



HISTORICAL AFFAIRS AND LANDMARK REVIEW BOARD

Courthouse Plaza One 2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22201

TEL 703.228.3830 FAX 703.228.3834 www.arlingtonva.us

January 19, 2012

Mrs. Mary Hynes, Chairman and  
Members of the County Board  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 300  
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Dear Mrs. Hynes:

At our regular monthly public hearing on Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012, the Arlington County Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board (HALRB) discussed the proposed Site Plan #418 at 3001 Washington Boulevard known as the Penzance Clarendon Assemblage plan. This site plan includes two important historic preservation proposals: 1) full building preservation of the buildings at 2825 Wilson Boulevard (Walgreens site) and 2901 Wilson Boulevard (Boulevard Woodgrill/Clarendon Building), and 2) façade preservation of the old McQuinn's Sporting Goods store and the adjacent ABC store at the corner of North 11<sup>th</sup> Street and Highland Street.

The HALRB discussed the preservation easements and those design issues where the Planning Commission asked for additional comments. The HALRB made four separate motions on the architectural drawings as follows:

- 1) The HALRB voted unanimously to support the inclusion of the newer design for the two-story façade elements adjacent to the ABC-store with the curved corner. The architects should work to detail the façade to achieve as much shadow line as possible.
- 2) The HALRB voted unanimously to support the stair elements with the horizontal mullions grouped together at the top (the project architect's original and preferred option).
- 3) The HALRB made a motion to support moving the two-story façade element so that it abuts the ABC Store. The HALRB felt that the gap between the historic façade and the newer building made for an awkward transition. The motion passed 5-4.
- 4) The HALRB made a motion to support the addition of a canopy on the two-story façade element that would be in line with the ground floor canopies of the historic facades. These canopies would serve as a transition to the existing preserved canopy in the one-story buildings. The motion passed 5-3-1.

The HALRB also voted unanimously to approve the wording for the Walgreens site preservation easement and the use of this wording as the template for the preservation easement to be put on the building located 2901-2909 Wilson Blvd.

#41

The HALRB appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Chris D. Wilson in cursive.

Chris Wilson  
Chairman

cc: Members of Planning Commission  
Members of HALRB

**From:** june oconnell [mailto:oconnelljm35@hotmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2012 11:09 AM

**To:** Mary Hynes

**Subject:** CB Meeting-Jan. 24-Item 41-Penzance/Clarendon Site Plan-honoring Sector Plan's office parking ratio

Penzance –CB-Jan. 24 Item 41- The County Board should honor the Clarendon Sector Plan’s office parking ratio provisions.

Dear Chairman Hynes and County Board Colleagues,

January 17, 2012

I regret that I will be away from Arlington for the hearing on Item 41/Penzance, and, as such, I am unable personally appear before the County Board (CB) to urge that you honor the Clarendon Sector Plan’s 1:580 parking ratio for this proposed site plan office building. I also regret that, as of this writing, the County Manager’s Report and Recommendation are not publicly available. (I believe in the past you/Ms. Hynes suggested that the Manager’s failure to do so *well* in advance of the CB hearing might be, *in itself*, a basis for deferring the item to the next CB meeting!)

#### Summary

I fully concur with Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association (CCCA)’s articulation of the Clarendon Sector Plan’s parking ratio in letters to the Transportation Commission, Planning Commission, and County Board. It is also my understanding that residents from the Lyon Park and Lyon Village neighborhoods spoke convincingly at those Commissions in opposition to the Applicant’s proposed nullification of the Sector Plan’s explicit provisions.

Those voices also exposed the Applicant’s proposal as an assault on a fundamental *core premise* of the *entire* Sector Plan, which was that site plan office/commercial buildings would provide shared parking in “off-peak” hours, nights and weekends”, to ensure sufficient parking options for the many small and local restaurants in C-2 (often historic) by-right properties which have been (and remain) critical to Clarendon’s identity.

#### The Survivability of Small Properties/Local Restaurants is Linked to Adequate Shared Parking.

I appreciate that you, Chairman Hynes, were not on the County Board when the Sector Plan was adopted. However, I am confident that your colleagues Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Tejada will recall that, toward the end of the “task force process”, a special Working Group was formed. It met in the County Board room and included CB members, the County Manager, PC, TC, HALRB, civic associations, Clarendon Alliance designees and others with staff leadership in attendance.

The meetings were open to the public and well attended by Clarendon business proprietors. I am hopeful that Msrs. Zimmerman and Tejada will also recall that these Working Group sessions often entertained questions/comments from those “in the pews”. On one such occasion, the owner of Public Shoes and other Clarendon RPC parcels specifically urged the Working Group to include in the Sector Plan a location/provision for a *public garage*, citing Ballston and Bethesda, so that there would be adequate retail parking on nights and weekends. He specifically noted that retailers and restaurants in the “historic” properties lacked on-site parking and that to survive and to prosper they needed to be competitive in attracting customers from other parts of Arlington, northern VA and Maryland, who could only reach Clarendon by car. The County Manager and Planning rejected any prospect for inclusion of a public parking garage in Clarendon. Rather, they pointed to the then DHS and other key

office sites (such as the Wachovia and Sullivan/ Penzance) as providing the necessary off-peak parking for Clarendon's historic *retail* center.

The role of *office* in providing shared parking was not a *new* discussion topic for the Clarendon Working Group. In fact, it was a continuation of the concurrent community's and the CB's focus on sufficient office development. Again, I am hopeful that Mssrs. Zimmerman and Tejada can recall for you (since apparently Mssrs. Bronsan and Miller's memories do not) that a key aspect of the CB's rejection of the first Clarendon Center site plan proposal was the need for more office at that site and in Clarendon overall with an emphasis on the shared parking office development would offer.

I am also hopeful that Mssrs. Zimmerman and Tejada will share with you the CB's and the Community's insistence, *throughout Sector Plan process*, that, though not law, its provisions were not just words on paper to be put on a shelf and subsequently circumvented. It was to be *honored*. Barely 5 years old, the Sector Plan provides for a 1:580 ratio on office sites, such as Wachovia and the Penzance. The Sector Plan articulates specific criteria for possible reductions, none of which apply to Penzance. To countenance an opt-out here, effectively nullifies its application to the Wachovia site and other Clarendon office construction (as well potentially another other County planning documents in which parking ratios are described).

The Sector Plan's 1:580 parking ratio was known when Penzance purchased in Clarendon and fosters the very long term Clarendon branding upon which Penzance seeks to capitalize. The Applicant paid \$2,370,000 for the Sullivan Monument's parcel (RPC 18-026-010) on January 7, 2010—that is more than 2 years ago—which was only the first of many parcels it would need to consolidate this site. That price was almost 4 ½ times the County's real estate assessed value (\$538,000). It strains credibility that Penzance (an established Rosslyn office building owner) would not have had preliminary meetings with the Planning Department's leadership preceding that purchase. At those meetings, the value and importance of the Sector Plan's provisions and their application to this site should have been conveyed. While I can appreciate that County staff cannot preclude an Applicant and its counsel from filing a 4.1 which does not comport the Sector Plan's clear and significant provisions, the Applicant should be under no illusions that it would not be held to the 1:580 ratio – especially since Planning leadership initiated no community public process/forum, thereafter, to revisit what had been the key area of office shared parking.

The bottom-line is that this Applicant will pay \$10maybe 12 million for the land parcels and expend another \$10/\$20/whatever millions to erect an office building, which would cost pretty much the same *to build* anywhere in the U.S. But, the office rents Penzance hopes to get are based on the value we/Arlington County/its taxpayers have added to its *location*. And, should the Applicant seek to sell the building a few years hence, it obviously expects to reap several multiples of what it cost because of the value/\$\$ we/the County and it residents have and will continue to expend. (Recall the Hartford Office Building, 3101 Wilson /\$112,600,000.)

CONCLUSION: Clarendon's core as a destination warrants honoring to the Sector Plan's ratio. You should not entertain any expedient whining by the Applicant that, if Clarendon needs a public garage, Arlington should build it. Courthouse and Ballston have public garages because those edifices were built decades ago. That was not Arlington's choice for Clarendon. In the interim decades (1980's to the present), Arlington/its taxpayers have expended millions and millions of \$\$\$s annually to fund METRO. Also, in those interim decades, the LV, LP, CCCA, Ashton Hts neighborhoods and countless residents throughout Arlington on a plethora of Commissions have devoted thousands of

volunteer work hours seeking *not just to preserve but to foster* the small local businesses at the *core of "historic Clarendon"*, who need off peak parking, and that priority is transparently balanced in the Sector Plan's office parking ratio.

Thanks to those public collaborative efforts Clarendon is more than a METRO stop. It is a destination. No one could want it to become like an Adams Morgan-like enclave inaccessible to non-locals on weekends and evenings. It is in everyone's interest, including Penzance's, that Clarendon to continue to prosper. Wherever someone lives outside the Clarendon-bullseye, whether across Lee Highway in Arlington, McLean, or Chevy Chase, we want them to enjoy Eventide, Liberty Tavern, and yes the Kabob Inn, but they'll have to drive to do so, and they won't do it if they can't park. And, if we want to join our friends living in such places, we'll have go to them or a find a mutually accessible venue. *Off peak parking is needed and the "smart growth" office parking ratio to facilitate that balance is reflected in the Sector Plan. It should not be written out and off. It should be honored!*

Your attention to and patience with my concerns is appreciated. Sincerely, June O'Connell/taxpayer/condo owner 2400 Clarendon Blvd.

Angela Brackett

FA

**From:** Kenneth Fulton <kennethgfulton@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 03, 2012 8:35 PM  
**To:** Jonathan Kinney  
**Cc:** 'todd@arlingtonmercury.org'; 'president@lyonparkcitizens.org'; 'jmschroll@gmail.com'; Aaron Shriber; Mary Hynes; Walter Tejada; Jay Fissette; Christopher Zimmerman; Matthew Asada; Peter Owen  
**Subject:** Re: Penzance/Clarendon Courthouse Civic Association

Jonathan,

Thank you for your thoughtful letter. I noted that the inaugural 2012 meeting of the Arlington County Board included discussion of "the Arlington way" of conducting business. Your correspondence, as well as the conduct of the project team throughout the ongoing discussion of the Penzance project, are representative of the type of vibrant, open, and respectful discussion that Board members were referencing. In preparing our December CCCA meeting agenda, the flow of information from County staff, the calendar of other discussion venues--such as this Thursday's Transportation Commission meeting--and the holidays precluded our arranging for a presentation at our last meeting, as you have been so kind to do in the past. While that was regrettable, we do believe there are remaining opportunities for dialog.

Responding in reverse order to your comments, we look forward to your email containing the 11<sup>th</sup> Street sidewalk section and a section of the site plan showing the streetscape on 11<sup>th</sup> Street and around the perimeter of the site and in the plaza. I will share it with the membership as soon as it is received.

Regarding easements, it appears that we have common ground on the importance of this issue. We will review the site plan conditions to ensure our mutual objectives can be accomplished.

Regarding the number of parking spaces, we acknowledge that the tandem and scooter parking spaces might be construed as a partial mitigant for deviation from the customary parking ratio. However, the sufficiency of these mitigants, the community benefits associated with parking ratio variances at other projects and their relevance in this instance, and the particular characteristics of the Penzance project's location in conjunction with the needs of the immediate neighborhood warrant additional full and transparent discussion.

We look forward to further conversations and public meetings, confident that our lead representative on the Penzance project, Matthew Asada, will continue his strong representation of the CCCA membership's thoughts on the issues associated with this project. Moreover, we welcome your presentations to the CCCA membership at its meetings. The CCCA remains committed, as are you, to ensuring that the Penzance project realizes its full potential in contributing the neighborhood.

Regards, and best wishes for the New Year,

Ken Fulton  
CCCA President

HR/CB 378503

1

#41

#41

Angela Brackett

FA

**From:** jmillerproperties@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2012 4:06 PM  
**To:** CountyBoard  
**Subject:** WEBSITE COMMENT: 3001 Washington Blvd project -- ATTN: countyboard

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

Name : Justin Miller

Submitter's E-Mail Address : [jmillerproperties@yahoo.com](mailto:jmillerproperties@yahoo.com)

Subject : WEBSITE COMMENT: 3001 Washington Blvd project -- ATTN: countyboard

Comments : Dear County Board,

I am a 3rd generation Arlingtonian and a current resident of the Lyon Village neighborhood along with my wife and daughter. We are staunchly in favor of Penzance's proposed office project as it will complete the New Urban feel of that side of Clarendon in conjunction with the Garfield Park apartment project already underway. The current uses on that block are very unattractive to be frank. I understand that it will also provide nighttime and weekend parking that is so dearly needed.

Please vote in favor of this project!

Sincerely,  
Justin Miller

Thank you.

378549

HHR/CB

Angela Brackett

FA

**From:** Dalejroberts@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2012 11:45 AM  
**To:** Mary Hynes  
**Subject:** WEBSITE COMMENT: Penzance Project -- ATTN: mhynes

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

Name : Dale Roberts

Submitter's E-Mail Address : [Dalejroberts@hotmail.com](mailto:Dalejroberts@hotmail.com)

Subject : WEBSITE COMMENT: Penzance Project -- ATTN: mhynes

Comments : Mary, I am writing to ask that the board approve the pending Penzance Project coming before the board. I understand the issues of providing public parking have been addressed and Penzance is going to be providing up to 600 spaces on nights and weekends.

They have a great prospective tenant that will bring 600 employees and 300 of them will have advanced degrees in their fields. This is the kind of employer this area desperately needs and will bring much needed office population to help all retail businesses in the Clarendon area.

I urge you to vote in favor of this project, as any delays may detour this group from locating to Arlington.

Thank you  
Dale

Thank you.

HR/CB

318548



ARLINGTON COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 900, Arlington, VA 22201  
TEL 703-228-3689 FAX 703-228-7548 [www.arlingtonva.us](http://www.arlingtonva.us)

January 19, 2012

Ms. Mary Hynes, Chair  
Arlington County Board  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22201

RE: Site Plan #418, 3001 Washington Boulevard (Penzance site plan)

Dear Chair Hynes:

I am writing to express the views of the Transportation Commission concerning the County Manager's recommendations relating to Site Plan #418, 3001 Washington Boulevard.

**The Transportation Commission, by a vote of 8-0, approved a motion to recommend that the County Board defer action on the site plan pending resolution of matters relating to the under-parking of the site and the width of the sidewalk along a portion of North 11<sup>th</sup> Street.**

The Commission heard this item at its meeting on January 5, 2012. The Commission received a presentation from the applicant and staff. There were 10 public speakers: Lisa Chavez, Matthew Asada, Ken Fulton, Christopher Wilson, Nancy Iacomini, Adam Thocher, Eric Gutshall, James Hurd, James Lantelme, and Peter Owen.

Eight of the 10 speakers (Ms. Chavez and Messrs. Asada, Fulton, Thocher, Gutshall, Hurd, Lantelme, and Owen), representatives and/or residents of the Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association, Lyon Park Citizens Association, or Lyon Village Citizens Association, expressed concern that the applicant had not provided the required parking or provided offsetting community benefits and that their application was inconsistent with the Clarendon Sector Plan; several of the eight speakers also expressed concern that the proposed sidewalk along the North 11<sup>th</sup> Street side of the project did not meet the minimum 14 foot width required by the Clarendon Sector Plan. Mr. Wilson and Ms. Iacomini, chair and past-chair, respectively, of the Historic Affairs and Landmarks Review Board, expressed support for the applicant's proposal and staff's position re a narrowed sidewalk along a portion of the south side of North 11<sup>th</sup> Street to accommodate reconstruction of the wall of the current building.

Present and voting at the meeting were Commissioners Gearhart, Everline, Grant, Lynott, Ortiz, Serie, Slatt, and Torma.

In discussion Commissioners focused principally on the proposed parking and on the proposed sidewalk width along the south side of North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, adjacent to the project. With regard to the parking, Commissioners noted that the applicant proposes to park the proposed office building at a ratio of 1 space per 780 square feet as opposed to the ratio of 1 space per 580 square feet required by the C-3 site plan zoning provision. Commissioners also noted that staff, when asked whether its recommendation to support the proposed reduction was based on community benefits, said that it was not, but rather based on a recent parking report from a consultant and what the staff though was an appropriate parking level. Staff also confirmed that the County Board had not granted any reductions from the 1 space per 580 square feet requirement in the C-3 site plan and C-R zoning provisions since approval of the current Clarendon plan in 2006 and conforming zoning changes.

#41

Several Commissioners noted that the Clarendon Sector Plan discusses parking at great length and takes a holistic approach to parking in Clarendon. They noted that the Plan assumes that restaurants of under 200 seats as well as many older structures will have little or no parking and that it also anticipates that the County Board will grant parking reductions in some instances to achieve community benefits identified in the plan, such as for full building preservation (in light of difficulties in both preserving a building and meeting parking requirements). But they also noted that the plan expects other buildings to meet the minimum parking requirement of 1 space per 580 square feet and to provide shared parking to help meet the overall parking needs of Clarendon. They also noted that the Clarendon plan expects parking needs to be met by the private sector and not through construction of a public parking garage.

Commissioners in general had trouble with the staff approach. Several expressed the view that it was inappropriate to rely on an incomplete consultant's report released just hours before, that had not been reviewed or vetted by the public. Furthermore, they observed that the consultant's report showed that what appears to be the most comparable office building in Clarendon, the Hartford office building (which is parked at 1 space per 580 square feet), is 97 percent full during the day. They also noted that the consultant's report did not address evening parking availability. In short, Commissioners expressed concern that staff was advocating an approach that was inconsistent with the Clarendon Sector Plan and that would make it difficult to require future developers to provide the minimum parking required by the zoning ordinance, or to provide, in the alternative, offsetting community benefits needed to achieve other goals of the plan.

With regard to the sidewalk along the western half of the south side of North 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Commissioners noted that the Clarendon Sector Plan calls for a minimum sidewalk width of 14 feet in this location, as opposed to the 10.5 foot sidewalk being proposed. Commissioners noted that the new sidewalk would likely be in place for the next 50 years. In response to Commissioner questions, it was explained that only a relatively small portion of the existing building frontage along North 11<sup>th</sup> Street (at the corner of North Highland Street) would be deconstructed and later returned to the site as part of the new building, while the remainder would be demolished and sent to a landfill. The new adjoining wall along the narrowed North 11<sup>th</sup> Street sidewalk would be of new and different materials, and of a different design, with the only historic feature its placement. To be consistent with the Clarendon plan, it appears that a narrowed sidewalk would be appropriate only for the small portion of the building wall being deconstructed and later reconstructed, not for the new sections of wall. Moreover, concern was expressed that the change in building setback where the narrowed portion of sidewalk ended presented a potential security "blind spot" for pedestrians, particularly after dark, unless it was tapered or made transparent so as not to provide a hiding place.

I understand that subsequent to the Commission's meeting the applicant agreed to changes that addressed some of the concerns expressed by members of the community and possibly some of the concerns expressed by Commissioners.

I would be glad to answer any questions (703-522-2276).

Sincerely,

Bill Gearhart  
Chairman