



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201
(703) 228-3525 • FAX (703) 228-3543



STEVE SOCKWELL
CHAIR

BRIAN HARNER
VICE CHAIR

FREIDA WRAY
COORDINATOR

GIZELE C. JOHNSON
CLERK

January 13, 2012

Arlington County Board
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 300
Arlington, Virginia 22201

SUBJECT: 2. A. Certification of Transferrable Development Rights to be considered for transfer from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 – Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC (“Receiving Site”), as described below, for the purpose of historic preservation. The Sending Site is approximately 40,656 sq. ft. located on the block generally bounded by Franklin Road to the north, North Edgewood Street to the east, Wilson Boulevard to the south, and North Fillmore Street to the west, and is identified as RPC# 15-065-001, 15-065-011, 15-065-012, 15-065-013, 15-065-016, 15-065-017. Proposed density to be certified is 69,464 sq. ft. of commercial GFA. Applicable policies: Clarendon Sector Plan; GLUP designation as Service Commercial and “Clarendon Revitalization District”; and Policy Guidance for Transfer of Development Rights.

B. Certification of Transferrable Development Rights to be considered for transfer from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 – Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC (“Receiving Site”), as described below, for the purpose of historic preservation. The Sending Site is approximately 15,390 sq. ft. located on the block generally bounded by Franklin Road to the north, North Fillmore Street to the east, Wilson Boulevard to the south, and North Garfield Street to the west, and is identified as RPC# 15-066-019. Proposed density to be certified is 74,747 sq. ft. of commercial GFA. Applicable policies: Clarendon Sector Plan; GLUP: Medium Density Mixed Use and “Clarendon Revitalization District”; and Policy Guidance for Transfer of Development Rights.

C. Transfer of Development Rights from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) 69,464 sq. ft. of commercial GFA to SP #418 – Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC (“Receiving Site”) by site plan under §36.H.5.b of the Zoning Ordinance. The Sending Site is approximately 40,656 square feet located on the block generally bound by Franklin Road to the north, North Edgewood Street to the east, Wilson Boulevard to the south, and North Fillmore Street to the west, and is identified as RPC# 15-065-001, 15-065-

P.C. #41.A-F.

011, 15-065-012, 15-065-013, 15-065-016, 15-065-017. The Receiving Site is approximately 49,295 sq. ft. located on the block generally bound by 11th Street North to the north, North Garfield Street to the east, Washington Boulevard to the south, and North Highland Street and identified as RPC# 18-026-001, 18-026-002, 18-026-003, 18-026-004, 18-026-008, 18-026-009, 18-026-010, and North Garfield Street right of way. Applicable policies: Clarendon Sector Plan; GLUP: Medium Density Mixed Use and “Clarendon Revitalization District”; and Policy Guidance for Transfer of Development Rights.

D. Transfer of Development Rights from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) 74,747 sq. ft. of commercial GFA to SP #418 – Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC (“Receiving Site”) by site plan under §36.H.5.b of the Zoning Ordinance. The Sending Site is approximately 15,390 sq. ft. located on the block generally bound by Franklin Road to the north, North Fillmore Street to the east, Wilson Boulevard to the south, and North Garfield Street to the west, and is identified as RPC# 15-066-019. The Receiving Site is approximately 49,295 sq. ft. located on the block generally bound by 11th Street North to the north, North Garfield Street to the east, Washington Boulevard to the south, and North Highland Street and identified as RPC# 18-026-001, 18-026-002, 18-026-003, 18-026-004, 18-026-008, 18-026-009, 18-026-010, and North Garfield Street right of way. Applicable policies: Clarendon Sector Plan; GLUP: Medium Density Mixed Use and “Clarendon Revitalization District”; and Policy Guidance for Transfer of Development Rights.

E. 1) An Ordinance to Vacate a Portion of an Easement for Public Street and Utility Purposes, Running North from the Corner of the Intersection of Washington Boulevard and N. Garfield Street along the Eastern Boundary of Lot 12, Lot 11, Lot 10, Part Lot 8 and Part Lot 7, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-001.

2) An Ordinance to Vacate a Portion of an Easement for Public Street & Utility Purposes, located at the Northeastern Corner of the Intersection of N. Highland Street and Washington Boulevard, on Lot 5-A, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-009, both with Conditions.

F. SP# 418 Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC for a special exception site plan for the construction of a 306,492 sq. ft. commercial building with 284,012 sq. ft. of office space and 22,479 sq. ft. of ground floor retail in the “C-3” zoning district under §§27.D.2 and 36.H. Property is approximately 49,295 sq. ft. and is identified as RPC# 18-026-001, 18-026-002, 18-026-003, 18-026-004, 18-026-008, 18-026-009, 18-026-010. The proposed density is 6.22 FAR. Modifications of zoning ordinance requirements include: parking ratio, penthouse height, bonus density for LEED silver certification and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan.

Applicable Policies: Clarendon Sector Plan; GLUP: Medium Density Mixed Use and “Clarendon Revitalization District”, and Policy Guidance for Transfer of Development Rights. **(Penzance)**

- RECOMMENDATIONS:**
- 2. A. Approve a resolution certifying 69,464 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation.**
 - B. Approve a resolution certifying 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation.**
 - C. Approve a resolution transferring 49,464 square feet of commercial GFA from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (“Receiving Site”).**
 - D. Approve a resolution transferring 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (Receiving Site”).**
 - E. Adopt an Ordinance to Vacate:**
 - 1) A Portion of an Easement for Public Street and Utility Purposes, Running North from the Corner of the Intersection of Washington Boulevard and N. Garfield Street along the Eastern Boundary of Lot 12, Lot 11, Lot 10, Part Lot 8 and Part Lot 7, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-001.**
 - 2) A Portion of an Easement for Public Street & Utility Purposes, located at the Northeastern Corner of the Intersection of N. Highland Street and Washington Boulevard, on Lot 5-A, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-009, both with Conditions.**
 - F. Adopt an ordinance to approve a site plan for the construction of a 306,492 square foot commercial building with 284,012 square feet of office space and 22,479 square feet of ground floor retail with modifications of zoning ordinance regulations for parking ratio, bonus density for LEED and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan, subject to the conditions of the ordinance, and the following modifications:**

- 1) Staff seek the opinion of the HALRB on the architectural alternatives and bring the preferred alternative forward to the County Board at its meeting on January 21, 2012.
- 2) In Condition #84 provide further clarification on the intent of the language that currently reads “The sidewalk and utility easements to be granted shall permit existing, and approved, uses within the easement areas so long as the retail spaces remain under lease to the tenants (as determined by ownership and business) occupying the retail spaces at the time of recordation of said easements. Upon termination of the aforementioned leases for each respective retail space, the new tenant(s) shall not be permitted to locate any structures, or operate any uses, within the easement areas without separate authorization by way of County Ordinance or County Board approval.”
- 3) Amend Condition #21 to add the following underlined language regarding the streetscape treatment on 11th Street North: “a minimum 14-foot wide sidewalk measured from the back of curb with a minimum 8-foot clear sidewalk, except where adjacent to the preserved building frontage to allow a custom streetscape standard that maintains an 8-foot wide clear zone for pedestrians and permits a narrower tree cut-out as long as the County standards for soil volumes are maintained or exceeded, ...”
- 4) Amend Condition #65 to include a requirement that should publicly available shared parking in the evenings and weekends be filled to 90 percent or more capacity on a regular basis, the developer shall provide a managed parking arrangement to permit valet parking in the garage.
- 5) Staff review all pertinent issues related to the easement language in Conditions #81 and 82, including review with the HALRB at its meeting on January 18, 2012, prior to the County Board meeting on January 21, 2012.
- 6) Direct the County Manager to conduct a parking study in support of future site plans so that future site plans have adequate information to guide recommendations to the County Board on the adequacy and sufficiency of parking.

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard these items at its January 9, 2012 meeting. Aaron Shriber, CPHD Planning, described the requests associated with Site Plan #418, including the transfers of development rights and ordinances to vacate public rights-of-way. He described the ways in which staff believes the proposed site plan meets the goals envisioned in the Clarendon Sector Plan and the Master Transportation Plan. Also present were Peter Katz and Tom Miller of CPHD Planning, and Melanie Jessick, Lisa Maher, and Linda Collier of DES Planning.

The development team for the applicant, Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC, was present, including Tom Ikeler, Penzance; Jonathan Kinney and Tad Lunger, attorneys (Bean, Kinney & Korman, P.C.); Rae Noritake, architect (Noritake Associates); and John Litustansky, engineer (Bowman Consulting). Mr. Kinney described the proposal, how the applicant believes it meets the goals of the Clarendon Sector Plan, and the benefits that are proposed to be provided with the proposal. Mr. Noritake presented the project details, including the building and site design, preservation of historic facades, treatment of streetscape, and street cross-sections.

Public Speakers

Chris Wilson, Chair of the Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB), reported on the HALRB's discussions on this project and their support for the proposal. The proposal fulfills two important historic preservation goals. It achieves building frontage preservation of the former McQuinn's Sporting Goods store and ABC liquor store located on 11th Street, and full building preservation of the Walgreens/Kenyon Peck and Boulevard Woodgrill/Faccia Luna buildings on Wilson Boulevard.

Alexander Tuneski, Vice President of the Clarendon 1021 Condominium Association, is representing the 419-unit development and stated that the association strongly supports the proposed development. The Association has 419 owners who have invested in Clarendon and have an immediate interest in assuring that this proposed project improves the immediate neighborhood. Clarendon 1021 is located across North Garfield Street from the proposed development, has 130 units with windows looking directly on the proposed development, and is the source of much of the pedestrians walking along 11th Street to the metro. He reported that in only five days, the association collected 223 on-line signatures for a petition supporting the project. He noted that the developer has been very responsive to their original concerns, especially with regard to relocating the loading dock entrance from North Garfield Street to 11th Street. Mr. Tuneski stated that the Association does not share the position of the Clarendon Courthouse Civic Association. His association is comfortable with the reduction in the parking ratio, believing it will deter traffic and encourage office workers to take the metro, helping to keep their neighborhood walkable. The proposed sidewalk and streetscape treatments are also acceptable. He believes the proposed development will be an asset to the neighborhood and Arlington County.

Matthew Asada, who represented the Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association and is also a resident of Clarendon 1021, expressed concerns about parking and the lack of extraordinary benefits in exchange for modifying the standard parking ratio from 1:580 to the proposed 1:780. He stated that the loss of parking through this modification will have a \$5 million impact, and the Transportation Demand Management plan only results in approximately \$500,000 of community benefits. Mr. Asada stated that the project falls short of the Clarendon Sector Plan's recommendation that 70% of the office parking be made available to the public during evenings and weekends, as the Sector Plan's recommendation is based on the standard ratio of 1:580 and there will be a deficit of 56 parking spaces available during evenings and weekends. He noted that his colleagues would address similar concerns and urged the Planning Commission to defer the proposal until these issues are addressed.

Kenneth Fulton, representing the Courthouse Hill Condominium Unit Owners Association located at 14th and Adams Street, urged the Planning Commission to defer the proposal. He identified a number of concerns, some of which included the proposed sidewalk width along the building frontage preservation on 11th and North Highland Streets, location of parking and garage entrances on 11th Street, and the reduced parking ratio. Mr. Fulton stated that the proposed parking ratio is less than the standard 1:580 and results in 126 fewer spaces. He noted that this is unacceptable, as more parking is needed in the community during evenings and weekends. He further noted that Block 33 is specifically designated for office in the Sector Plan so that parking from office use could be made available to the public during off-peak times.

Joan Lawrence, a member of the HALRB, stated that the proposal development is exciting. She noted that the public process worked well and resulted in the preservation of historic facades in place. The full building preservation on the TDR sending sites will provide important transitions to residential areas beyond. She urged the Planning Commission to approve the project.

Peter Owen associated himself with Matthew Asada's and Ken Fulton's remarks. He said he was the Transportation Commission representative to the Clarendon Sector Plan and was the Chair of the Transportation Commission when the Master Transportation Plan was revised. He wanted to discuss the role of the Planning Commission and provided some handouts for distribution, and to express his deep concern for the lower parking ratio. The applicant's justification for its parking ratio as presented tonight was totally different from the justification they presented to the Transportation Commission. Staff's explanation has not changed and is the same unacceptable policy justification. He stated that the Sector Plan recommended specific density and parking goals for the site. This site was supposed to maximize public parking. The site, at 6.22 FAR, has absorbed most of the bonus density in the sector plan and therefore must provide its full share of the parking. A policy set forth in the Master Transportation Plan is to require the provision of additional community benefits in exchange for lower parking ratios. He stated that staff has failed to take this into consideration. He urged the Planning Commission to defer the project.

Nancy Iacomini, speaking as a former HALRB member and former member of the working group for the Clarendon Sector Plan, stated that historic preservation was identified in the Sector Plan as a significant community benefit. She read a passage from Jane Jacobs' "The Life and Death of Great American Cities" extolling the need for old buildings, including "plain ordinary old buildings." The proposal is achieving this with preservation of "Notable" building frontages on 11th and Highland Streets and full preservation of "Important" buildings on Wilson Boulevard.

Mark Tate, representing the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington and its 100 members in Arlington County, strongly supports the project. He noted that it will add businesses and parking to the area. The proposed development was unanimously supported by the association's member businesses.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Serie reported that at its meeting on January 5, 2012, the Transportation Commission unanimously voted to defer the proposed site plan. The discussion focused on the reduction in the

parking ratio, the lack of appropriate community benefits in exchange for the parking ratio reduction, and the long term impacts on the parking ratio policy.

Commissioner Savela reported on the Site Plan Review Committee. The block faces several challenges and requirements, including the complex assemblage of parcels, the minimum of 60% commercial use within the 3.0 FAR base density, and the façade preservation on Highland and 11th Streets. The block is also one of three receiving sites permitted to receive additional density and additional height in return for extraordinary benefits identified in the Sector Plan as including historic preservation, affordable housing, public open space, and green building design. She stated that the proposal far exceeded the expectations for the block, and explained that she served on the Clarendon Sector Plan Task Force for the full five-year process. The Sector Plan seeks to alter the use mix in Clarendon to reflect a greater proportion of office space, a goal which ran up against developers' claims prior to the plan's adoption that Clarendon was a residential market and would never attract commercial tenants. The proposed site plan results in greater commercial density than anticipated as a result of being 100% density for both the base density and for the significant additional density generated through the historic preservation, thus providing substantial new commercial space envisioned by the Sector Plan through its two dedicated office towers and hopefully attracting the remaining commercial development sought under the plan. In addition, by virtue of the higher density and 100% office use, the project results in a greater number of parking spaces available for shared parking. The project also provides a public easement along Wilson Boulevard adjacent to the Faccia Luna/Woodgrill building, allowing for improvement in the pedestrian clear space. Commissioner Savela noted that the SPRC participants focused on certain smaller issues such as the loading and garage entrances, architecture and penthouse height, the 11th Street and N. Highland Street streetscapes, and the plaza design, for which agreements have been reached. The outstanding issues include extension of the awning and building amenities at the corner of 11th and Garfield Streets to accommodate the bus stop patrons; questions regarding completion of modifications to the Washington Boulevard and Highland Street intersection as suggested by the Sector Plan; and opposition from community representatives to the reduced parking ratio, and desire by community representatives to move the historic buildings on site in order to provide a wider sidewalk and planting strip on 11th Street. Planning Commissioners and HALRB representatives did not support the moving of the historic building. With regard to the parking ratio, Commissioner Savela noted that the zoning ordinance Section 27.D, which implemented the Sector Plan guidance for the C-3 Clarendon Revitalization District, specifically prohibited the County Board from modifying the maximum heights limit map but permitted modification of other requirements including parking ratios, use mix, design requirements, and streetscape requirements. Commissioner Savela noted that the SPRC report provided a suggested outline for questions and discussion.

Planning Commission Discussion

Historic Preservation (including questions on TDR calculations, façade preservation requirements, HALRB position, preservation easement Conditions 81 and 82, and action items A through D in staff report)

Commissioner Klein requested clarification regarding the future development potential on the TDR sending sites. Mr. Shriber responded that all of the density on the sending sites will be transferred to

the receiving site, resulting in the sending sites having no additional density to redevelop. It essentially freezes the density on those sites. Commissioner Klein inquired about whether density would be attributed to the parking lot on the Walgreens site. Mr. Shriber responded that the TDR density calculation is based on the density of the building to be preserved. Walgreens contains 16,488 square feet of GFA, resulting in a maximum TDR of 69,464 square feet. The entire site, including the parking lot, would be subject to a restrictive deed covenant and any future redevelopment would not be able to exceed the density currently existing on the site.

Commissioner Fallon inquired as to whether the density on the two sending sites is considered residual density. Mr. Shriber responded that it is not residual density, but rather the existing densities on the sites, multiplied by the conversion factors permitted with a TDR for historic preservation purposes as recommended in the Sector Plan, would be sent to the receiving site. The sending sites would not be able to achieve additional density beyond what currently exists without separate action by the County Board to permit an increase. Commissioner Fallon followed that a new TDR could be proposed for the sending sites. Mr. Shriber responded that there are a number of controls in the language of the conditions, such as the historic preservation easement, to preclude serious consideration of additional density on the sending sites. It is unlikely that more density would be achieved on the sites in the future.

Commissioner Cole asked if the proposed conditions would preclude redevelopment of the Walgreens parking lot and easement areas. Mr. Shriber responded that the Walgreens site comprises 40,000 square feet, developed with a 16,000 square foot building. The Sector Plan provides guidance for full building preservation, and does not address redevelopment of TDR sending sites. Given this, staff sought to protect the site with an easement for the entire site to stay true to the Sector Plan's vision. Commissioner Cole inquired about the purpose for precluding future redevelopment of sending sites. Mr. Shriber responded that the Sector Plan's conversion factor permitted with a TDR for historic preservation purposes compensates for future redevelopment of the sites at 500% of the GFA for the first 10,000 square feet preserved and 300% for any additional GFA preserved.

Commissioner Savelle explained the sequence of actions, noting that the County's authority to implement a County-wide TDR policy had not yet been granted at the time of adoption of the Clarendon Sector Plan. The plan defined the amount of density to be granted to sites eligible for bonus density in return for achieving historic preservation of targeted buildings within the sector.

Commissioner Harner inquired about the how the GFA was identified for the sending sites. Mr. Shriber responded that the GFA was secured from the County's real estate records and property certified survey plats, and confirmed based on the Zoning Ordinance's definition of Gross Floor Area. Commissioner Harner noted his concern for the limited economic viability of the buildings on the sending sites. He asked if the HALRB carefully reviewed the easement language in Conditions #81 and #82, and specifically the language regarding permitted improvements to the building's exterior and interior. Mr. Shriber responded that Historic Preservation staff is in the process of reviewing the easements and the condition language, which will be finalized in coordination with staff and the attorneys. Commissioner Klein pointed out some of the restrictions in the conditions regarding exterior improvements, and the requirement for HALRB review. Mr. Wilson noted that HALRB review would be required only if tax credits are pursued. If tax credits are not pursued, then

review would be limited to staff. Commissioner Klein suggested that the conditions be revised to reflect this. Mr. Kinney further clarified that, for example, with the expansion of existing or installation of new HVAC equipment, HALRB review would be required. However, with the replacement of HVAC equipment of the same size and location, HALRB review would not be required.

Commissioner Monfort inquired about the reasons the easement ownership is not being held by an independent third party, such as the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust. Mr. Shriber responded that with the Saul Clarendon Center project, for example, it was difficult to identify an entity that would accept the easement. Mr. Kinney indicated that the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust would not be able to hold the easement due to their requirements, and it was determined that it would be best for the County to hold the easements. The County has proven experience in this area. Commissioner Monfort asked why an easement is preferable to creating a local historic district. Ms. Iacomini responded that property owners prefer the easements over the historic district designation. The HALRB has a good track record of working in concert with building owners. Commissioner Monfort inquired about the requirements in the easement conditions regarding the location, size and placement of building signage. Ms. Iacomini responded that the Historic Preservation staff is working with the building owner representatives regarding the placement of signs on the buildings. Commissioner Monfort followed that the conditions need to be revised to provide more detail regarding signage that would be acceptable.

Commissioner Malis inquired as to why a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) would not be required for the preserved buildings. Ms. Iacomini responded that a CoA is only required for buildings located in a local historic district. Commissioner Malis inquired about the easement, to which Mr. Shriber responded that it will be recorded among the land records. The easement will specify the amount of density available on the sites today and will cap it so that additional density will not be permitted in the future. Mr. Kinney noted that the easement will be referenced in any conveyance of the properties. If the County acquires the properties, the easements will still apply. Commissioner Malis asked if a future County Board could reverse or undo an easement. Mr. Kinney responded that the current County Board could restrict the ability to do that in the future. He noted that the current owners are willing to relinquish the density. The agreement the applicant has with the owners is that they are taking all of the density off the sending sites. Commissioner Monfort commented that none of the preservation options are absolute and that even an historic district can be uncreated or its restrictions waived.

Commissioner Malis commented that the proposal would transfer density from the sites, but asked if it would prevent the demolition of buildings on the sites. Mr. Kinney responded that easement forbids the property owner from voluntarily demolishing the property. Demolition is only allowed under very restrictive circumstances.

Commissioner Ciotti confirmed that the ABC store is a “Notable” site. She asked if it would remain a “Notable” site if the building is deconstructed and reconstructed one foot back from its original location. Ms. Iacomini responded that location is one of the standards for evaluating a site, and based on federal standards, relocating the building may result in the loss of its “Notable” designation. In respecting the community’s history and sense of place, Commissioner Ciotti asked how one should balance preservation of the community’s past with future community needs for safe

pedestrian travel through wider sidewalks. Ms. Iacomini responded that there are trade-offs and the Sector Plan acknowledges that narrower sidewalks may have to be constructed as long as a minimum six foot clear zone is maintained. Furthermore, the Sector Plan does not envision 11th Street as a major pedestrian way.

Commissioner Cole stated that the Walgreens parking lot currently violates the County's goals for site design and parking placement, and noted his interest in preserving the possibility to allow redevelopment in the future if the County Board desires. Commissioner Monfort asked if density could be moved on the site to allow changes to the buildings. Mr. Shriber responded that the Sector Plan guidance states that additions to buildings are not envisioned, however the County Board, with HALRB guidance, may allow minor alterations or modest additions if the overall preservation of the full structures is not diminished.

Parking (including parking counts, ratios, tandem spaces, and public access)

Commissioner Fallon inquired about the 70% Sector Plan target for evening and weekend public parking and the number of spaces that could be shared with the public in the proposed development. He asked if the applicant would consider making the fourth level of parking available to the public if the spaces are unoccupied. Mr. Kinney responded that 287 parking spaces would be made available to the public. The applicant wants to help solve the nighttime parking problem and does not think there will be a need for more than the proposed 287 spaces on any given night. Their prospective tenant is an international organization and will have employees in the building at all times of the day and night. If there turns out to be demand for more parking spaces, they are willing to implement a managed parking system which would greatly increase the number of spaces available to the public through the use of valet parking, etc. In response to the neighborhood's concerns, the developer is willing to commit to a condition requirement that if evening and weekend parking is found to be under capacity, it will take the necessary steps to bring it up to capacity.

Commissioner Fallon asked for clarification about the parking demand in the evenings and on weekends. Ms. Jessick noted that the parking study conducted by the County focused on daytime office parking demand. Several of the Commissioners expressed concerns about the parking study and that it did not focus on evening parking, which is the crux of the issue in the community. Commissioner Forinash noted that the timing of the parking study, during the Thanksgiving holiday, was atypical and problematic. Commissioner Monfort noted that data taken from other areas in the County, such as Ballston, are not analogous to Clarendon. Clarendon is an entertainment district and only studying daytime parking is inadequate. He noted that he avoids driving through Clarendon in the evenings because the roads are so congested. Ms. Maher noted that the study was commissioned to specifically analyze parking related to office use and the proposed office ratios, to ensure the proposed parking would meet the needs of that office building when considering parking ratio modifications. Although the Sector Plan policy speaks to the provision of office parking for nighttime use, the primary use is office. The parking study included a daytime occupancy study of Ballston, Virginia Square and Clarendon. Commissioner Monfort responded that the limited scope of the study is inadequate if one is trying to consider the whole picture – daytime and nighttime use.

Commissioner Malis noted that if the Sector Plan recommends a certain level of office parking during the day that will also be available to the public at night, and a decision is made to require

fewer office spaces during the day, then fewer spaces than anticipated will be available for public use at night. Ms. Maher responded that the Sector Plan does not specifically state that daytime parking is built to meet the nighttime demand. It states that the daytime parking is available for shared parking at night. The amount of office parking provided during the day, even at a lower level, addresses the nighttime parking needs. After-hour use of the parking garage is a secondary, added benefit. In the Sector Plan, certain blocks were designated as office sites, to provide a minimum of 60% base office density. The proposed project is providing 100% office, so not only is it providing more office on the site, but additional office density through the TDR. It results in significantly exceeding the amount of office parking, and indirectly the amount of available shared parking, than originally anticipated for the site.

Commissioner Forinash asked staff to clarify the chart displaying approved office site plans with their approved parking ratios and the underlying standard minimum parking ratios. Ms. Jesick explained that the chart listed office site plans approved since 2005. Commissioner Forinash asked if staff would characterize the chart's findings as suggesting that the majority of office projects approved since 2005 were approved with reduced parking requirements. Ms. Jesick agreed. Commissioner Forinash stated he believed the approved reductions were considered through the public process in the context of community benefits on a site plan by site plan basis. Commissioner Forinash asked if tandem parking spaces are counted as required parking. Mr. Shriber responded no. While the Zoning Ordinance does not include tandem spaces in the required parking, the County Board can modify the parking requirements to count them as required parking.

Commissioner Savela noted that the Sector Plan recommends that 70% of the office parking should be shared during evenings and weekends, and her understanding of the CCCA's position is that the number of spaces available to the public must be equal to 70% of the resulting number of spaces if the building were parked at the 1:580 ratio. Commissioner Forinash cited a bullet from page 108 of the Clarendon Sector Plan ... "70 percent of the required commercial office use parking should be made available for use by the public during evenings and weekends when the office spaces are not typically occupied." He asked Mr. Asada from the CCCA to come forward and address the Sector Plan's requirements. Mr. Asada stated that the Sector Plan clearly requires this project to deliver the regulated 490 spots, and 70% of this would result in 343 spaces available for public use. He added that the 343 spaces represented an even greater difference from the 253 spaces, not including the tandem spaces.

Commissioner Serie stated that these are fundamental issues in need of County Board guidance. The discussion at the Transportation Commission meeting reached a critical level, necessitating a deferral recommendation in order to receive County Board guidance. He stated that the site plan chart distributed, showing approved office projects since 2005, suggested policy-making by random dots. He added that the Planning Commission and County Board approved the Founders Square project, a 20-story building that slaughtered the Quincy Street Plan. In that case, supporters agreed that there were essential overriding reasons to approve that project, to retain DARPA in Arlington. However, that project also provided enormous community benefits, with over \$6 million provided toward the building of Mosaic Park. Approval of Founders Square created another exception, another dot on the site plan chart. He supported that application, but is concerned about all of these dots, all of these random exceptions, that are approved and what their impact is on County policy.

Commissioner Malis stated that the staff's chart of approved office projects did not provide information on the extraordinary community benefits that were offered in exchange for the reduced parking ratios. She stated that the policy seems to be changing to indicate that a shift in the parking ratio is needed, rather than requiring an extraordinary community benefit in exchange for a reduced parking ratio, which results in a policy change for a specific project. Her concern is not that the community benefit is not being required, and perhaps the parking spaces may not be needed, but that this policy change is not being vetted in a process and uniformly applied. She said that it is possible that the County may not need the 490 spaces, although we have not seen the nighttime and weekend data and so cannot assess this, but noted that public transportation is not free and these systems must be managed by the County. The community has to pay for provision of these systems, and the County and the site plan should share in that cost. There may be a need to change the parking ratios in the Zoning Ordinance, but what she is missing is the extraordinary community benefit provided in return for the reduction in parking.

Commissioner Cole expressed concern about the information provided by staff and noted shortcomings in the parking study. It failed to ask the right questions such as, does the proposed parking meet the dual goals of addressing the daytime and nighttime parking needs. The table of parking ratios does not provide data on other Clarendon site plan projects. Ms. Maher responded that it was difficult to get data that directly relates to the proposed office development. There are very few stand-alone office buildings in Clarendon or the corridor, as most are a part of mixed-use developments. Many are old office buildings, some built by right, some with surface parking lots. Commissioner Cole stated that Ms. Maher was starting with the question of what is the right parking ratio for office buildings, but he believes the right question is what is the right parking ratio for Clarendon to meet the nighttime and evening uses.

Commissioner Ciotti stated that the primary goal is to provide sufficient office parking and that shared nighttime parking is a secondary goal. The County must also consider the environmental goals of reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality. Ms. Maher responded that in consideration of existing parking demand in office garages, parking ratios in other cities, and the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) goal of reducing the amount of traffic over the next five years, the proposed office parking ratio of 1:780 was determined to be appropriate. One of the goals of the MTP is to not overbuild parking. This requires additional TDM measures, which is why an enhanced TDM plan was negotiated with the applicant. The parking ratio of 1:580 was established 30 years ago prior to Metro was fully operational and before development of our other transit and transportation modes.

Commissioner Fallon stated that he does not necessarily view this as a policy change, but rather as a struggle to apply it to a new reality – that Clarendon's entertainment district has become more of an attraction to the public and attracting more drivers from outside of the district. He agrees with Commissioner Ciotti regarding the need to "right-size" parking for the commercial building's needs. He asked what the applicant's responsibility under the Sector Plan or the Zoning Ordinance was to provide surplus parking for evening and weekend parking as a community benefit. Given their location so close to the Metro, he wondered if it is the applicant's obligation to alleviate the community's problem that the County has created through the success of the entertainment district in Clarendon. If the vision of Clarendon is to achieve a certain amount of parking, then that is a separate issue from this application and the policy should be revised to reflect that.

Commissioner Forinash disagrees with staff's conclusion that the parking study establishes an office parking ratio of 1:780 as appropriate for the entire corridor. This establishes new policy.

Commissioner Klein commented that the Commission seems to be asking for complete and perfect information, but that will never exist and the Commission needs to work with the data it has. She has never had a problem locating on-street metered parking in Clarendon at night and does not understand why it is a crisis. The number of garage spaces available in Clarendon, as presented in staff's chart, is a lot. Given the County's goals of sustainability and reducing traffic, the idea of requiring the applicant to add all of this additional parking seems inappropriate. Managed parking will result in much more parking in this garage. The data shows that there is enough parking available in Clarendon and throughout the corridor. She does not believe that the County needs to widen roads and build more garages to accommodate more drivers. Parking needs to be balanced with other County goals such as sustainability and air quality.

Commissioner Serie summarized his three areas of concern: First, the proposal lacks significant corresponding community benefits to justify the dramatic departure from the standard parking ratio. Second, he compliments staff on everything they do to collect data. However, County studies should contain relevant data. The data from the parking study does not justify such a dramatic reduction in the parking ratio. The survey data had not been publicly vetted, and the Transportation Commission had no time to study the data and use it to justify the reduction in the parking ratio. Public hearings, with all of the incredible talent in the audience, are not the time to introduce new data. Third, there are short and long term implications of reducing the office parking ratio. The Sector Plan established there will be no public parking garage, and office parking must meet the parking needs. He stated that there are enough random dots from the approved site plans to suggest a potential policy change, which is why guidance from the County Board is needed. Also, there needs to be full public and County Board support that the data is sound.

Commissioner Kumm Morris said there are many good reasons for reducing parking in the metro corridor, but we are really missing data to support this. She is concerned that there are County-wide ratios being applied when there are very different parking needs across the different metro sectors. The real question is what is the parking need in Clarendon in the evenings and weekends. In the absence of having the data, we have to stay with current standards rather than reducing parking.

Commissioner Savela stated that she wanted to append to Ms. Maher's list of Sector Plan goals to include the necessity of mitigating the "orange crush". Office space in Clarendon results in a reverse commute. If the modal split in offices in Clarendon was shifted to emphasize transit, there would be more people exiting the Metro in the mornings, providing space for Clarendon residents trying to get on the Metro. This was an important factor during the five years of discussion on the Clarendon Sector Plan update. Based on her extensive experience on the Planning Commission, Transportation Commission, the Clarendon Task Force, and the Master Transportation Plan plenary group, one interesting observation is that in the early 2000s, the County was urging developers to reduce parking through each site plan. The County was trying to discourage driving, discourage excessive use of our streets, and change modal splits. The County sought to unbundle pricing in office and residential garages to further disincentivize car ownership. The County adopted policies long before the MTP elements to try to help spur the modal split the County benefits from today. The

developers initially pushed back, as they were concerned that if they reduced the parking then they would not be able to market their buildings, they would not get tenants, and they would not get financing. The County went so far as to involve the bankers in the discussion to educate them that we really had too much parking in many places and the parking being sought in these applications were often excessive and unnecessary. Planning and AED staff helped move the industry toward the goal of lowering the parking. The fact that developers are now saying they don't need all of this parking, that they are willing to commit to smaller garages and believe they can fully lease their buildings and get financing, is an indication of the County's success with its transportation policies. While it is being perceived as negative, the reduction in parking ratios moves the County in the direction of all the policies that it has sought to achieve.

Commissioner Savela continued that another concern raised by the Commission is that the parking study presented by County staff does not include all of the information that is desired. She reminded the Commission that the Commission has recommended approval of numerous site plans with parking waivers without having parking data. Staff has always been very helpful in responding to our request for data, and is good at bringing us new data when it becomes available. This is not something staff should be punished for. The County has made decisions on site plans in the past without new data. While she fully appreciates people's concerns about the need for data, it is not an issue for this one applicant, but rather an issue to help the County shape and refine its transportation and parking policies.

Commissioner Savela further commented that there has been much discussion around acknowledging a reduction of parking where appropriate but capturing the full financial savings that accrue to the developer in community benefits. She asked why a developer would hand over the full foregone construction cost to the County, giving up their asset, the foregone parking, which would add value to their project, rather than simply choosing to build the parking. Virginia state law specifically does not allow the County to demand proffers or requirements that are not related to mitigating the impacts of the development. Therefore, the County cannot tell the developer that it wants another 200 parking spaces to further benefit shared parking unrelated to their office development. That would be against the law. She is reminded of the lawsuit over affordable housing, which the County lost, and the County had to seek special authority from the Virginia State General Assembly to allow it to include the affordable housing contribution in the standard site plan conditions. She noted that other types of contributions that the County has achieved that are not specifically tied to mitigating impacts are gained through the cooperation with the developer. We have brought developers along by, in part, convincing them of the benefits that accrue to them from our good urban planning policies. We have made a convincing argument that we have created a really successful environment here, and they benefit from that, and they have been willing to make these contributions.

Commissioner Savela stated that she personally does not think parking in Clarendon is a problem. She often drives to Clarendon on weekend nights for dinner. While she has observed a huge amount of traffic circling around trying to find free on-street parking, she has never had any problem with finding parking in the garages. Even though there is a fee, a large supply of parking does exist in the garages. The former DHS garage now has more spaces available to the public because fewer spaces are permanently reserved for tenants. Our policies have tried to push people to accept that there is a real cost to providing parking, and there is a real cost to maintaining our streets. However, a shift in

our culture is required to get people to accept paying for parking in garages. The Sector Plan suggested ways to change people's behaviors, such as expanding the hours of residential zoned parking to later in the evenings, although she understands the drawbacks to residents; extending the hours of meter parking to later in the evenings, such as 9:00 pm; and revising the parking ordinance. Fairfax County has implemented a new ordinance for metro areas in Tysons Corner that requires a maximum, rather than a minimum, office parking ratio, which makes Fairfax County more progressive than Arlington County in this area. Fairfax's parking maximum for this project would allow less parking than our minimum parking requirement. She believes that all of these factors need to be taken into account and not place upon this one applicant the responsibility of parking all of the demand from the entertainment uses in Clarendon. That was not what was anticipated in the Sector Plan.

Commissioner Monfort stated that while he does not disagree with the specific statements made by Commissioner Savelle, he does not like relying on anecdotal evidence of the availability of parking in Clarendon during the evenings and weekends. The parking study only considered daytime parking and he is just requesting that it also analyze evening and weekend parking needs.

Commissioner Ciotti stated that it was not the responsibility of the applicant to build additional parking for nighttime uses.

Other Transportation (including TDM Condition #50)

Commissioner Serie stated that the TDM plan does not adequately address the bigger issue of providing sufficient shared public parking spaces, and it falls short of the goals of the Sector Plan. Clarendon will always be car-centric. The TDM plan seems robust for an office building, but is seriously lacking when put in the context of providing new public parking.

Commissioner Forinash stated that the financial contributions agreed to in the TDM condition are not extraordinary and do not meet the levels of other approved site plans.

Streetscape and Plaza (including sidewalk widths and treatments on 11th Street and fronting preserved buildings on Wilson Boulevard)

Commissioner Kumm Morris commended staff and the applicant for considering alternative solutions for 11th Street. She asked that the applicant consider planting alternatives and providing additional street trees on 11th Street. She suggested that Condition #21 be modified to require two additional street trees with reduced street cut-out widths, as long as the soil volume is no less than the current County standards. That would allow the soil volume beneath the sidewalk to be increased through the use of alternative techniques, while still meeting County standards ensuring thriving street trees. Mr. Shriber responded that staff would analyze the provision of two additional street trees on 11th Street for impacts on other elements in the streetscape.

Commissioner Klein asked if the language in Condition #84 allows future tenants to have outdoor seating on the Boulevard Woodgrill/Faccia Luna sites as long as a six foot wide sidewalk is maintained. Mr. Shriber responded that the intent is to allow a conditional easement for existing

tenants to utilize the area for outdoor seating, but any new businesses would be required to provide the unobstructed six foot wide sidewalk.

Commissioner Forinash asked if the diagonal crosswalk crossing Washington Boulevard on the east side of Highland Street, located at the corner of Highland Street and the entry plaza, could be redesigned to achieve a straight line and shorter distance across Washington Boulevard. Ms. Jessick agreed that staff could consider this.

Commissioner Serie stated that the project preserves a substandard sidewalk on 11th Street, even though we have stretched the definition of building preservation with the reconstruction of the 11th Street facade.

Commissioner Cole noted that he had not seen any proposal from the applicant that included a sidewalk clear space of less than 8 feet, with options for an increased clear space, and many sidewalks in Arlington are well below this width. Mr. Shriber confirmed that the Sector Plan calls for a 14 foot sidewalk with an 8 foot clear space, and allows for modifying this all of the way down to a six-foot clear space adjacent to historic spaces. Staff has not had time to evaluate the new proposal from the applicant involving the narrowing of the street. Commissioner Klein thought that the proposed sidewalk was quite adequate, and offered examples of much more constrained, yet more highly utilized, sidewalks.

Commissioner Savela asked staff to address the Washington Boulevard and Highland Street intersection concerns. Ms. Jessick described the proposed improvements, explaining that the proposed site plan meets the goals envisioned for Highland Street. She also confirmed that other improvements are under consideration for inclusion in the CIP.

Condition #84 (sidewalk, utility and street easements to be granted by sending sites)

Commissioner Malis asked for clarification regarding the TDR sending site easements. Mr. Shriber responded that the intent is to allow existing tenants to occupy the easement area; to protect the current lease holders regardless of their business, not the next or future lease holders. Future lease holders or business tenants would have to comply with the six foot wide clear sidewalk zone. Commissioner Savela suggested that revisions to the conditions be incorporated to make it clear that the reference to lease holders refers to those as of 2012.

Commissioner Cole asked if the term “lease holder” is the appropriate term. Mr. Kinney responded that the properties are operated by the tenants. The intent is to address the tenants. He added that the existing tenants do not currently meet ADA requirements, but have voluntarily agreed to apply for new Certificates of Occupancy and comply with ADA.

Commissioner Malis asked if the property owner changes, will the new property owner have to comply with the condition requirements. Mr. Shriber responded that the intent is for current lease holders and not property owners. Furthermore, if the lease holder changes its restaurant business, for example, the intent is to not penalize the lease holder.

Vacations issues (staff report item 2.E)

Ms. Collier presented the staff recommendation for the proposed vacations. The independent appraisals were completed. The CPHD Planning recommendation is that the proposed vacations are in compliance with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Malis inquired about the consequence of the applicant not agreeing to the required compensation. Ms. Collier responded that staff would recommend that it be deferred or denied. Mr. Shriber added that if the County Board does not approve the proposed vacations, then there would not be sufficient site area and density to support the site plan.

Architectural issues

Commissioner Klein noted that the developer's architect presented two options for the treatment of two building elements, and asked whether the Commission wants to choose the preferred options. Mr. Noritake described the differences between the two options for the two building elements. Commissioner Klein stated a preference for the first tower shown on the first option, and the new alternative shown for the lower façade treatment in the second set of options.

Commissioner Harner asked if the HALRB had an opportunity to review the options for the two building elements. Ms. Iacomini responded no, but they could review them at their next meeting on January 18th, prior to the County Board meeting on January 21st.

Assessment of Community Benefits

Commissioner Savela inquired about the calculation of the AHIF contribution, and if the dollar value is based on the full 6.2 FAR including the density transferred from the TDR sending sites. Mr. Shriber responded yes, that the \$1.2 million contribution includes the full density with the exception of the LEED bonus. He further explained that the calculation was not typical because it incorporated densities from the TDR sending sites as a part of the base density, resulting in a higher contribution. Mr. Kinney added that the densities from the sending sites were added to the density on the receiving site, rather than calculating the densities on the three sites separately and adding the resulting contributions. It affects the base density and the net effect is a higher contribution. Mr. Lunger added that the contribution exponentially increases as the density goes beyond 1.0 FAR. Instead of having an 80,000 square foot base site, there is a 49,000 square foot base site and the AHIF contribution is exponentially higher than it would have been if the sites were calculated separately. Commissioner Savela stated that the calculation was approached differently than in other site plans, and suggested that it be clearly explained in the staff report.

Commissioner Savela clarified that the Founders Square Site Plan, which has been identified earlier in the discussion for its extraordinary community benefits for Mosaic Park, contributed over \$6 million toward Mosaic Park not as an "extraordinary community benefit" but in the form of the purchase price of the density transferred from Mosaic Park to the Founders Square application, as established in the TDR Zoning Ordinance. The parallel to the proposed site plan before the Commission is that the Sector Plan has identified historic preservation as an extraordinary community benefit, and this applicant has sought to preserve two full buildings and the on-site historical frontage. The extraordinary community benefit in return for the density in the proposed

site plan is the historic preservation, and the community benefit in Founders Square is derived from the County's sale of unused density from the Mosaic Park parcel.

Commissioner Harner asked staff to highlight the proposal's extraordinary community benefits and if there are extraordinary community benefits beyond the historic preservation. Mr Shriber responded that the foremost extraordinary community benefit is the perpetual preservation of historic resources. He stated that this is exceptional because the Sector Plan does not require that the resources be preserved, and in order to provide this benefit for the community the developer had to incur certain costs. Other community benefits include a higher AHIF contribution resulting to the approach to its calculation, the additional TDM contributions, and provision of shared public parking. Commissioner Savela confirmed that the Sector Plan specifically identified historic preservation, as well as affordable housing, open space and green buildings, as extraordinary community benefits.

Commissioner Harner stated that the community identified a savings to the developer for providing a reduced parking ratio. He asked if staff analyzed the calculation proposed by the community. Mr. Shriber responded that staff's focus was on whether the proposed parking ratio is appropriate for the office use. As alluded to in the Sector Plan, the shared parking would be a secondary benefit to the community, available as a result of parking provided for the primary office use. The TDM Plan will ensure that the garage functions efficiently with fewer spaces than required by the Zoning Ordinance. Commissioner Harner noted that the community is more interested in the delta between the required parking and the proposed parking and whether it is monetized at a value greater to the developer versus the community, and whether the value is captured in some additional benefits. Mr. Katz responded that the \$40,000 per space represents an investment by the developer that is recaptured through the life of the project. Either the cost or benefit of parking is a function of local demand, and the general idea is that the parking space will pay for itself over time. It is a business decision, in absence of strong government involvement. The developer may spend a lot of money to build the parking, but will eventually recoup the investment. If the government reduces or eliminates the parking, the dollar savings is not available for use by the government to direct to other purposes. He noted that Commissioner Savela spoke to the legality of directing those foregone costs to be directed for other purposes. Therefore, staff cannot support imposition of a significant fee on the applicant in lieu of constructing the spaces, but a token fee is appropriate. Mr. Katz further commented that the MTP policy does not encourage additional parking. By sharing private office parking, the County has been able to address the public parking need without the investment of a public parking garage. He cited the large public parking garage built by taxpayers to spur development of Bethesda Row. We have been fortunate in Clarendon to see economic growth without a similar public investment. The County is now in an enviable place, where it sees growth and vitality in its urban areas, and people traveling to these areas not only by vehicle but also by transit. The community's desire for more parking works against the County's general policy of *"providing a parking supply to meet community demands cost efficiently and equitably while being careful not to create inducements for more driving and reducing the community's walkability"*. Finally, he noted that we may look for perfect parking ratios but in reality, these things tend to be much more elastic. If you add more parking, you will induce more driving. If you constrict it, you create the tipping point that causes people to move to other modes of transportation. Again, to expect a \$40,000 contribution, or even a \$20,000 contribution, per parking space avoided, is

unrealistic; the developer would probably prefer to build the spaces since they will get the money back over a 30 to 40 year period.

Planning Commission Motion

Commissioner Savela moved that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board approve the resolutions to A. certify 69,464 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation; B. certify 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation; C. transfer 49,464 square feet of commercial GFA from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (“Receiving Site”); and D. transfer 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (Receiving Site”). Commissioner Klein seconded the motion.

Commissioner Harner commented that he has concerns regarding the level of review by HALRB regarding easement protections. Commissioner Savela noted that these concerns should be addressed in the motion for the site plan because the conditions are associated with the site plan. There was discussion amongst the Commissioners about the order of the items under consideration, and whether the motions for items A – D and the proposed vacations should be tabled until after further discussion of the motion for the site plan.

Commissioner Fallon moved to table further discussion of the motion for items A through D at this time. Commissioner Harner seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted 12-0 to support the motion.

Commissioner Savela moved that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board adopt the ordinance to vacate 1) A portion of an easement for public street and utility purposes, running north from the corner of the intersection of Washington Boulevard and N. Garfield Street along the eastern boundary of Lot 12, Lot 11, Lot 10, Part Lot 8 and Part Lot 7, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-001; and 2) A portion of an easement for public street & utility purposes, located at the northeastern corner of the intersection of N. Highland Street and Washington Boulevard, on Lot 5-A, Moore’s Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-009, both with conditions. Commissioner Fallon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cole moved to table further discussion of the motion for item E at this time. Commissioner Serie seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted 12-0 to support the motion. Commissioners Ciotti, Cole, Fallon, Forinash, Harner, Klein, Kumm, Malis, Monfort, Savela, Serie, and Sockwell supported the motion.

Commissioner Savela moved that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board adopt the ordinance to approve a site plan for the construction of a 306,492 square foot commercial building with 284,012 square feet of office space and 22,479 square feet of ground floor retail with modifications of zoning ordinance regulations for parking ratio, bonus density for LEED and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan, subject to the conditions of the ordinance, with the following modifications:

- 1) Staff should seek the opinion of the HALRB on the architectural alternatives and bring the preferred alternatives forward to the County Board at its meeting on January 21, 2012.
- 2) Condition #84 should provide further clarification on the intent of the language that currently reads “The sidewalk and utility easements to be granted shall permit existing, and approved, uses within the easement areas so long as the retail spaces remain under lease to the tenants (as determined by ownership and business) occupying the retail spaces at the time of recordation of said easements. Upon termination of the aforementioned leases for each respective retail space, the new tenant(s) shall not be permitted to locate any structures, or operate any uses, within the easement areas without separate authorization by way of County Ordinance or County Board approval.”

Commission Fallon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kumm Morris asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that Condition #21 be amended to add the following underlined language regarding the streetscape treatment on 11th Street North: “a minimum 14-foot wide sidewalk measured from the back of curb with a minimum 8-foot clear sidewalk, except where adjacent to the preserved building frontage to allow a custom streetscape standard that maintains an 8-foot wide clear zone for pedestrians and permits a narrower tree cut-out as long as the County standards for soil volumes are maintained or exceeded, ...” There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Savela asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that Condition #65 be amended to include a requirement that should publicly available shared parking in the evenings and weekends be filled to 90 percent or more capacity on a regular basis, the developer shall provide a managed parking arrangement to permit valet parking in the garage. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Harner asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that staff review all pertinent issues related to the easement language in Conditions #81 and #82, including review with the HALRB at its meeting on January 18, 2012, prior to the County Board meeting on January 21, 2012. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Savela commented that there has been a lot of discussion surrounding the parking ratios, application of the parking ratios, variations by site plans, and the data needed to support the parking ratios. She expressed her hope that the County Board direct the County Manager to develop a plan to review this issue in the context of the issues raised through the proposed site plan and identify a path going forward, whether it is to work toward a revision to the Zoning Ordinance or develop a more formulaic approach to determining the appropriate parking ratio, or some combination of these.

Commissioner Savela thanked the applicant for their great work on this project. She noted that the applicant has strived to comply with almost every aspect of the Sector Plan. She was impressed that a project so complex was able to come together and meet so many objectives of the Sector Plan.

Commissioner Harner stated that the discussion on parking was very useful. He noted that the Commission normally hears two conflicting requests from various community members: to provide more parking in order to constrain parking on residential streets, and to provide less parking so people don't drive on their streets. From the discussion it became apparent that there is some conflict between what actually exists and the data presented in the parking study. Commissioner Harner added that the site plan process identified some significant issues, and the applicant has been very responsive. The issues discussed regarding the various data points considered for parking ratios could be discussed at any site plan meeting and the Commission could go through this same exercise over and over. He appreciates Mr. Katz's comments as being very helpful in putting this issue into a more rational context. Notwithstanding the community's desire to see the project built at the 1:580 ratio, the staff's charts demonstrate that there is a lot of parking being provided. The applicant has offered to provide managed parking, which provides greater flexibility and would add to the amount of parking available to the public. Although all of the architectural issues have not been tweaked, he will support the motion to approve.

Commissioner Fallon remembered voting on the Clarendon Sector Plan and the discussion held at that time that the plan was a departure from previous sector plans by being much more prescriptive. The justification for this was that future site plan applications would be much easier to process due to the level of specificity in the plan. The long discussion tonight suggests this will not always be the case. He stated that the process resulted in a good project, and that he likes the architecture. The project meets a number of Sector Plan objectives. He particularly appreciates the use of the TDR for historic preservation, the stepback above the preserved façade, and the higher AHIF contribution. The discussion was very thorough, and he believes that some of the policy issues, such as the easements and parking ratio, will be adequately addressed and resolved by the County Board hearing. He believes that the parking issues will be raised more and more with future site plans, and the County will need to provide a more definitive determination on the appropriate ratios and the developers' responsibilities. He thinks the appropriate questions are what is the appropriate parking amount for the project itself, and what is the applicant's responsibility to provide additional parking. Perhaps a thorough review of the parking ordinance is needed, along with a thorough analysis to ensure we are right-sizing parking.

Commissioner Forinash stated that he cannot support the project at this time. He believes he must respect the position of the Transportation Commission and what they viewed as a major unresolved issue regarding the parking ratio. He would prefer a motion to defer the proposal.

Commissioner Serie agreed that a motion to defer is preferable. He stated that there are very serious public policy issues associated with the proposal. The County's parking study needs greater analysis and public vetting to see if it provides the comprehensive analysis needed to support such a dramatic recommendation. The project does not provide adequate mitigation in terms of community benefits in exchange for the lower parking ratio. There has been no effort to compensate for the \$5 million in savings and this represents a freebie to the applicant.

Commissioner Malis thanked Commissioner Savelle for her leadership on this project. She also thanked Mr. Katz for his comments. She does not feel comfortable supporting the project because of the division among the community over unresolved issues. She views the reduction in parking as a

breach with the community, and is concerned with how easily the applicant diverged from the Sector Plan on this issue.

Commissioner Sockwell stated that he believes the parking issues have been fairly vetted. There are two major issues: the appropriateness of the parking policy in general for Clarendon and evaluation of the parking ratio for this particular project. The analyses of both are based on relatively soft data. But a luxury of serving on the Planning Commission, as opposed to the Transportation Commission, is that one gets to balance competing policies. He believes this is an attractive project, despite the parking policy, due to the historic preservation offering and the opportunity for the project's delivery of additional office space in Clarendon. He supports the motion.

Commissioner Cole stated that this is a considerably better than average project, with more of a significant shortcoming than we see in other site plans. He expressed concern that the available information to guide decisions regarding parking was significantly inadequate. It is unfortunate that the parking issues did not reach a head at SPRC but instead did not become a major issue until the Planning Commission. He heard Commissioner Savela comment that she hoped something would be done to address the shortcomings of the data in the parking study. He believes the Commission should advise the County Board to direct the County Manager to conduct the necessary studies to provide critical information that would assist the community in making decisions regarding the adequacy of proposed parking. Commissioner Cole then asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that the County Board direct the County Manager to conduct a parking study in support of future site plans so that future site plans have adequate information to guide recommendations to the County Board on the adequacy and sufficiency of parking. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

The Planning Commission voted 12-0 to support the motion for items A – D: A. certify 69,464 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation; B. certify 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA, as transferable development rights from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) for the purpose of historic preservation; C. transfer 49,464 square feet of commercial GFA from 2825 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (“Receiving Site”); and D. transfer 74,747 square feet of commercial GFA from 2901 Wilson Boulevard (“Sending Site”) to SP #418 (Receiving Site”). Commissioners Ciotti, Cole, Fallon, Forinash, Harner, Klein, Kumm, Malis, Monfort, Savela, Serie, and Sockwell supported the motion.

The Planning Commission voted 12-0 to support the motion for item E, in that the proposed ordinance to vacate is substantially in compliance with the County's Comprehensive Plan: Ordinance to vacate 1) A portion of an easement for public street and utility purposes, running north from the corner of the intersection of Washington Boulevard and N. Garfield Street along the eastern boundary of Lot 12, Lot 11, Lot 10, Part Lot 8 and Part Lot 7, Moore's Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-001; and 2) A portion of an easement for public street & utility purposes, located at the northeastern corner of the intersection of N. Highland Street and Washington Boulevard, on Lot 5-A, Moore's Addition to Clarendon, RPC No. 18-026-009, both with conditions. Commissioners Ciotti, Cole, Fallon, Forinash, Harner, Klein, Kumm, Malis, Monfort, Savela, Serie, and Sockwell supported the motion.

The Planning Commission voted 9-3 to support the amended motion for item F: Adopt the ordinance to approve a site plan for the construction of a 306,492 square foot commercial building with 284,012 square feet of office space and 22,479 square feet of ground floor retail with modifications of zoning ordinance regulations for parking ratio, bonus density for LEED and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan, subject to the conditions of the ordinance, with modifications. Commissioners Ciotti, Cole, Fallon, Harner, Klein, Kumm, Monfort, Savela, and Sockwell supported the motion. Commissioners Forinash, Malis, and Serie opposed the motion.

Respectfully Submitted,
Arlington County Planning Commission

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stephen Sockwell". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Stephen Sockwell
Planning Commission Chair

ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

SITE PLAN REPORT FOR 01-09-2012 PC AGENDA ITEM #2, 3001 N. Washington Blvd. (Penzance)

Submitted by Terry Savelle, Planning Commissioner and Site Plan Chair

SPRC Meeting Dates: 9/12/2011; 10/17/2011; 11/3/2011

Project Summary: This application is likely one of the most complex site plans ever brought forward in Arlington County. It seeks to assemble several parcels separately owned (some through family trusts) on a small unredeveloped block in the heart of Clarendon. This block, bounded by Washington Blvd, N. Highland St., N. Garfield St., and 11th St. North represents one of three blocks identified in the Sector Plan as a potential receiving site for additional height and density "in return for extraordinary community benefits including building preservation, affordable housing, green building design, and/or public open space." This block is also one of four remaining unredeveloped blocks with a use mix target for the base density of 3.0 FAR of 60% commercial, reflecting the County's objective of increasing the percentage of GFA that is office space in Clarendon. (The County has long sought to increase the office mix in Clarendon, with very limited success.) Finally, the block contains a building listed as Notable on our Historic Inventory list and targeted for façade preservation in the sector plan. The application has sought to overcome the obstacles and meet the many goals for the block set forth in the Sector Plan.

The proposed project for two office buildings with ground floor retail far exceeds the use mix target (100% commercial for both base density and transferred density). It preserves and restores the historic façade with modifications negotiated with HALRB to improve the viability of the retail space and the pedestrian experience on 11th St., and perhaps most importantly, ensures the full building preservation of those historic buildings housing Faccia Luna/Boulevard Woodgrill building and Walgreens. Finally, three of the four levels of parking are made available for public use after 5:00 p.m. weekdays and on weekends. An additional benefit not anticipated by the Sector Plan are new public easements adjacent to the preserved buildings along Wilson Boulevard. There are some modifications of use or departures from urban design guidelines sought, including a reduction in the stepback above the historic façade, the 11th Street sidewalk, and the office parking ratio, all of which are compatible with and anticipated by the Sector Plan and fully comply with Section 27.D of the Zoning Ordinance.

Issues Addressed and Agreed upon by the Developer:

- Request initiated by community to relocate garage and loading from N. Garfield St., as described in Sector Plan, to 11th Street North. SPRC committee members agreed, given the changes to the character of N. Garfield St. since the adoption of the Sector Plan.
- Several architectural features were discussed by the committee, with the applicant responding with modifications and alternatives for consideration. The committee was generally very complimentary on the architecture. In particular, the higher penthouse of 23" to fully screen the mechanical equipment was endorsed.
- The applicant modified the design of the small plaza at the corner of Highland and Washington Blvd. in response to SPRC comments.

Outstanding Issues:

- The committee sought an extended awning and amenities at the building corner on 11th St. North and Garfield to accommodate bus stop patrons. County policy prohibits an extension of the awning into the public right-of-way and to date, staff has not supported this request. However, this issue remains under discussion and may be resolved favorably prior to the County Board meeting.
- Questions were raised regarding the completion of the modifications to the Washington Blvd. and Highland St. intersection suggested by the Sector Plan and adjacent to already redeveloped properties. Such improvements are not typically made the responsibility of an applicant, although the applicant has not stated an opinion on this issue. However, the County has not determined whether any changes to the intersection are appropriate (the Sector Plan provided a schematic showing significant nubs on the NW and SE corners, but no actual measurements or studies were done) and staff continues to discuss this issue.
- Community representatives remain strongly opposed to the reduction in the office parking ratio. They believe there is insufficient parking in Clarendon to support the evening and weekend demand.
- Community representatives seek to require the applicant to move the historic building on site targeted for façade preservation to provide a wider sidewalk and planting strip on 11th St. N. The Sector Plan does envision such a streetscape, but specifically acknowledges that the desired streetscape along preserved frontages is unlikely and allows for the reduction in clear space to 6'. Various allocations of the space between the building wall and curb were considered in SPRC, with some consensus around devoting the maximum amount of space possible for pedestrian passage while including tree pits in select locations. However, Planning Commissioners and HALRB did not support moving the building.

Suggested Outline for Questions:

- Historic Preservation (including questions on TDR calculations, façade preservation requirements, HALRB position, preservation easement conditions 81 and 82, and action items A through D in staff report)
- Parking (incl. parking counts, ratios, tandem spaces, and public access)
- Other Transportation (including TDM condition #50)
- Streetscape and plaza (including sidewalk widths and treatments on 11th Street and fronting preserved buildings on Wilson Blvd.)
- Condition 84 (Sidewalk, utility, and street easements to be granted by sending sites)
- Vacation issues (staff report item 2.E)
- Architectural issues
- Assessment of Community Benefits
- Commission questions not captured above

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC
Applicant
3001 Washington Boulevard

This project will bring vitally needed WorkPlace use and fill the void in a key, currently underutilized block to complete the vision set forth in the Clarendon Sector Plan. It will enhance the dynamics of the daytime population in Clarendon by bringing daytime office use to balance the predominantly residential use mix in Clarendon, envisioned by the Clarendon Sector Plan.

HIGHLIGHTS OF UNIQUE PUBLIC BENEFITS

- Bringing a large, prestigious, non-profit think-tank institution to Arlington County at significant financial concessions made solely by applicant, resulting in:
 - Creation of stable, long-term economic development catalyst in Clarendon (lead tenant is 70 plus years old non-profit)
 - \$2.5 to \$3 million new annual tax revenues to County
 - An estimated \$9 million in annual small business, restaurant, and retail expenditures in Clarendon
- Establishing almost 300 public parking spaces to Clarendon for evening and weekend use (top three levels in garage)
- Commitment to a Managed Parking System will provide approximately 513 off-street parking spaces for peak daytime users, for an effective parking ratio of 1:589
- Paying Affordable Housing contribution (well in excess of \$1 million) based upon contribution for the Washington Boulevard development, AND for two off-site historically preserved sites, as well
- Preservation in perpetuity of 3 important historical sites in Clarendon, which involved:
 - Buying and transferring all available developable FAR from two full building historic preservation sites to eliminate risk of redevelopment or physical alterations of the existing structures
 - Providing historic easements over all sites ensuring ongoing preservation and maintenance responsibilities by site owners
- Full consolidation of a 6-parcel city block. This full block consolidation is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to achieve under current economic conditions

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC
Applicant
3001 Washington Boulevard

DETAILED COMMUNITY BENEFITS LIST

URBAN DESIGN:

- This development will provide a world-class office building with ground floor retail that meets the Clarendon Sector Plan's urban planning and design objectives for this neighborhood and was designed through intense collaboration with all public and private stakeholders over the last 4 years.
- Full consolidation of a 6-parcel city block this full block consolidation is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to achieve under current economic conditions.
- Will extend the Clarendon Sector Plan's sidewalk & streetscape design from the Clarendon Center south to Washington Boulevard.
- Will create a cohesive, coordinated development that will expand Clarendon's retail district into and around the entire block as well as providing a continuous pedestrian friendly retail link to adjacent blocks consistent with sector plan's vision.
- Building design addresses County Planning Staff request for multiple buildings, including potential office condo use creating a development that breaks down the city block scale avoiding one massive, mega-block building.
- Design provides opportunity for both large corporate and small workplace tenants with potential condominium office ownership.
- Architecture that complements Clarendon's unique urban character and will also invigorate the neighborhood with its distinct, signature features.
- \$75,000 contribution for public art either on-site or within the Clarendon Metro station area.
- Creating a dynamic gateway development with vibrant ground floor retail uses.

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC
Applicant
3001 Washington Boulevard

PARKING AND TRANSIT:

- Proposed office use will create “reverse commute” traffic patterns which will improve the efficiency of road & transit system.
- Bringing 287 new, evening & weekend public parking spaces to Clarendon where currently there are less than 20 off street parking spaces.
- Full block assemblage & development creating a more efficient parking & off-street loading solution versus an unassembled, separate parcel development scenario.
- Development will eliminate 4 curb cuts on Washington Blvd & 4 curb cuts on North Garfield Street adding 11 additional on street parking spaces (22 total).
- Combined loading dock & parking garage entry for both buildings to minimize sidewalk curb cuts.
- Redesign and relocation of loading dock from N Garfield Street in response to specific request of community.
- Bicycle parking & storage in excess of County requirements with shower & changing facilities.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

- Affordable housing contribution in excess of \$1 million which includes the transferred density from the full building preservation sites.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

- Bringing a large (approximately 190,000 SF or 65% of the total office use) prestigious, think-tank institutional tenant to Clarendon. All costs associated with bringing and retaining this tenant in Clarendon is being born by the applicant solely, with no financial support or contributions from the County.
- Approximately \$37.5 to \$45 million tax revenues to Arlington County - including real estate taxes, license fees, meal and sales taxes, etc. – during the initial 15 year lease term of the major tenant lease (excluding any adjustment for tax increases).

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC
Applicant
3001 Washington Boulevard

- Will provide a significant economic boost to local daytime businesses through the introduction of a long term office tenant with a large professional workforce in a predominantly residential community.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION:

- Providing the extraordinary community benefit of full building preservation of two sites identified by the Clarendon Sector Plan and in the recently adopted County Historical Resource Inventory as important commercial structures.
- The Walgreens/Kenyon Peck and the Boulevard Woodgrill/Faccia Luna buildings will be fully preserved in order to limit any future development on those parcels with no major alterations to occur without County approvals and preserving the smaller scale and unique character of both buildings in perpetuity.
- Buying and transferring all available developable FAR from the sending sites to eliminate risk of redevelopment or physical alterations of the existing structures.
- Providing County requested dedications/easements at TDR sending sites.
- Deconstruction, reconstruction, and restoration of two landmark, historic frontages (McQuinn's & ABC Store).
- New development designed specifically to accommodate the scale & character of the preserved facades through reducing the adjacent frontage to 2-stories.

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND OPERATION:

- Committing to achieving LEED Shell & Core Silver Certification with USGBC.
- Project incorporates green roofs.
- Providing District Energy ready designed building.
- Anchor tenant targeting LEED Silver or Gold for tenant improvements.

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC

Applicant

3001 Washington Boulevard

- Committed to operating and maintaining property to similar LEED standards.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA):

- Installation of powered door openers for the main pedestrian entrances to the office building and on the first level of the parking garage.
- Handicap van accessible parking garage.

PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT:

- Purchase, replacement and installation of new public 450' waterline to upgrade County system costing over \$100,000.
- Replacement of sanitary sewer lines found to be deficient in the streets surrounding the project.
- Installation of County requested conduit system for dry utilities that the county can use for future needs and allow for future utility installation without street/sidewalk excavation.
- Street & Sidewalk improvements
 - Garfield Street realignment - difficult to achieve without full block consolidation as it extends over 3 separate parcels.
 - Creation of an intimate, publicly available plaza, with both outdoor cafe and more meditative, quiet space elements - versus, alternative of 6 parcel scheme redevelopment, with little to no opportunity to create similar outdoor space for the neighborhood.
- Completion of Dominion Virginia Power's local grid which will provide for more reliable power distribution.
- Undergrounding of current overhead utilities.
- Providing Storm Water Management (quantity & quality) for the site which is currently providing none (*Bowman to confirm*).
- Contribution of \$24,000 for the installation of multi-space parking meters along the public street frontage.

Penzance Clarendon Assemblage, LLC
Applicant
3001 Washington Boulevard

- Contribution of \$65,500 to the Underground Utility Fund.
- Installation of new fire hydrants as well as fire department connections in order to provide adequate fire protection for the building and neighboring properties.

Gizele Johnson

From: Freida Wray
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 11:03 AM
To: Aaron Shriber; Gizele Johnson
Subject: FW: WEBSITE COMMENT: Comments on Penzance project -- ATTN: FWray

FYI.

Gizele - At the citizen's request, please include this in the hand-outs to the PC tonight. Thanks.

Freida Wray
Planning Commission Coordinator
Planning Division, CPHD
fwrap@arlingtonva.us
703.228.3525
703.228.3543 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: fcura@verizon.net [mailto:fcura@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 10:38 AM
To: Freida Wray
Subject: WEBSITE COMMENT: Comments on Penzance project -- ATTN: FWray

The following comment has been submitted from the Arlington County Website:

Name : Federico Cura

Submitter's E-Mail Address : fcura@verizon.net

Subject : WEBSITE COMMENT: Comments on Penzance project -- ATTN: FWray

Comments : Frida,

Could you please pass these comments on the Penzance project along to the Planning Commission?

I will be unable to attend the PC meeting.

As a former member of the Transportation Commission, I want to first thank you for your service.

My wife and I have lived in Clarendon for more than 10 years and have seen many changes in our neighborhood. We love most of the changes. But one thing that we don't love is all the overflow parking we get in the neighborhood on evenings and weekends. I also don't like the closure of the county's parking garage in Clarendon. Moreover, I don't like to see the empty and closed parking lot at Clarendon's Thurgood Marshall School (across from

Whitlow's). I also believe the newly opened Trader Joe's grocery store in Clarendon is a jewel. It is inevitable that more people will shop at Trader Joe's five years from now and that the limited parking garage space there will not be enough. I can't believe that the county's report on parking related to the Penzance project would ignore evening and weekends, and Trader-Joe's-related parking needs. Furthermore, I can't believe that the county staff provided millions in savings to the developer and required so little parking in return.

We need more parking in Clarendon and the Penzance project is a great opportunity to create more parking!

I am a huge supporter of public transportation, but we can't expect everyone eating out, shopping and working in Clarendon-Courthouse to get there with public transportation. We want to attract people from the outer suburbs to come to Clarendon-Courthouse. They are used to their car and we should give them appropriate parking at parking garages like the one at the Penzance project. We want to attract people from Vienna and Leesburg to come to Clarendon, spend money in Clarendon, eventually move to Clarendon, and eventually ditch the car and get a Zipcar membership.

We need more parking in Clarendon now and we will need even more parking five years from now. More parking will let our small businesses thrive in Clarendon! The Penzance project is a great opportunity to create more parking.

Best regards. Federico Cura, 1004 N. Daniel Street, Arlington, VA 22201, fcura@verizon.net

Thank you.

Gizele Johnson

From: Freida Wray
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 1:04 PM
To: Aaron Shriber; Gizele Johnson
Subject: FW: Restauranteur Support for Penzance Project

FYI.

Gizele - Please send an electronic copy to the PC, and provide hard copies for the meeting tonight. Thanks.

Freida Wray
Planning Commission Coordinator
Planning Division, CPHD
fwray@arlingtonva.us
703.228.3525
703.228.3543 (fax)

From: Ryan Duncan [mailto:ryan_overwood@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2012 12:46 PM
To: Freida Wray
Subject: Restauranteur Support for Penzance Project

From: ryan_overwood@hotmail.com
To: countyboard@arlingtonva.us
Subject: Restauranteur Support for Penzance Project
Date: Mon, 9 Jan 2012 10:14:35 -0700

January 9, 2012

Dear Arlington County Board / Planning Commission members:

I am writing as a long-time restaurant owner in Clarendon (15+ years) in support of the Penzance development project under consideration at 3001 Washington Boulevard.

Over the years as Clarendon has matured and grown we have noticed a steady decline in our lunch business, in large part (we believe), due to the scant amount of office space, relative to the number of dining establishments in the area. We understand the proposed Penzance project would add nearly 300,000 square feet of office space and I hope this would give a needed boost to our weekday lunches as well as our happy-hour and special event/private party business. Additionally, the new parking component of this project would be extremely helpful to us as parking is an ongoing concern.

I would not be surprised if this new project, if approved, ends up landing a few high profile corporate tenants to the area which, in turn, could lead others to discover that Clarendon is a great place to work, not just to live.

I appreciate your consideration and I hope you will feel free to contact me if you have any questions as it pertains to this issue.

Sincerely,

Ryan Duncan

SAUL CENTERS, INC.

7501 Wisconsin Avenue ♦ Suite 1500 ♦ Bethesda, Maryland 20814-6522 ♦ PH: (301) 986-6200

October 25, 2011

RE: 3001 Washington Boulevard, Arlington, VA

To whom it may concern:

Saul Centers, Inc. is the Manager of Clarendon Center LLC, the owner of Lyon Place apartment building located at 1200 N. Garfield Street as well as the adjoining office building located at 3030 Clarendon Boulevard (collectively, "Saul Properties"). The Saul Properties are adjacent to the proposed 3001 Washington Boulevard property to be developed by Penzance with two office towers and ground floor retail. The Saul and Penzance properties are separated by 11th Street.

We met with the Penzance team on October 5, 2011 to discuss their proposed development project. Specifically, they educated us about such things as screenwall height, façade design, building size, first floor layout, retail spaces, loading dock and parking ramp locations. We have no objections to the current design of the Penzance project. In our letter dated October 17, 2011, we specifically supported the 23-foot high screenwall to hide the mechanical equipment on top of the 10-story Penzance office building.

We also discussed coordination of loading dock usage between our two properties since the loading docks are located opposite one another on 11th Street. Since the Saul Properties have been experiencing stabilized operations for nearly a year, we will educate the Penzance team about our existing conditions such that their future operations work well with ours.

Feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
CLARENDON CENTER LLC
By: Saul Centers, Inc., Manager



Mary Beth Avedesian
Vice President – Acquisitions & Development



October 13, 2011

Mr. Aaron Shriber
Arlington County Site Plan Review Committee
Senior Site Planner
2100 Clarendon Blvd, Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22201

Re: Proposed Development at 3001 North Washington Blvd,
Arlington, Virginia

Dear Mr. Shriber,

The Board of Directors of Clarendon 1021, A Condominium (the "Board"), is writing to express the Clarendon 1021, A Condominium Unit Owners' Association's (the "Association's") support for the proposed development at 3001 North Washington Blvd, as submitted to the County by the Penzance Group (the "Development").

As you are aware, Clarendon 1021 occupies the entire city block on North Garfield Street across from the Development. The front entrance of our building will face the Development and approximately 130 of the 419 condominium units in our building will look directly onto the Development. As a result, our building will be the most impacted of the four residential properties bordering the Development, two of which are apartment buildings whose residents, since they have not purchased property in the neighborhood, are not invested in the long-term development of Clarendon and do not share our concerns regarding the preservation and enhancement of property values.

In March 2011, representatives of the Penzance Group presented their original plan for the Development to the Association at a Clarendon 1021 Board meeting. Our unit owners adamantly opposed the original site plan primarily because it located a loading dock directly across from our building's Garfield Street entrance, which is used by our owners, our residents, and their guests. The Board, on behalf of the entire Association, expressed to Penzance the Association's opposition to the positioning of the loading dock and certain other elements of the design. We were pleased to learn that Penzance was willing to address our concerns. The site plan currently under review locates both the loading dock and parking garage entrance on Eleventh Street. We support this site plan.

There are several reasons why we believe that the current site plan for the Development is in the best interest of our neighborhood. First, we believe that the loading dock and parking garage is more appropriately placed on Eleventh Street, because Eleventh Street already includes a loading dock



A Condominium Unit Owners Association

for Clarendon Center (as well as for our building), has commercial spaces and the side of commercial establishments on the ground floor of the entire block, and has fewer residents (and no Arlington County property taxpayers) who would be directly impacted by the sights and sounds of the dock. In contrast, locating the loading dock on North Garfield Street would adversely impact the quality of life for our owners and residents and potentially could result in a loss of property values.

Second, the area of North Garfield Street in front of our building is already often congested with cars picking up and dropping off residents and loading items, congestion which will be worsened when Trader Joe's opens later this year. Having the parking garage and loading dock on Eleventh Street will reduce the potential back-ups that may occur on our block if cars or trucks are turning into the Development on North Garfield Street.

Finally, our Association strongly supports the creation of a continuous strip of retail on North Garfield Street, which would be interrupted by a loading dock. By relocating the loading dock to Eleventh Street, which would otherwise offer little attractive commercial space, the developer created the opportunity to have retail establishments stretch down North Garfield Street from Circa to the new Garfield Park development, creating a more vibrant and integrated retail district. Our Association believes that retail on North Garfield Street appropriately compliments the residential character of our block.

Overall, the Association believes that the Development as submitted can be an asset for both Clarendon 1021 and the Clarendon community as a whole. The Association applauds the Penzance Group's efforts to work with our community on this project. As a result, the Association urges the Site Review Planning Committee and the County to support this Development.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth H. Benoit

By: _____

Elizabeth Benoit, President
Clarendon 1021, A Condominium

cc: Jonathan Kinney, Esq.
cc: Todd Sinkins, Esq
cc: Rosemary Ciotti



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association
1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

January 7, 2012

Arlington Planning Commission
2200 Clarendon
Arlington, VA 22201

Commission Members,

The CCCA urges the Planning Commission to recommend that the County Board defer action on the Penzance project to allow for public review and discussion on several key issues, most notably a proposed fundamental change in the parking requirements for Arlington.

Several members Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association (CCCA) attended the Transportation Commission meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2011, and spoke on the Penzance project. Other Arlington residents, as well as representatives of the Lyon Park Citizens Association and the Lyon Village Citizens Association, also made comments to the Transportation Commission. Neighbors were unanimous in their recommendation that the Penzance project application be deferred for further discussion of the important issues not yet resolved. As a result of the discussion, the Transportation Commission unanimously voted to defer approval of the application.

Key points made by community residents and civic associations included the following:

Facade preservation at 11th and North Highland

- **The full sidewalk width is needed at this location.** The current version of this project does not provide a needed 14- foot sidewalk on 11th street to compensate for diminished street scape resulting from parking and loading deck entrances, lack of retail storefronts, reduced trees, and to compensate for the original intent to have this street be a significant pedestrian thoroughfare.
- **Locating the preserved façade to allow the sidewalk is consistent with other changes made to the structure.** This façade "preservation" actually involves disassembling and removing the structures during construction, reconstruction (in some cases using new materials) the façades with substantial modifications that include new cladding, a significant number of new windows, and other modifications intended to render the spaces commercially viable. By



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

failing to use this opportunity to reposition the façades, the project effectively is preserving a historically inadequate sidewalk at the expense of "preserving" a significantly changed historic façade. Therefore the Sector Plan's flexibility for sidewalk width near historic buildings is not applicable to this site.

- **The Sector Plan calls for 14 feet at this location.** The Clarendon Sector Plan (see Urban Design Guidelines, Section D.8 "Streetscapes" pages 137-9, and table 3.1) seeks to have clear sidewalks up to 14 feet wide. The current plan accommodates this at 11th and Garfield, but tapers the sidewalk to only 10.5 feet wide at 11th and North Highland.

Reduced parking ratio and other transportation issues

- **Our neighborhood specifically needs to maximize night and weekend parking availability at this site.** There are well-established complaints by Clarendon businesses (restaurants, entertainment venues, grocery stores, general retail) guests and visitors finding available parking when visiting the neighborhood. not all visitors to the Clarendon neighborhood can walk or use public transportation; many visitors travel by car from residential or distant areas where public transportation is not a reasonable option. A lack parking is likely to diminish visitors not from the immediate neighborhood to the detriment of Clarendon businesses. The proposed 1-780 parking space ratio does not comport with Clarendon Sector plan required 1-580 ratio for this block (see Sector Plan "Vision Statement", Section D.8, page 105).
- **We need this garage to create office parking flexibility, not absorb it.** On nearby blocks, challenging design constraints will be needed to create a new public park where there are now extensive underground utility lines. The Penzance 6.2 FAR building should be creating office parking capacity to allow parking reductions in the future, not spilling over to absorb claimed current excesses.
- **The proposed "enhanced TDM" is a completely inadequate substitute for the needed parking.** If the reduced parking ratio is granted—a decision that would wrongly deviate from the Sector Plan—the direct benefits offered by the developer in exchange for parking reduction (a one-time payment of \$150,000 plus nominal enhanced TDM contributions and nominal contributions to Arlington County Commuter Services that primarily benefit only building tenants) are inadequate to the value represented by the parking spaces. The proposed benefit is little more than \$1000 per space, whereas the Clarendon Sector Plan values such spaces at about \$40,000. (See Sector Plan "Vision Statement", Section D.8, page 105 for the estimated value of an underground parking space. See also pages 19 – 20 of the staff analysis for the proffered direct benefits.)



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

- **The developer and staff have compared this building to others that are not similar to justify lower parking ratios.** Comments by the applicant at the Transportation Commission meeting regarding instances where reduced parking ratios have been granted in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor fail to address the significant benefits received or other factors not in evidence with Penzance. The examples cited at the meeting were not presented and vetted in the SPRC process, and citizens believe additional facts mitigate against this argument.
- **The survey used to justify this massive policy change is flawed and was suppressed until after all public discussion was over.** The parking survey referenced in the staff analysis on pages 18 – 19 was not provided to citizens and civic associations in advance of the meeting despite direct requests. At a minimum, the survey times failed to include periods when significant new businesses were open (i.e., Trader Joes) and were conducted only during a limited set of business hours, ignoring evening and weekend hours.
- **Staff claims that excess parking is a burden on Arlington is inapplicable to our needs for this site.** Night and weekend demand “induced” by “excess” parking is off-peak and has little fiscal impact on Arlington. Area residents,— even those in relatively close proximity— particularly elderly citizens, who shop at Trader Joes value parking availability because they cannot reasonably transport bulky purchases by foot or public transportation. In any event, reducing driving demand by constraining parking was debated and rejected in the Master Transportation Plan. Rather, reduced parking must be diverted to other more tangible community benefits.
- The site plan does not incorporate or address a building awning on Garfield for the bus stop, which was discussed and informally proposed by the applicant during the SPRC process.

Problems associated with policy and/or the public process

- **The final hours of a site plan are the wrong time to create sweeping new parking policies.** Comparisons to of Arlington parking ratios to those in Alexandria, Crystal City, and Tysons Corner focus on isolated facts and fail to consider the variety of interrelated factors that were considered in developing the Clarendon Sector Plan. The carefully negotiated interrelated elements of the Sector Plan cannot be modified without resulting knock-on unintended consequences that would be detrimental to the entire Plan.
- **Staff admits that it only has information on half the needed analysis.** Although staff has produced a last-minute parking survey to purportedly justify lower parking ratios throughout the R-B corridor, at the Transportation Commission meeting, they conceded that they have not finished their analysis of the economic value of foregone parking spaces to developers in order to ensure



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

that we "Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits." (Master Transportation Plan Parking Policy #6) The reduced parking in and of itself is not a valid benefit, particularly on this site.

- **The Sector Plan and its 1:580 parking ratio should be adhered to until the County Board votes to change that policy after community discussion.** The Master Transportation plan specifically says "use the parking ratios specified in the Zoning Ordinance... as a starting point for evaluating off street parking needs in special exception projects" (MTP parking implementation action 6(a)). The Clarendon Sector Plan was thoroughly and publicly discussed over an extended period before becoming final. It represents an integrated, tightly woven vision. It would be inappropriate—and undermine the transparent public process that is "the Arlington way"—to randomly and arbitrarily change fundamental elements of the Sector Plan.
- **The public process on this aspect of the site plan was deeply flawed.** Multiple speakers noted the unevenness, lateness, or unavailability of critical information flow from staff throughout the process. These problems in information flow inhibited public discussion. As a specific example, multiple speakers noted that the parking survey cited by staff on pages 18 – 19 of their analysis was not available prior to the Transportation Commission meeting and was not even identified as ongoing throughout the SPRC process.
- **Criticism of this inadequate process must be tolerated and debated, and is not the same thing as "attacks" on county staff.** The simple fact is that the entire analysis provided in the staff report on this project was conducted in secret. This is a fact to which staff admits: they acknowledge that secret, internal staff discussions were underway for a year before this report came out. Even up until the hour of the Transportation Commission meeting, staff refused to allow citizens access to the underlying data, and even then the much of the data and methodology remains a mystery.
- **The Planning Commission has a specific duty to ensure planning policy is not made in this way.** Public policy should not be set, nor governance subverted, by a pattern of special exceptions. The fundamental purpose of the Planning Commission is to guard against just this sort of ad-hoc policy-making.

Many of comments above were contained in the CCCA's letter to the Transportation Commission; a copy of that letter is below. The CCCA believes that the breadth and significance of these issues represent a compelling need to defer this project for further public discussion.

We note that one of the issues in our previous comments, which involves easements on historic sending sites, has been satisfactorily addressed by proposed conditions. This



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

is another additional example of the applicant ongoing efforts to be responsive to citizen and staff concerns. We have noted the applicant's creativity and flexibility in past comments, and we would be remiss in complementing this again.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Regards,

Ken Fulton
CCCA President
703-243-2536



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

December 22, 2011

Arlington County Board
2200 Clarendon
Arlington, VA 22201

Board Members,

The Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association (CCCA) has been actively participating in SPRC and other discussions regarding the Penzance project bordered by Washington Boulevard, 11th Street, N. Highland Street and N. Garfield Street. The CCCA greatly appreciates the opportunity to participate in the project discussion. In general, the developers have been quite responsive to citizen input, and have demonstrated flexibility and creativity in addressing issues posed. The project represents an important and valuable economic development project for the neighborhood, and will help to fulfill some of the central goals of the Clarendon Sector Plan—most notably, it will for the first time use the Plan's innovative density transfer formula to preserve two historic buildings of great interest to the community. In addition, the project will provide daytime office density that will help improve lunchtime traffic for area restaurants and take better advantage of our peak transportation infrastructure capacity.

The CCCA has received regular updates on the project, including two presentations from the developer, and has discussed it at each of our last few meetings. At our December 20, 2012 meeting, CCCA members considered the various issues and concerns outstanding and voted to take the following positions.

First, the CCCA believes that the density transfers for the project should not be approved until the County has secured permanent protection of the sidewalk in the 2900 block of Wilson Blvd. adjacent to the Faccia Luna Trattoria and the 2800 block of Wilson Blvd. adjacent to the Walgreens. Because this is the first time that the Sector Plan's historic preservation density transfer provision is being used and is establishing precedent, the County should carefully resolve certain theoretical and practical challenges. In this project, the County is indirectly financially rewarding owners of historic properties in return for a promise never to re-develop them. But in doing so, the County is permanently relinquishing its standard means of obtaining safe and ample sidewalks—also a key Sector Plan goal. These goals can be fully compatible, provided that the County sets the precedent that when paying a property owner to remove a site from development it ensures that the payment also secures the necessary public



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

access and utility easements. We urge the County to secure permanent easement rights at these locations as a condition for granting density benefits to the Penzance project.

Second, the CCCA strongly opposes granting the developer an office parking ratio of less than 1-to-580. This *quantity* and quality of night and weekend public parking is a specified community benefit for this block of Clarendon. The current proposal is for a 1-780 office parking ratio, a reduction of 95 spaces in the garage, and we find this unacceptable.

In taking this position, the CCCA reminds County staff that the Clarendon Sector Plan Task Force and the County Board considered and rejected planning for a Bethesda-like public parking facility. Instead, as the Sector Plan clearly indicates throughout its Section D.8, the County has chosen to rely on private facilities to provide sufficient public parking to meet demand. Considering that the 3033 garage no longer is a free public parking facility, and that a grocery store has opened across the street from this site, the need for such private parking on nights and weekend is only more acute.

Increasing the supply of night and weekend parking for the public was and remains a key goal of the Clarendon Sector Plan. Furthermore, the Plan makes clear that the designation of the Penzance site, in particular, for office uses (as opposed to residential units) was in part to ensure "*opportunities for new shared parking resources.*" Quoting from the Sector Plan that discusses this particular block (which is called "Block 33" in the plan): "*These prime office areas include Blocks 4, 6, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 33 (Washington Boulevard Frontage). These areas are clustered together in close proximity to the Metro station, are visible from the station entrance and Central Park, and are situated facing at least one of Clarendon's primary streets. In addition, these future office development sites could advance the shared parking goals for Clarendon which would increase the supply of parking available to the public during off-peak times.*" (emphasis added). The 1:580 parking ratio is specifically mentioned in the Sector Plan on page 2.86 of the plan as the underlying office parking ratio for the Plan's analysis and policies.

The Sector Plan notes that (as of 5 years ago) an underground parking space in Clarendon cost on average \$35,761 to construct. Reducing the parking in this building by 95 spaces is thus a reduction in cost to the developer—and a lost opportunity for direct community benefits—of approximately \$3.4 million. Although the applicant and staff have posited a "robust" Transportation Demand Management Program to reduce the possibility of spillover office worker parking during the day, this in no way addresses the Sector Plan's stated need for parking availability on nights and weekends.



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association

1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

Moreover, there has been no proposal or discussion of any other transportation benefit even approaching the value of the lost spaces.

Looking forward, the CCCA notes that other blocks in Clarendon where future development could occur will not have the flexibility of this site in constructing parking. This site will have no out-parcels, no buildings preserved intact, and no other serious impediments to excavation or garage layout. The CCCA believes it important to secure parking supply in conjunction with this project in order to provide greater flexibility in future construction where it would need it more, such as at the Verizon site where a public park is of great interest to residents and where construction may have to contend with immovable underground utility lines.

In sum, the CCCA believes this is the right block on which to build a central public parking facility with ample space. That is what is called for in the Sector Plan, and we believe that is the appropriate transportation benefit to insist on at this location.

Finally, we request the historic facade at the corner of 11th and Garfield streets be located such that it provides standard sidewalk widths. As currently planned, the historic facade will be disassembled and rebuilt in its existing location, which will not provide a standard clear-width for the sidewalk along 11th Street. The CCCA has proposed, and continues to believe, that the rebuilding of the facade can be accomplished in a way that provides the standard sidewalk clear width and retains the historic nature of the structure, if not its exact current location. (Although some at the SPRC meetings have asserted otherwise, the CCCA believes that the architecture of the building surrounding can easily be modified to accommodate this facade position without diminishing appearance or building density or adversely affecting the historic preservation effort.) While the CCCA recognizes that the Sector Plan allows for a narrower sidewalk if required for historic preservation, we believe it is inappropriate to apply this principle when the building is in any event going to be completely disassembled and then only partly reconstructed. We urge the County to require the modest adjustment in location of the re-built historic facade to facilitate sidewalk clear-width (including shy zone) in conformance with the Sector Plan.

In taking these positions, the CCCA seeks to acknowledge the flexibility and responsiveness of the developer, help realize the important economic and quality of life benefits that the project can bring to the community, and ensure that the spirit and explicit requirements of the Clarendon Sector Plan are realized. We are grateful for the opportunity to participate in these discussions and comment on the project.

Regards,



Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association
1109 N. Fillmore St., Arlington Virginia 22201

Ken Fulton
CCCA President
703-243-2536

P. Owen Handout

D.8 Parking

Policies for Parking

43. Provide sufficient parking to meet realistic needs generated by the envisioned land use mix proposed in the plan.
44. Locate and design parking facilities, including access points, in such a manner as to reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians along streetscapes and through the design readily enable pedestrians to reach parking areas.
45. Emphasize strategic locations of pooled parking resources enabling visitors to Clarendon to park once and walk to multiple destinations.
46. Include knock-out panels in underground parking garages in order to facilitate connections to adjacent parking facilities particularly where adjacent parcels are irregularly shaped or sized which could limit the viability of underground parking.
47. Price on- and off-street public parking to encourage efficient use, reflect the public cost of providing parking, and to minimize incentives to drive personal vehicles.

Existing Parking Resources

Parking in the Clarendon station area is available in underground parking garages, surface parking lots, and on the street. Historically, on-street parking and surface lots supported the area's retail establishments, many of which were clustered along Wilson Boulevard. The availability of convenient parking for retail patrons has long been an issue for Clarendon. In recent years the situation has become more apparent as large-scale redevelopment began to occur in Clarendon and parking reservoirs disappeared as new high-rise buildings with limited access to parking garages were built. In order to find "free" parking, shoppers and diners circulate around some of Clarendon's streets vying for "prime" spots, or park farther from their destination, although those willing to park in paid lots still find sufficient parking for a few dollars per visit (or paid through validation). This is not unusual for an urban environment.

In 2004, the County conducted a parking survey of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor. The survey showed that there were 40 garages and lots in Clarendon, 24 in commercial or office buildings and 16 in residential buildings. These parking facilities contained a total of approximately 7,400 parking spaces. Only five of the garages are currently open to the general public. These garages contain a total of 2,180 spaces. The garage at Clarendon Square, located at 3033 Wilson

Boulevard, has approximately 500 spaces, the Market Common Phase I garage has 1,100 public spaces, the Market Common Phase II garage has 160 spaces open to the public, and the Hartford Office building garage has 380 public spaces. The newly opened Station Square project has 77 parking spaces available for daytime public use, and a total of 188 spaces available evenings and weekends. An additional 20 spaces are available, evenings and weekends, at the Thurgood Marshall School building off Wilson Boulevard and North Fillmore Street. Several other lots and garages are available to the public; however, they are limited to those persons conducting business on-site.

Fortunately, for the Clarendon area, the Arlington County Government occupies a major portion of an office building in Clarendon, 3033 Wilson Boulevard, and allows the public to access its parking garage during evening hours and on weekends without any per-use user fee. This parking will remain available to the public as long as the County occupies the building. Over time, knowledge of this parking garage has become more widespread and today, reportedly, it is commonly full or nearly full on evenings and weekends with retail and restaurant patrons. The provision of free parking within this building supplements the paid parking available at the other garages in the neighborhood and the on-street parking. In the future, the County may choose to charge a fee for parking to better manage this resource.

CLARENDON SECTOR PLAN

Today, the Clarendon area has approximately 750 on-street parking spaces. This number may increase as the remaining blocks available for redevelopment reconstruct their street frontages, as new streets are constructed, or as other street improvements occur. Parking meter use is enforced from 8 am to 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday. After 6 p.m., there is often competition between employees and retail and restaurant customers for the spaces.

In addition to on-street parking along Clarendon's streets, in the central core all redevelopment projects include underground parking to accommodate their commercial or residential uses. The Zoning Ordinance allows for parking ratios of one space per unit for residential uses and one space per 580 square feet of commercial use for projects utilizing the special exception site plan process. As an incentive to encourage the retention of existing or the attraction of new restaurants in Clarendon area, the zoning ordinance permits exemptions from parking requirements for these uses within 1,000 feet of a Metro entrance. Many restaurants have located in the Clarendon area due to this parking exemption; however, some recently approved projects have accommodated a small quantity of parking within the garages for retail uses.

Clarendon's largest concentration of retail tenants—at The Clarendon Market Common—has provided

parking resources for the Clarendon area above the minimum required parking that benefits the retailers within the project, and also provides parking that can be used for other retail, restaurant, and visitor needs. These two parking garages in the eastern end of Clarendon are widely used. In contrast, the western edge of Clarendon and the 10th Street corridor do not have large parking resources and could benefit from similar parking supplies when redevelopment occurs.

The Market Common includes 300 apartment units. Only 275 residents have parking spaces within the garage. Tenants are charged \$25/month for a parking space in the building. This "unbundling" of parking fees from unit rentals, along with the availability of other transportation options, discourages residents from owning private vehicles and minimizes the need for additional parking.

Parking Demand

Land in Clarendon currently costs approximately \$5 million per acre. The approximate land cost for an on-street parallel space is \$18,000 and off-street surface parking spaces can be considerably more costly due to greater land requirements. The total capital construction cost for on-street spaces is approximately \$21,000 and can exceed \$40,000 for above or below grade parking garage spaces. With

these costs, it is critical that the County manage this resource in a fiscally responsible way.

Provision of parking in the Metro corridors must be carefully balanced with other fiscal demands. While the County has encouraged transit ridership and focused higher density developments within a one-half mile radius of each station, parking ratios have been reduced to encourage walking and transit use. This policy has generated much discussion during planning and development review processes and conflicts arise for employees, consumers, and residents alike. Some feel that parking in Clarendon is insufficient especially for short-term needs. Others point to recently constructed buildings where residents are not filling the spaces that were built under the requirements of the current parking policy.

Demand for parking space in Clarendon originates from three principal sources, each with its own characteristics:

Residents' Car Storage. Most households in Clarendon own automobiles and need a place to store them even if they walk or take transit to work on a daily basis. The 2000 Census found that approximately 94% of Clarendon area households owned at least one vehicle. At that time the percentage of multifamily residential units in Clarendon was substantially lower than in other sector areas within

the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor. Elsewhere within the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor the same census found that approximately 17% of households did not own any vehicles. It is expected that over time, Clarendon will more closely resemble the rest of the corridor in terms of auto ownership.

In general, households can be divided into three distinct categories with regards to the storage of owned vehicles.

- A small but growing percentage of area residents owns no cars at all (these households may seek access to convenient car-sharing resources, such as Flexcar or Zipcar, or not drive);
- Households who walk, bicycle, commute via transit or work at home commonly only need a car for weekend use, errands and or other related uses (some of these households may not need automobile storage, again using shared or rental vehicles, while others may be willing to accept some degree of assured remote storage several blocks away for owned vehicles, with access to short-term parking in their immediate buildings for drop-offs and errands); and
- Households who need to be able to store a vehicle as close as possible to their unit because they use it on a daily basis, have security and/or mobility issues, or are simply willing to pay for the privilege.

Employee Vehicle Parking. Regardless of the level of attractiveness of transit, a substantial portion of all Clarendon employees (whether working in office, retail/restaurant, or residential facilities) will arrive by car and will need a place to park for extended periods of time. Realistic parking accommodations must be made for employee parking. Anecdotally, it has been suggested that employees of retail, restaurant and residential establishments may use cars more often for arriving at work than long term employed office workers. This may be due to work schedules during times with less transit frequency. Failure to appropriately address the commuting needs of these particular workers results in three problems that impact the vitality of Clarendon:

- Employees utilizing short-term parking spaces (by meter feeding or repeatedly moving their cars) otherwise needed for patrons to retail, restaurant and/or office uses;
- Employee parking encroachment into bordering residential neighborhoods; and
- Employee recruitment issues for retail and restaurant establishments.

Patron & Visitor Parking. A substantial proportion of visitors (particularly first time visitors) to Clarendon's retail, restaurant, office and even residential locations arrive by car and need adequate supplies of short-term, conveniently accessible parking. Clarendon's stores and restaurants draw a high percentage of their patrons from locations within the region beyond walking distance. Many other Clarendon shoppers and diners arrive by transit or bicycle. There also is some parking demand by long-term guests visiting local residents. At build-out, Clarendon will need to provide adequate amounts of well located and always accessible visitor parking to accommodate these fluctuating needs and parking should be priced to reflect its true cost and value. Parking that is underpriced can encourage more Clarendon visitors to drive rather than use transit, bike or walk.

Parking in Residential Neighborhoods. The close proximity of the Metro core and adjacent single-family neighborhoods in Clarendon has led to overspill parking pressures, with commuters, shoppers, restaurant goers and apartment residents seeking to park on residential streets. On most of the residential streets, Residential Permit Parking (RPP or zoned parking) provides protection by reserving on-street spaces for residents. The enforcement hours for most of the zoned parking areas in Clarendon are 8 am to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, but 2006 policy

changes allow for these hours to be extended into the evening. Residents have expressed that they would prefer that the hours of enforcement be extended later into the evening, but few have approached the County to initiate the change under the new policy. The principles articulated in this Sector Plan strongly suggest that the preservation of the single-family home character outside the Metro core is important, and should be maintained with regard to on-street parking (through zoned parking), regardless of the potential spillover demand.

Recommendations

As in all other parts of Arlington, parking for Clarendon should be provided by two principal means: 1) through existing publicly-owned or leased parking facilities or 2) through privately-owned parking facilities. A more in-depth examination of the current and projected parking utilization is recommended with the goal of refining the parking ratios to best serve the Clarendon area. The following specific considerations should guide that analysis:

Existing Publicly-Owned or Leased Parking Resources

This refers to on-street parking and parking in lots associated with various schools and other public facilities, including the two leased public parking

facilities at 3033 Wilson and the Thurgood Marshall School. In managing these resources the County should:

- Seek to maximize the physical number of public on-street parking spaces consistent with safe design by minimizing driveway cuts, converting excessive travel lane width, re-striping spaces and other measures that create additional spaces;
- Dedicate all available on-street parking in the core and the Transition Areas to signed or metered short-term, high turnover parking
- Consider extending the enforcement hours for metered parking to 10 p.m. for all days, as well as charging on Sundays to encourage turnover at the meters and to discourage employees from parking at meters;
- Maximize the after-hours use of the 3033 Wilson and Thurgood Marshall School parking facilities for restaurant and retail establishments' employee parking or, where compatible with neighborhood concerns, as short-term, high turnover patron parking;
- Increase the availability of convenient daytime, high-turnover visitor parking (particular during lunchtime hours) in the 3033 Wilson garage by relocating some of the all day employee parking to lower levels of the garage; and
- Limit Permit Parking zones to the "Residential Areas" only.

Privately-Owned Parking Resources

It is the intent of these recommendations that, beyond the above stated publicly-owned or leased parking, all future increases in physical parking supplies will be privately owned and managed, but subject to regulations and agreements designed in accordance with the principles set forth below. An overarching principal across these strategies is that recommended Prime Office sites are important locations where shared parking for visitors to Clarendon will be sought.

Existing & Approved (not yet built) Facilities.

Existing and approved privately-owned parking facilities in Clarendon would continue to be operated and managed in accordance with established regulations and requirements under the Zoning Ordinance and the conditions of any already approved and effective site plan approval documents and agreements.

In addition, the County, Clarendon Alliance and/or others are encouraged to work with the owners and operators of the existing parking garages to devise ways to better market, promote, manage and sign them to optimize the use of existing capacity, particularly for short-term, high turnover customer parking and retail/restaurant employee parking. The owners of the larger office and/or retail garages are also encouraged to explore ways of filling their garages

during overnight hours and weekends with the cars of local residents who commute elsewhere during the working weekdays.

New Facilities. As new development proceeds, the continuation of the existing Zoning Ordinance requirements is recommended for parking in new developments including existing parking standards for special exception site plan projects with several modifications for shared parking, small projects, and parking relief for preserved structures as follows:

- New projects should design their garages to maximize the use of their parking spaces over a twenty-four hour period. The parking spaces would be "shared" so that visitors of the proposed building(s) and the general public would have access to short-term, unreserved, high-turnover parking spaces during the hours not in use by the primary building occupants. The shared parking spaces should not be considered extra or additional parking spaces; rather, these spaces would be allocated from the total amount of required spaces for the total project based on the proposed uses. The parking spaces that are designated as shared parking would be calculated by applying the following formulas to the specific project and should be located on the first level of the garage closest to the street level:

- One space for every ten residential units, when there are at least 100 units, made available during the day from 9a.m.-5p.m.;
- During the day and evening hours, the following uses should provide shared parking as follows:
 - All parking for retail and restaurant uses
 - Any parking proposed for commercial office uses that exceeds the minimum requirement;
 - Ten percent of the required commercial office use parking made available during the day from 9a.m.-5p.m.; and
 - 70 percent of the required commercial office use parking should be made available for use by the public during evenings and weekends when the office spaces are not typically occupied.

Conditions relating to the operation, management and pricing of such shared parking would be issued as part of the site plan approval for the project and/or via a separate Parking Management Plan and/or Development Agreement with the County.

- Projects on sites of under 20,000 square feet in size are expected to meet their Zoning Ordinance parking requirements on site, whenever feasible. In instances where provision of such parking on site is unattainable, exceptions might be granted where up to 100% of the required parking could be located within 1,000 linear feet of the project site, with appropriate assurances to ensure the parking remains available for the duration of the project.
- Projects which include buildings listed for preservation in Chapter 2 may seek relief from meeting the parking requirements described in the Zoning Ordinance. As conceived, the measures for parking relief for such structures should generally include the following approach, upon further codification in the Zoning Ordinance:
 - The parking requirement for the floor area of full preservation required by the plan will be the lesser of: (1) the ordinary requirement under the ordinance, or (2) the amount specified in Table 2.2 as existing on December 31, 2006.

The parking requirement for the floor area of partial building preservation required by the plan will be the amount of parking specified in Table 2.2, pro-rated by the ratio between the floor area preserved and the floor area of the original building.

The County Board may choose to reduce the parking requirement for preservation of floor area within the identified buildings beyond the partial preservation required in the plan. In such case, the reduction may be equal to the lesser of: (1) the current ordinance requirement or, (2) the pro-rated amount based on the ratio of the floor area preserved and the floor area of the original building.

PARKING SPACES ASSOCIATED WITH STRUCTURES RECOMMENDED FOR PRESERVATION

Table 2.2

Block	Building(s)	Address	Estimated Parking Spaces	Approximate Parking Area (sq. ft.)
1	Meat Market Building	2719 Wilson Blvd.	27	6,500
1	Bike / Garden Shop Building	2727-31 Wilson Blvd.	5	1,300
2	NTB Building	2825 Wilson Blvd.	35	14,750
3	All Buildings	2901-25 Wilson Blvd.	40	12,000
8	All Buildings	3125-41 Wilson Blvd.	30	5,300
10	All Buildings	3165-95 Wilson Blvd.	12	4,200
12	All Buildings	3201-25 Washington Blvd.	6	1,150
18	Clarendon Citizens Hall Building	3211 Wilson Blvd.	5	2,400
19	Kirby Garage Building	3237 Wilson Blvd.	8	5,700
24	USPS	1020 N Highland St	2	470
27	All Buildings	3016-28 Wilson Blvd.	0	0
30	Leadership Building	1101 N Highland St	0	0

Notes:

1. Existing spaces as counted through 12/31/2006.

2. The existing estimated parking spaces may or may not conform with existing zoning. In cases where existing spaces are non-conforming, the existing approximate parking area may be used in determining the preferred number of spaces within a conforming parking layout as part of the proposed redevelopment.

Source: Field survey conducted by Arlington County DES.

P. Owen handwritten

Master Transportation Plan - Parking and Streetscapes Element

"Traditionally... the private sector has been required to provide infrastructure only for its driving tenants.... Adjustment of parking requirements must go hand-in-hand with facilitating and increasing support for other modes of travel through TDM measures and enhanced provision of transportation infrastructure." (page 13)

Excerpts from: Implementation actions (page 14)

"a. Continue the practice of using the Zoning Ordinance to establish the appropriate minimum off-street parking requirements for by-right buildings. Use the parking ratios specified in the Zoning Ordinance (which are based in trip generation studies, partly modified by anticipated modal shift) as a starting point for evaluating off-street parking needs in special exception projects." ✕

In other words, ratios specified in the Zoning Ordinance are presumed by policy to be valid until changed.

"i. Study existing parking ratios and TDM measures and practices to determine if adjustments should be made based upon expected need." ✕

"k. Support an on-going research program to assess the appropriate parking supply for the County's diverse types of neighborhoods and unique land uses and to add to the understanding of the parking dynamics in the County. Include in this program periodic surveys of property managers or garage operators to collect data on garage utilization."

In other words, studies of expected need should be applied to the ratios and practices, and not to individual projects on an ad-hoc basis.

"b. Determine off-street parking demand in special exception projects based on the expected travel pattern of users of the site. Factors influencing parking demand include TDM measures affecting the site, local market pricing and management of the parking facility, access to infrastructure and services for public transit and alternative modes, density and the land use mix both on-site and in the area. In establishing the approved parking level for a site, consider parking demand and parking supply in the immediate area (generally within 1/8 mile of the site), and constraints and efficiencies of parking construction at the project site."

Determinations about deviations from the standard parking ratios set forth in the Ordinance are extremely site specific, and should take into consideration the characteristics of nearby parcels.

“g. Encourage parking built in excess of minimum site needs to be managed to enable shared parking and a possible reduction in the parking requirements for nearby parcels.”

In combination with (b) there is a clear implication that efficiencies of parking on a site can and should lead to higher amounts of parking on that site -- so that the site can be a “sending site” for shared parking.

“c. Provide County-owned off-street public parking only as appropriate to support other County goals and policies (such as economic development, historic preservation, affordable housing) when on-street parking spaces in the area are frequently over-subscribed and proximate publicly-accessible privately owned lots are often close to capacity or otherwise inaccessible.”

In other words, Arlington, unlike Bethesda and many other communities, depends on an ample, well-planned, and accessible private parking supply.

Clarendon Sector Plan
Excerpts from: D.8 - Parking

P. Owen handout

Policies:

"45. Emphasize strategic location of pooled parking resources enabling visitors to Clarendon to park once and walk to multiple destinations. "

The Penzance location is extremely strategic:

- *in the very center of Clarendon*
- *across the street from a grocery store*
- *within 1/8 mile of a block where we seek a new public park*
- *two blocks from the 3033 garage now no longer operated by Arlington*

"43. Provide sufficient parking to meet the realistic needs generated by the envisioned land use mix proposed in the plan."

The plan envisions the most complicated area to park will be located a block away from this site, where substantial tradeoffs will need to be made in order to build a public park where there are currently extensive underground utility lines.

In the text:

"The total capital construction cost for on-street spaces is approximately \$21,000 and can exceed \$40,000 for above or below grade parking garage spaces. With these costs, it is critical that the County manage these resources in a fiscally responsible way." (page 105)

The proposed parking in the Penzance project is 126 spaces less than the County's 1:580 requirement for standard spaces. The total reduced capital cost for this can therefore be estimated at \$4.5 million.

"The zoning ordinance allows for parking ratios of... 1 space per 580 square feet of commercial use for projects utilizing the Special Exception process" (page 105)

The 1:580 ratio is the explicit ratio expected in Clarendon and on which the parking policies in the Sector Plan are set. Exceptions to this general rule are also set forth explicitly in the Sector Plan.

"While the County has encouraged transit ridership and focused higher density development within a one-half mile radius of each station, parking ratios have been reduced [to 1:580] to encourage walking and transit use. This policy has generated much discussion during the planning and development review process. Some feel that parking in Clarendon is

insufficient especially for short-term needs: others point to recently constructed buildings where residents are not filling spaces." (page 105)

The idea that some parking garages in Clarendon are underutilized is not news, but served as a basis for the Sector Plan's policies. The staff report supposedly deviating from the established parking ratios do not provide new information unknown at the time the Sector Plan was adopted.

"At build-out, Clarendon will need to provide adequate amounts of well located and always accessible visitor parking to accommodate these fluctuating needs and parking should be priced to reflect its true cost and value" (page 106)

Recommendations:

- Maximize the after-hours use of the 3033 and Thurgood Marshall School parking facilities for restaurant and retail establishments' employee parking, or... as short term, high turnover patron parking"
- Increase the availability of convenient high-turnover visitor parking (particularly during lunchtime hours) in the 3033 Wilson Garage..." (page 107)

Both of these facilities are no longer operated by the County to provide public parking.

- New projects should design their garages to enable significant amounts of shared public parking...70% of the required commercial office use parking should be made available for use by the public during evenings and weekends when the office spaces are not typically occupied." (page 108)

Note that this amount of public parking is a minimum standard and not the maximum goal. The staff report incorrectly implies otherwise.