

# Long Range Planning Committee, Meeting Summary

November 14, 2018; 7-9:00pm

2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Room 715

**Subject: Special General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Study Process Revisions and Introduction to Shirlington Village PDSP**

## **(Meeting #1)**

Planning Commission Members in attendance: Nancy Iacomini (Chair), Daniel Weir, Jim Lantelme, Jane Siegel, and James Schroll. Staff members in attendance: Margaret Rhodes, Kelsey Steffen, Matt Ladd, Jennifer Smith, and Richard Tucker. Members of the public in attendance: John Dameron, Kelechi Aleosobi, Dan Glavin, Dan Corwin, Jay Brinson, Tad Lunger, Caroline Herre, Edie Wilson, Niassa Andrews, Kedrick Whitmore, Casey Nolan, and Ellie McCann.

---

### **Welcome**

- Welcome and opening remarks provided by LRPC Chair.

### **LRPC Discussion on the Special GLUP Study Process Revisions Proposal**

Staff gave a presentation on the Special GLUP Study typical process and rationale based on the adopted County Board policy. Staff then walked through the proposed process revisions. At the conclusion of staff's presentation, the LRPC discussed the proposed changes. Comments and questions were then posed by members of the public, which included representatives from the Shirlington Civic Association. Comments and questions included:

- One question from a planning commissioner was about the new fees proposed to accompany the process change amendments. The commissioner was interested in the linkage of the fees to the process revisions and how the fee would be determined.
- Overall the commentary from the committee was supportive of a fee that reflects staff time.
- The commissioners also stated that, overall, they are supportive of a process change as opposed to returning to the previous course or continuing with the current course for addressing Special GLUP Studies.
- A commissioner also noted that she does not want any more notes on the GLUP map, as they are confusing.
- One of the commissioners asked if the proposed process amendment would extend the timeframe it takes for staff to undertake a Special GLUP Study.
- The commissioners commented on how the proposed process may allow for a more predictable timeline with set times for submission and review during the year.
- Overall, the commissioners were interested in seeing more details on the criteria for determining whether a Special GLUP Study process versus another type of land use review process should be pursued.

- One of the commissioners also suggested that staff review previous Special GLUP Studies and determine if the Special GLUP Study process was a good fit and worked well to meet the County's and the applicant's objectives.
- One of the commissioners asked if an amendment might be needed to the County Board's policy on Special GLUP Studies.
- A commissioner again brought up the timing issue related to the proposed new process and whether the proposed timeline is fair to applicants.
- The above comment led to a discussion amongst the commissioners about the obligation of staff to respond to land use requests from individual applicants. Staff confirmed that there is apparently no legal obligation to review the requests when they are out of turn, in addition to clarifying that the new process aims to allow for more transparency in the process and requirements for Special GLUP Study requests.
- One commissioner asked if staff could gauge the predicted number of applications that will be submitted in the next few months.
- Another commissioner questioned if the revised process proposal could make it seem as if the County is trying to not incentivize GLUP amendments and that the County believes the GLUP is what it should be.
- The commissioners also commented on the proposed criteria for the review of initial Special GLUP Study applications as proposed by the new process. They suggested staff further clarify "community support."
- One commissioner also asked if the size of the site should be part of the criteria.
- A commissioner stated that the proposed "Corollary Action" regarding edge studies may be too immature to be addressed in the current proposal.
- Another commissioner noted that edge areas are unique, but that the Lee Highway Plan could be informative.
- One commissioner asked about the involvement of the applicant in the new process.
- Overall the committee appeared supportive of the idea of allowing the applicant to participate if the applicant is limited to discussing a broad scope to justify the land use change and not specifics about the project driving the proposed change.
- Once commissioner stated that a clear set of guidelines should be provided to applicants so they understand what is expected. They should also provide presentation slides to the LRPC ahead of time.
- A commissioner commented on the Washington and Kirkwood Special GLUP Study and how it maybe should have been a sector or area plan.
- Another commissioner added that with the Washington and Kirkwood Special GLUP Study it was especially hard to separate the proposed development from the broader policy discussion.
- One of the commissioners asked if a Special GLUP Study can expire if no site plan has been filed.
- A member of the public noted that the proposed process change reads as if a Special GLUP Study request could be rejected. He requested that the language be refined in the proposal or have staff further clarify if they want the ability to reject a study request.
- Another person stated that overall Arlington County needs more comprehensive planning and adequate staff. This process proposal will not fix the issues that Arlington County planning has with keeping pace with development.

- Another member of the public echoed that comment, asking if the County will be able to respond to the demand of development.

#### **LRPC Discussion of the History of the Shirlington Village PDSP**

Staff gave a presentation on the history of the Shirlington PDSP and where it stands today in terms of its realized development. This was followed by LRPC discussion. Comments and questions included:

- One commissioner asked what the definition of a PDSP was.
- A member of the public noted that there is a difference between Shirlington and Shirlington Village and that should be noted for future discussions of the PDSP.
- One commissioner asked about the timing of the one current Special GLUP Study request currently on file with the County within the Shirlington Village PDSP.
- A member of the public and the applicant's representative noted that the Special GLUP Study application was submitted in December 2017, however, it has not been addressed due to the current County staff workload.
- A commissioner asked when the GLUP was last reviewed comprehensively.