of major corporations, institutions and international firms;
- ~~B.~~ Provide hotels that expand and enhance hotel services for Rosslyn and Arlington County businesses, residents, and visitors;
- ~~C.~~ Provide residential development that meets the housing goals and policies of Arlington County;

- ~~D. Implement urban design, streetscape and open space plans and policies, including the central place, the esplanade and other public facilities;~~
- ~~E. Achieve the policy objectives for increasing retail commercial services in the center of Rosslyn; and~~
- F. Achieve superior architecture and the best in urban design practice.

Uses

Uses shall be as specified in §7.1. ~~and special exception site plans as previously approved by the County Board, subject to all conditions of approval and any future amendments which the County Board may approve.~~

§7.15.2.

Density and dimensional standards

A. By-right

Development allowed by-right in the C-O Rosslyn district shall comply with the following standards, except as otherwise expressly allowed or stated.

Type of Standard	Single-family Dwellings	All Other Uses
Lot area, minimum (sq. ft.)	6,000	20,000
Lot width (feet)	60	100
Height, maximum (feet)	35	35
Floor area ratio, maximum		
Site area up to 9,999	--	0.40
Site area 10,000 to 19,999	--	0.50
Site area 20,000 and above	--	0.60

B. Special exception

Development allowed by special exception in the C-O Rosslyn district shall comply with the following standards, except as otherwise approved by the County Board.

Type of Standard	Office, Retail, Service Commercial	Multiple-family Dwellings	Hotel
Lot area, minimum (sq. ft.)	30,000	30,000	30,000
Lot width, average (feet)	125	125	125
Height, maximum, including penthouse and parapet walls (feet)	153	180	180
Floor area ratio, maximum	3.8	4.8	4.8

1. Exceptions

~~(a)~~ See §7.15.4. for provisions for additional density and height.

~~(a)~~(b) The County Board may ~~authorize~~approve application for rezoning to the C-O Rosslyn District where a lot or plot having less width or less area is part of a block surrounded by streets and/or buildings that generally comply with the provisions of this section.

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

C. Bulk, coverage and placement

For bulk, coverage and placement requirements not listed in this section see §3.2.

Provisions for Additional Density and Height

In considering the approval of a site plan the County Board may approve additional density and height above that provided in §7.15.3.B where it finds that the development project is consistent with the Rosslyn Sector Plan, offers certain features, design elements, services, or amenities identified in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, and meets §15.5.5 and the other special exception criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. In considering such modification, the County Board may also consider characteristics of the site and the area as described in §15.5.7 -and the plans and policies adopted for the area. Provisions of §15.5.9 for the approval of additional height and density shall not be applicable in the C-O Rosslyn district. Under no circumstances shall application of the modification of use provisions of §15.5.7.A be applied to permit a modifications of density or height density of more than 10.0 F.A.R. or a height of more than that 300 feet except as described below. The foregoing shall be sSubject to the following:

D.A. ExceptionsDensity

1. DensityUnder no circumstances shall the County Board approve density above 10.0 FAR, except that:

- (a) The County Board may approve density above 10.0 FAR where it finds that additional density is necessary to accomplish new segments of 18th Street N. and the development project is consistent with the building height and form guidelines of the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and
- (b) The County Board may approve above 10.0 FAR for a receiving site where the additional density achieved through the transfer of development rights, as provided in §15.5.7.B.

2. No portion of the site shall be used more than one time in computing the permitted density. All mechanical penthouse area in excess of that used for elevator, mechanical, or maintenance equipment shall be counted as gross floor area.

B. Building Height

1. The County Board may approve additional height above that provided in §7.15.3.B, exclusive of mechanical penthouses and parapet walls, up to the building height shown in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, and consistent with the step-backs and neighborhood transitions shown in the Rosslyn Sector Plan, where it finds:

- (a) The development project is consistent with the vision and policy guidance of the Rosslyn Sector Plan;
- (b) Priority public view corridors are preserved;
- (c) The development project contributes to a distinctive skyline with varied heights;

(d) The development project provides a transition in scale and height to surrounding lower density neighborhoods;

(e) The increase in height does not have a substantial adverse impact on daylight for public parks and open spaces envisioned in the Rosslyn Sector Plan; and

(f) The development project provides a pedestrian-scaled street environment and view opportunities.

2. The County Board may approve height above that recommended in the Rosslyn Sector Plan where it finds that the additional height equally or better meets the findings of §7.15.4.B.1, provided that under no circumstances shall additional building height be approved to accommodate additional density granted in §7.15.4.A.1(a) or to allow a building height greater than 470 feet above sea level.

1. Provision for additional density and height

~~(a) In considering the approval of a site plan the County Board may permit additional density, above 3.8 floor area ratio (FAR) for office, retail and service commercial uses, above 4.8 F.A.R. for hotels and multiple-family dwellings, and above the existing density on a site when it is already greater than 3.8 F.A.R. for office, retail and service commercial uses, or above 4.8 F.A.R. for hotels and multiple-family dwellings, up to maximum of 10.0 F.A.R. and/or height up to a maximum of 300 feet. Increases in density and height may be approved when the County Board finds that the development proposal offers important community benefits identified in approved plans for the area and meets the other special exception criteria of the zoning ordinance. In considering such modification, the County Board may also consider characteristics of the site and the area as described in §15.5.7 and the plans and policies adopted for the area. Provisions of §15.5.9 for the approval of additional height and density shall not be applicable in the C-O Rosslyn district. Under no circumstances shall application of the modification of use provisions of §15.5.7 be applied to permit a density of more than 10.0 F.A.R. or a height of more than 300 feet except as described below.~~

~~(b) To enable the county to provide for adequate streets the County Board may grant additional density (F.A.R.) within the height limit up to an amount that would be permitted if any area dedicated from the site for street purposes were permitted to be counted in calculating density.~~

~~(c) To enable the county to achieve an enhanced Rosslyn skyline and other community amenities the County Board may grant additional height up to maximum of 490 feet above sea level for projects within Central Place (defined as the area bounded by 19th Street N., N. Lynn Street, Wilson Boulevard, and Fort Myer Drive). Development subject to site plan approval pursuant to §15.5 within Central Place may be approved when the County Board finds a project is generally consistent with the May 5, 2007 County Board Resolution on Urban Design Principles for Rosslyn Central Place, and additionally meets the standards of §15.5.5.~~

2. Lot area and width

~~The County Board may authorize application for rezoning to the C-O Rosslyn District where a lot or plot having less width or less area is part of a block surrounded by~~

141 ~~streets and/or buildings that generally comply with the provisions of this section.~~

142 ~~_____~~ **District use standards**

143 ~~Use standards applicable to specific uses in the C-O Roslyn district include:~~

144 [Reserved]

145 **Site development standards**

146 ~~§7.15.4.~~ The site development standards of Article 13 and Article 14 apply to all development, except as
147 otherwise specified below.

148 ~~A. Retail and service commercial uses when allowed by the General Land Use~~
149 ~~§7.15.5. Plan~~

150 ~~In site plan projects, retail and service commercial uses, when allowed by the General~~
151 ~~Land Use Plan, shall be provided and located as described in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan~~
152 ~~Addendum. Primary retail and service commercial uses shall generally be located at the~~
153 ~~street level and on the streets identified for such uses in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan~~
154 ~~Addendum. Secondary retail and service commercial uses shall generally be located on~~
155 ~~levels other than the street level and off the street frontages or in areas designated for~~
156 ~~secondary retail and service commercial uses in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum.~~

157 ~~B. Landscaping~~

158 ~~20 percent of total site area is required to be landscaped open space in accordance with~~
159 ~~the requirements of §14.2, Landscaping. The County Board may modify landscaping~~
160 ~~requirements by site plan approval when the County Board finds that the proposed site~~
161 ~~plan accomplishes the policies and recommendations contained in the Rosslyn Station~~
162 ~~Area Plan Addendum and other plans and policies established for the area by the County~~
163 ~~Board.~~

164 ~~C.A. Parking and Loading~~

165 ~~Parking and loading shall be regulated as specified and regulated in §14.3, and as~~
166 ~~specified below, except that the County Board may specify and modify parking~~
167 ~~regulations by site plan approval.~~

168 ~~1. Parking Requirements~~

169 ~~(a) Dwelling unit~~

170 ~~One off-street parking space shall be provided for each dwelling unit.~~

171 ~~(b) Hotel~~

172 ~~0.7 off-street parking space for each guest room and dwelling unit.~~

173 ~~(c) Office and Retail The parking provided shall be located below grade or~~
174 ~~within the structure housing the use to which the parking is~~
175 ~~appurtenant, except as may be allowed in an approved site plan.~~

176 ~~(d)(c) Off-street loading spaces for all permitted uses shall be provided as~~
177 ~~specified in §14.3.~~

178 ~~Transportation Demand Management plans shall be required to be approved as~~
179 ~~part of any site plan approval unless determined otherwise by the County Board.~~
180 ~~Office and, retail and service commercial parking may be approved within a range~~
181 ~~between the rate of one off-street parking space for each 530 sq. ft. of office,~~

182 ~~retail and service commercial gross floor area and the rate of one off street parking~~
 183 ~~space for each to~~ 1,000 sq. ft. of office ~~and;~~ retail ~~and service commercial~~ gross
 184 floor area depending on the adequacy of the Transportation Demand Management
 185 plan in addressing the need for parking.
 186

187 2. Additional Parking Requirements

188 (a) The parking provided shall be located below grade or within the structure housing
 189 the use to which the parking is appurtenant.

190 (b) Short-term, convenient parking shall be provided for customers of commercial
 191 tenant retailers when the business premises are open to the public for business.

192 (c) Transportation Demand Management plans shall be required to be approved as
 193 part of any site plan approval unless determined otherwise by the County Board.

194 (e) The parking provided shall be located below grade or within the structure housing
 195 the use to which the parking is appurtenant, except as may be allowed in an
 196 approved site plan.

197 ~~2. Off street loading spaces for all permitted uses shall be provided as specified in~~
 198 ~~§14.3.~~

199 ~~§7.15.6-~~ Streetscape

200 ~~Streetscapes, including curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light, street furniture, landscaping and~~
 201 ~~other elements, shall be provided as contained in the Rosslyn Station Area Plan Addendum,~~
 202 ~~and other plans and policies established for the area by the County Board.~~
 203

Rosslyn Sector Plan Implementation: GLUP, MTP and Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Comments/responses on proposed amendments (updated 4/6/16)

#	Source/Date	Comment	Staff Response
GENERAL LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENTS			
GLUP Map Text			
1.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Description of Rosslyn as having the “greatest concentration” of activities is not accurate; consider different language such as “varied activities”	This language is intended as a vision statement, not as a reflection of current conditions. The statement is consistent with the vision statement in the Rosslyn Sector Plan (page 49), so staff proposes utilizing the same text in the GLUP.
2.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Existing bullet regarding preservation areas should be updated to better reflect all the residential areas surrounding the RCRD, including River Place; consider also whether the description reflects the current intent for these areas.	This bullet is intended to reflect planning guidance, not current conditions. The Rosslyn Sector Plan recommends that future planning will need to be done for the River Place site (page 89). Staff is evaluating the language to ensure it adequately describes current policy guidance outside the RCRD.
3.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Somewhat confusing to describe “Plan features” when, in fact, there are multiple plans for each station area.	This is standard language on the GLUP map and is meant to reference multiple plans.
4.	Resident, 2/16	Existing bullet regarding preservation areas should refer to Radnor-Fort Myer Heights, not Fort Myer Heights.	Staff agrees. Staff is evaluating language to ensure it adequately describes current policy guidance outside the RCRD.
GLUP Map Booklet			
5.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	It’s not appropriate to strike “over the next 25 years” from the description of the RCRD; the timeframe acts as a reminder that plans need to be refreshed over time.	The sentence in the GLUP is describing the purpose of the RCRD, which is not limited to a 25-year timeframe. Staff does not agree with keeping this text.
6.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	When describing "C-O Rosslyn" zoning district, clarify that additional height and density is earned above base site plan heights/density.	The language in the GLUP states that the "C-O Rosslyn" zoning district allows the County Board to approve additional height and density.
7.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Are bullets just examples or meant to be complete description of the plan’s vision and goals?	Yes, the list is a summary of highlights and not inclusive of all the vision, goals, policies and recommendations in the Plan.
MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENTS			
MTP Street Typologies			
8.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Addition of new street typology should be part of a broader County-wide process and discussion, rather than grouped together with Rosslyn implementation.	The new typology will be proposed as a County-wide update and go through a separate process prior to the Rosslyn amendments.
9.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	What is the significance of changing streets from Type A to Type B? Staff responded that the types reflect the intended mixed-use character and anticipated level of activity.	The types reflect the intended mixed-use character and anticipated level of activity.
MTP Bike and Trail Network Map			

#	Source/Date	Comment	Staff Response
10.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	The bicycle element of the MTP has not been updated to differentiate between bike lanes and cycle tracks. Can these be distinguished from one another on the map?	The County has long-term plans to update the bicycle element, but this has not been done yet. Therefore, the map will reflect the current bike lane typologies.
11.	TC Member, email, 3/17/16	Why doesn't the Potomac River Connector trail get a call-out under Key Facilities like the Rosslyn Circle Tunnel and Iwo Jima connection to Roosevelt Bridge do?	The Potomac River Connector Trail is listed as a "Proposed New Bicycle Facility" because it will be an addition to the MTP Map. The other two facilities that were mentioned are listed separately because they are currently shown on the MTP Map and therefore are not additions. There is no implication that it is less important than the other facilities.
ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS			
Zoning Framework			
12.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Can staff provide examples of project-/site-specific conditions that would warrant a modification of the heights map?	Examples include site grade or orientation, location of the line delineating split-height zones in a single block, accommodation of a creative rooftop or step-back solutions, increased differentiation between tower heights in multi- tower site plans, and other unanticipated circumstances.
13.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Where in the Plan is the basis for Option 3?	The Plan recommends that the Zoning Ordinance address heights, but it does not recommend the manner in which height is regulated. Option 3 is one approach.
14.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Could you codify heights for each site without a map?	Yes, height could be codified in other ways through text. For example, the "MU-VS" district codifies heights by block through text. Alternatively, the Zoning Ordinance can reference the height map without codifying it.
15.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	How would Option 3 ensure neighborhood transitions if all buildings could be proposed at 390'?	This option would require that the County Board make a finding that a site plan is consistent with the recommendations of the Plan, and as such, it could be extremely difficult/impossible for 390' buildings on certain sites to be approved with such findings.
16.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Is the criteria for "upholding vision goals and recommendations" meant to include all elements of the Plan?	Yes, the Zoning Ordinance will reference the policy guidance of the Plan in its entirety.
17.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	How are single-tower sites defined?	The illustrative plan in the Plan shows single-tower sites based on assumptions made during modeling. However, determination would be made at the time of final site plan.

#	Source/Date	Comment	Staff Response
18.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Are there any districts that have no height caps?	Yes, several of the "C-O" districts do not have an ultimate height limit and can be modified through bonus provisions.
19.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Is there a way to incorporate review process in the ZO (e.g., a project with no modifications has a faster process than one with modifications)?	The review process and timing is governed by §15.5 and Administrative Regulation 4.1. Staff does not recommend codifying a Rosslyn-specific site plan process.
20.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Recommend codifying the map and limiting the flexibility – either by only allowing the height of single-tower sites below 300’ to be modified or by providing strong criteria and a maximum height limit/maximum amount of modification. The zoning should ensure that modifications only are granted in unique circumstances.	In the resolution adopted with the Plan, the County Board gave clear direction that the property owners should be able to offer alternative creative solutions or proposals consistent with the stated goals of the Plan to be considered as part of the site plan review process. Therefore, the Zoning Ordinance should allow for some flexibility in building height. Rather than codify a map and allow for multiple ways to modify it, staff believes that referencing the map and codifying goals of the Plan more strongly enforces the Plan recommendations related to height.
21.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Include strong findings for height modifications; consider criteria on page 168 as a starting point for developing criteria.	The preliminary approach includes strong findings, based on the goals of the plan, the peaks and valleys approach to building height, and the criteria for height flexibility. With this approach, the County Board would have to find a site plan consistent with the findings in order to grant the height in the Plan or allow for height above that in the Plan.
22.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	The zoning text should place the burden to justify a variation from the Plan on the applicant rather than on the SPRC. Leaving the map out of the Zoning Ordinance would place the burden on SPRC to raise concerns about the deviations from the Plan.	While the preliminary approach does not codify the map, staff believes it does place the burden on the applicant to justify a variation from the Plan. First, the base special exception heights are a starting point and the County Board may approve “up to” heights in the Plan based on findings. The applicant will need to prove that the site plan meets each of the findings included in the ordinance. Further, in order to allow a site plan to exceed height on the map, the County Board must make an additional finding.
23.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Plan provides a strong vision, but it does not need to be codified. Flexibility should be provided and ultimately evaluated through the site plan process.	The preliminary approach strikes a balance between providing flexibility and ensuring that the vision and goals of the Plan will be upheld. The map is referenced but not codified, and the findings provide strong guidance for evaluating the height of site plan proposals.
24.	Property owner, Letter, 3/11/16	The Building Height Map establishes maximum heights for each building site in Rosslyn, and is best interpreted as	

#	Source/Date	Comment	Staff Response
		guidance for future site planning, rather than strict regulation. Codification of a district-wide maximum height limit with no site-specific limitations is the appropriate approach to codification of the Plan recommendations and is consistent with direction given by the County Board at the 2015 public hearing.	
25.	LRPC/ZOCO, 2/24/16	Key considerations include neighborhood transitions, step-backs, public view corridors, peaks and valleys goals, predictability, and flexibility for specific, challenging circumstances.	Many of these considerations are included in the findings in the preliminary approach. While flexibility inherently lowers the amount of predictability, the strong findings and reference to the height map ensure that the Plan's policies provide a starting point for review.
26.	Property owner, email, 3/16/16	The scope of the re-write should not expand beyond minimum updates necessary to implement the Plan.	The intent of the Zoning Ordinance amendment process is to implement the vision and recommendations of the Rosslyn Sector Plan. As such, the amendments will reflect the
27.	Rosslyn BID, email, 3/17/16	Narrowly restrict the scope of proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance to provide maximum flexibility consistent with the intent of the Realize Rosslyn Plan.	recommendation to only codify the density, height and step-back elements of the building height and form guidelines. Further, the County Board's direction regarding flexibility for creative solutions, as provided in the resolution adopted with the Plan, will inform the proposed zoning approach.
28.	Property owner, email, 3/16/16	Consider how to adjust the height map for Rosslyn Plaza Phase 1 to reflect the approved height of up to 275-feet	Under the preliminary approach, the map is not codified. The height of 270' for Rosslyn Plaza Phase 1 will remain as recommended in the Plan. The goal of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is to implement the Plan, which may allow for some deviation from Plan heights.
29.	Land use attorney, email, 3/22/16	The language in option 1 is too ambiguous to become law - the term "single tower sites" is not defined in the proposed ordinance. In the Plan it says "for any site on Map 1.2 with a building height limit below 300 feet as depicted on Map 3.16 that can only fit one building tower" a height modification is possible. You can build more than one tower on any site. While this is appropriate planning language, you can't port this into the Zoning Ordinance - it is ill-defined and too ambiguous to be law.	Rather than call out the single-tower sites as having different criteria than other height modifications, staff concluded that it was appropriate to reinforce that all projects must meet the core goals of the peaks and valleys approach. The proposed text would require the Board to make a finding that the proposal is consistent with the Plan, including the single-tower height flexibility recommendations.

#	Source/Date	Comment	Staff Response
		This can really trip up a property owner that changes plans and wants to use multiple towers somewhere. Accordingly, we would advocate for option 2 or 3.	
Public Review Process			
30.	Property owner, email, 3/16/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff should provide proposed revisions to the Ordinance as soon as possible that in their professional judgment best reflect what the County Board requested via the adopted Sector Plan and Resolution; • Following this, the ZOCO committee, affected property owners, and others should have ample and equal opportunity to review and discuss the proposed revisions with Staff and request any changes; • The ZOCO Committee should add seats for NAIOP, EDC, Chamber, affected property owners and others as may be necessary to provide more balanced representation; and • The County Board should designate a ZOCO Liaison that will attend all of the meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft amendments were provided for the April 12 ZOCO meeting. • Staff is committed to a broad based, balanced and ongoing engagement throughout the Rosslyn rezoning process. The draft text will be shared for review and comment by all stakeholders, and we intend to regularly update this comment/response matrix and share it prior to ZOCO, PC and County Board meetings. Staff welcomes all feedback and will continue to reach out to stakeholder groups to offer meetings. • ZOCO is a committee of the Planning Commission, and meeting participation is at the discretion of the ZOCO chair. The Rosslyn Process Panel has been invited to participate to provide continuity from the Rosslyn Sector Plan process. Also, as stated above, staff will continue to contact stakeholder groups to offer briefings. • Staff will continue to brief the County Manager and, as needed, County Board members throughout the process.
31.	Rosslyn BID, email, 3/17/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affected property owners and others with key interests should have the opportunity to review and discuss the proposed revisions with staff and request any changes, which staff should then add to the comment matrix, to be called out and discussed in subsequent ZOCO meetings; • Ensure a more balanced discussion at ZOCO by adding a seat for the Economic Development Commission and NAIOP and/or the Chamber and by providing an opportunity for public comment during the ZOCO meetings; and • The County Board should designate a ZOCO liaison that will attend all of the meetings. 	