



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

September 13, 2012

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

SUBJECT:

3. **A. Z-2556-12-1** Rezoning from “C-O” zoning district to “C-O-Crystal City” zoning district, located at 1851 South Bell Street and to be renamed 1900 Crystal Drive, approximately 1.7 acres; a portion of RPC# 34-026-037.

- B. Crystal City Block Plan 421-1** for Blocks J-K identified in the Crystal City Sector Plan, defined by Crystal Drive, 18th Street South, Jefferson Davis Highway, and 20th Street South. This Crystal City Block Plan will provide supplemental long-range planning guidance and an integrated planning approach with refinements of the recommendations for Block J-K as outlined in the 2010 Crystal City Sector Plan. The Block Plan illustrates and reaffirms the plan strategies for Block J-K related to elements such as block structure and neighborhood form, land uses, accessibility and circulation, public open spaces, and sustainable development. Additionally, it provides three distinct conceptual build-out scenarios for the Block, inclusive of the currently proposed site plan (SP#421), that are reflective of a variety of Sector Plan recommendations. Some of the major initiatives recommended in the Block Plan are high density redevelopment adjacent to Metro; achievement of Center Park; Jefferson Davis Boulevard and South Clark Street modifications, and more complete pedestrian facilities traversing the block.

- C. SP#56** CESC Mall Land L.L.C. for a site plan amendment for the removal of land area from SP#56. Property to be excluded is approximately 133,956 sq. ft., located at 1851 South Bell Street (to be renamed 1900 Crystal Drive), and is identified as a portion of RPC# 34-026-037. Property to remain in SP#56 is approximately 279,282 sq. ft., located at 1800, 1801, 1901 South Bell Street and 1999 Jefferson Davis Highway, and is identified as RPC# 34-026-035, the remaining portion of 34-026-037, 34-026, 038, 34-026-039, and 34-026-040. The proposed density of the remainder of SP#56 is 3.95

P.C. #40.A-D.

FAR. Modifications of zoning ordinance requirements include: density, parking, and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan. Applicable policies: Crystal City Sector Plan; GLUP “High” Office-Apartment-Hotel and Crystal City Coordinated Redevelopment District.

- D. SP#421** CESC Mall Land L.L.C. for a final site plan for the construction of a 730,994 sq. ft. commercial building consisting of 719,704 sq. ft. of office space with 11,290 sq. ft. of retail space in the “C-O-Crystal City” zoning district under ACZO §25C.E and §36.H. Property is approximately 133,956 sq. ft., located at 1851 South Bell Street (to be renamed 1900 Crystal Drive), and is identified as a portion of RPC# 34-026-037. The proposed density is 5.46 FAR. Modifications of zoning ordinance requirements include parking, and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan. Applicable policies: Crystal City Sector Plan; GLUP “High” Office-Apartment-Hotel and Crystal City Coordinated Redevelopment District. **(1900 Crystal Drive)**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3. A. Adopt the resolution to approve the rezoning request from the “C-O” zoning district to the “C-O-Crystal City” zoning district.**
- B. Adopt the attached Crystal City Block Plan for Blocks J-K (CCBP-JK-1), dated August 6, 2012.**
- C. Adopt the ordinance to approve an amendment to Site Plan #56 to permit the removal of 133,956 square feet of site area, subject to the conditions of the ordinance.**
- D. Adopt the ordinance to approve Site Plan #421 to permit development of up to 730,994 square feet of commercial space comprised of a building consisting of up to 719,704 square feet of office space with up to 11,290 square feet of retail space with modifications of zoning ordinance requirements for parking, and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan, subject to the conditions of the ordinance, with the following modifications:**
- 1. Notes should be added to the Proposed Crystal City Block Plan Map scenarios explaining proposed and potential deviations from the Crystal City Sector Plan.**
 - 2. The Proposed Crystal City Block Plan Map scenarios should be amended to show potential decking over the 18th Street parking and loading area.**
 - 3. Add conditions to address building glass reflectivity and require sensors to control interior nighttime lighting.**

- 4. Amend Condition #52 to include the illumination measurement that corresponds to the level of lighting proposed for the architectural banding.**
- 5. The County Board should direct staff to develop the plan to acquire Center Park, as referenced in Condition #85, by a date certain and prior to the approval of any additional site plans.**
- 6. Amend Condition #84 to change the timing for a new study of the provision of community benefits, requiring the applicant to commence construction of the building within three years, instead of within four years, consistent with the site plan term identified in Condition #1.**
- 7. Add a condition stating, *“In recognition of the County undertaking major reconstruction and realignment of roads, and installation of the transitway and transit stops, there shall be cooperation and coordination for the purpose of minimizing any conflicts that delay either the County’s contractors or the developer’s work, and the applicant and County shall establish a cooperative approach to resolve any conflicts in the most efficient and cost-efficacious manner possible.”***
- 8. Add a condition to require the applicant to revise the proposed building’s northwest façade facing Center Park to provide more articulation to the building wall in order to reduce the tower’s mass and to increase the distinction between the podium, tower and top.**
- 9. The County Board should direct staff to review the Crystal City Sector Plan to evaluate the appropriateness of the minimum sidewalk standards given the expected density of projects coming forward.**
- 10. Add new Condition #87 to require the applicant to work with community representatives to identify a location that is satisfactory to all parties for a community meeting space at the earliest possible time.**

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard these items at its September 6, 2012 meeting. Aaron Shriber, CPHD Planning, described the requests associated with the 1900 Crystal Drive project, including the proposed rezoning to “C-O-Crystal City,” Crystal City Block Plan, amendment to Site Plan #56 for removal of land, and new Site Plan #421. He described the ways in which staff believes the proposed requests meet the goals envisioned in the Crystal City Sector Plan, as well as the proposed Crystal City Block Plan. Mr. Shriber addressed key details related to building density, height, massing and design; site design and site access; streetscape improvements; and parking. He also described the public review process. Finally, he provided a general outline of the community

benefits package, to include contributions toward utility undergrounding, public art, affordable housing, and transportation demand management elements. Also present were Anthony Fusarelli of CPHD Planning, Robert Gibson of DES Planning, and Mark McCauley of AED.

The development team for the applicant, CESC Mall Land LLC, was present, including Reid Wepler and Mitch Bonanno, applicant (Vornado/Charles E. Smith); John Milliken, attorney (Venable); John Pickard, design architect (Pickard Chilton); Katie Peterschmidt, architect of record (Cooper Carry, Inc); John Lutostanski, engineer (Bowman Consulting Group); and Quentin Thomas, architectural lighting consultant. Mr. Milliken and the entire team joined the Commission to thank Commissioner Savela for her work, especially her efforts and leadership on the Crystal City Sector Plan. He described this first project (1900 Crystal Drive) under the new sector plan, and how the applicant has designed a project that he believes meets the goals and criteria of the Crystal City Sector Plan, including the Crystal City Block Plan, and the proposed rezoning and site plan. Mr. Wepler provided an overview of the project, including designs of the plaza, building, the unifying paving treatment, and standard traffic mitigation measures. Mr. Pickard shared the team's vision for the project, and described the details of the building massing strategy and building architecture.

Public Speakers

Christer Ahl, representing the Crystal Park Condominium Association, was pleased with the responsiveness of the applicant in addressing many of the issues raised by the community, including using a type of glass on the building façade that has limited reflectivity at the 11 – 13 percent range, and using a sensor-based interior lighting system, regardless of the tenant, that will turn lights off after office hours. He requested that these commitments be reflected in the staff report. Mr. Ahl identified two remaining issues. With regard to the community benefits package, he questioned the real benefits to the community. He also expressed concern for the projected amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on Crystal Drive and adjacent intersections. He suggested that vehicular traffic be directed to Route 1 and I-395 via South 18th Street, that modifications be made to relevant intersections, and a second metro entrance on Crystal Drive be made a higher priority. Finally, Mr. Ahl expressed gratitude for the efforts of Commissioner Savela on the Crystal City Sector Plan Task Force, noting that she was a steady force, having the knowledge, skills, tenacity and patience necessary to move the task force toward consensus, which culminated in adoption of the Crystal City Sector Plan.

Judy Freshman, a Crystal City resident who is also a member of the Crystal City Citizens Review Committee (CCCRC), stated that one of the charges of the Committee is to “establish criteria and a matrix for evaluating the progress and monitoring the impacts on all dimensions of the Plan” and among the elements are community services, parks and other community amenities. The CCCRC will be working with staff to establish standards and benchmarks for the elements. Ms. Freshman commented that it is important to get the proposed project right because the applicant will be coming forward in the future with many other projects. She expressed concern about the community benefits, which are not unusually generous and mostly benefit the project. She suggested a condition that would require inclusion of community benefits that are true community amenities. A precedent must be established with this first project to remind the developer that they are partners with the community and that their project, even if it is consistent with the Sector Plan, is enabled by the

community. Ms. Freshman suggested that a community meeting space that is available to all residents of the community would be a true amenity and benefit.

Angie Fox, representing the Crystal City BID, commented that Crystal City has an image issue and half of her job is to change how people experience the area. The proposed project is critical to its success and a first major step towards the transformation of Crystal City. This particular site hosts one of most successful farmers markets in the area, movie nights, and the Diamond Derby. She looks forward to partnering with the applicant in the future on the new programming that will be added to the plaza. Ms. Fox also emphasized the standard sidewalk paver treatment in Crystal City and the BID's role in maintaining and promoting its continued use.

Planning Commission Report

Commissioner Forinash reported on the Transportation Commission meeting that was held on August 30, 2012. The Commission voted unanimously to approve all elements of the proposed request. The Commission's only issue concerned the required 6-foot wide clear sidewalk standard on Crystal Drive, which the applicant meets, but a wider clear zone would have been preferred for a building of this size. Other elements discussed by the Commission included the design of the pedestrian staircase leading to the interim park, the loading dock and garage access points for the site, the pedestrian crossing on Crystal Drive, and the proposed sidewalk paver treatment, including ADA implications.

Commissioner Kumm reported on the Urban Forestry Commission. The Commission raised concern that the street tree species were not specifically identified in the plans. The Commission expressed the view that in the future all plans submitted to the County should identify street tree species.

Commissioner Malis reported on the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC). She stated that the LRPC reviewed the Crystal City Block Plan Map Scenarios and noted a preference for the options that included relatively more residential space. The option that included almost 100 percent office was not favored. In general, the committee thought the block plans were on point.

Commissioner Monfort reported on the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC). He stated that the Crystal City Sector Plan provides extensive guidance and criteria on the design and massing of the buildings. In almost every case the site plan meets the criteria established in the Plan. There was extensive discussion on elements of the building design, including the distinction between the podium and top, reflectivity of the glass façade, and interior lighting. The applicant agreed to conditions to address the concerns. Discussions on the public infrastructure focused on pedestrian access and improving the walkways; treatment of the interim park, and measures to ensure that the final park is developed.

Planning Commission Discussion

Block Plan: Is the proposed Block Plan consistent with the recommendations of the Crystal City Sector Plan? Are deviations from those recommendations appropriate?

Commissioner Savela asked a question of staff about whether all of the relevant Crystal City information, such as the “C-O-Crystal City” zoning ordinance provisions and the Administrative Regulations describing block plan requirements, would be provided on a Crystal City website. Mr. Fusarelli stated that this information will be added to the Crystal City/Pentagon City website portal.

Commissioner Harner asked a number of questions of clarification about the proposed and existing loading and garage entrances, and whether the site plan and Crystal City Block Plan Map scenarios are consistent with the Sector Plan guidance. Mr. Shriber responded that the site plan proposal is consistent with the Block Plan scenarios that show retention of the existing entries on 18th Street. He explained that the entire block will be served by existing points and the new building will be served by the existing and new access points on South 20th street, which staff believes is consistent with Sector Plan.

Commissioner Harner asked a number of questions about the departures from the Sector Plan, their implications, and if they are documented for purposes of evaluating future projects. Mr. Fusarelli explained that the diagrams in the Block Plan show how the project differs from the Sector Plan and that the Sector Plan would not preclude other development scenarios as the concepts are illustrative. One of the primary differences is that the proposed site plan includes an initial building located on the southeast corner of the block with a future building on the northeast corner, while the Sector Plan envisioned the entire Crystal Drive block frontage developed as one project. The illustrative concepts provided in the Sector Plan only show one way that the area could be built out, but recognize that there would be other alternatives. Commissioner Harner expressed concern that the Sector Plan does not really plan the block.

Commissioner Monfort asked if the Sector Plan can be further refined and Mr. Shriber responded that the purpose of the proposed Block Plan is to show how the block will be built out consistent with the Sector Plan or where it varies from the Sector Plan.

Commissioner Savela indicated that the Block Plan/Base Plan on pages 3 - 11 includes diagrams from the Sector Plan, and noted that Commissioner Harner made a valid point. She agreed that the Block Plan should highlight elements of the proposal that vary from the Sector Plan.

Commissioner Cole stated that during LRPC he raised concerns regarding the loss of park space and the loss of access to the park from South 18th and South 20th Streets. Furthermore, he expressed concern that the park would be substantially reduced in size if the parking entrances were to continue as they exist today. The applicant has shown in each of the three block plan scenarios that the intent is to extend the deck to the edge of the sidewalk on South 20th Street to cover the area that the park was originally intended to include, but they do not show access, or at least provision of a pedestrian stairway, to the park from this point. In addition, none of the scenarios show the deck extending to 18th Street and providing access from South 18th Street. Commissioner Cole commented that it is critical that the County Board understands that the site plan does not achieve the level of park space and access as envisioned in the Sector Plan’s Public Open Space Map and that the full benefit to the community will not be provided.

Commissioner Cole also referred to the sector plan’s Retail Frontage Map, which requires retail along the proposed site plan building’s entire west frontage. However, the proposed site plan calls

for a fitness center in the southwest corner of its plaza level floor plan, which he believes should not be considered conventional retail, as it does not serve the public in the same way as retail. The County Board should be made aware of this as well, as falling short of meeting the Sector Plan goal of providing full retail along the park frontage.

In response to Commissioner Cole's concerns regarding the park access points from South 18th and South 20th Streets, Mr. Gibson highlighted two key transportation issues. The limited amount of service in the block plan supports over 1.7 million square feet of office development and there are a significant number of parking spaces that support the development. The provision of connectivity from South 18th to South 20th Streets supports the block's grid and allows directional choices for vehicles to reduce congestion and circling through blocks. Secondly, the Surface Transitway Map shows existing and proposed metro entrances at the corners. Because South 18th Street will be increased in size to support transportation networks and the street car, staff believes it will be unlikely that there would be a mid-block pedestrian crossing but rather crossings at the corners where the signalized intersections are shown.

Commissioner Harner expressed concern that these issues will not be diagrammed as development moves to the next level of block plans and that departures from the Sector Plan and the rationale for the changes need to be codified. The illustrative plans in the Sector Plan show the existing building that is to remain as being aligned along South 18th Street with the new building, so that there is a consistent building wall along South 18th Street. It appears the entire mass of the proposed project has shifted north of the build-to line. While he understands the reasoning for this, the rationale for the change needs to be made clear. Commissioner Harner stated that the park could be enhanced by having buildings on its south side respect the space with a street wall. He thinks that is what the Sector Plan envisioned. However, it troubled him that the new building mass has been moved to the north in the block plan. Mr. Fusarelli responded that the reason for the apparent change is the existing podium along the northern edge of Crystal Mall 2 to handle the grade difference between Clark Street and Crystal Drive. Although the Sector Plan did not get into this level of detail, the proposed northern face of JK-2 and the existing podium for Crystal Mall 2 would create a consistent street wall across the street from the park.

Commissioner Savelle stated that the discussion shows how confusing the various documents are and suggested that page 2 of the Crystal City Block Plan document be expanded to explain the purposes of the various sections provided in the Block Plan. She also suggested that a paragraph be added to highlight the deviations in the loading and parking entrances, and describe the rationale for relocating the building tower.

Commissioner Cole suggested that when this is presented to the County Board, the staff report should include a section that outlines all of the differences between the Sector Plan and the block plan. There was further discussion about what the County Board approved regarding required information on the block plan. Mr. Fusarelli explained that the general structure, rather than the specifics, of the block plan was reviewed by the County Board as part of the Zoning Ordinance amendment for the "C-O-Crystal City" zoning district. The specific requirements for the block plan will eventually become part of the administrative regulations. However, the checklist presented to the County Board in December 2011 was used for the review of the proposed Crystal City Block Plan.

Commissioner Monfort stated that he would make a motion to add a condition to require that the block plan stipulate the deviations from the Sector Plan. Mr. Shriber suggested that for this proposal staff would provide a bulleted list of the deviations. Also, this component can be added to the requirements in the administrative regulations to ensure that it is included with future Crystal City Block Plans.

Commissioner Malis stated that unfortunately it would be presumed that the block plan scenarios match the Sector Plan's illustrative plans unless deviations are explicitly pointed out. Mr. Shriber responded that there are certain areas in the three block plan scenarios that deviate from the Sector Plan, such as the use mix. While the Block Plans do not clearly highlight all the differences, the site plan documents the changes from the Sector Plan. Staff agreed to highlight the differences in the block plan as the proposal goes forward to the County Board.

Commissioner Harner stated that if the Commission is considering documenting the changes from the Sector Plan, it would be useful to point out the differences in the loading and parking accesses and provide an explanation of the details of the proposal, as this would be useful for analysis of future development proposals. Mr. Shriber responded that the block plan provides conceptual guidance and its purpose is not to provide details of dimensions of curb cuts, for example. That is the purpose of the site plan, which in this case the site plan provides the details. Commissioner Harner explained that the Sector Plan has a map detailing proposed garage access and loading entrance locations for all blocks, and that this block plan deviates from that recommendation. The rationale for this deviation should be provided in the Block Plan.

Building Design: Is the proposed building design consistent with the requirements of the Crystal City Sector Plan? Are deviations from those requirements appropriate? Should the building architectural design be further refined? Does the proposed building or any design elements (i.e., reflective glass) adversely impact immediate neighbors? Should the applicant be required to install sensors to control nighttime interior lighting?

Commissioner Monfort inquired if the site plan includes conditions to address interior lighting sensors and glass reflectivity. Mr. Shriber responded that the applicant has agreed to address these issues and staff and the applicant are working to develop conditions that will be added to the site plan.

Commissioner Malis inquired about the guidance that will be provided to address architectural lighting and asked if that is the intent of Condition #52. She noted that the applicant in its presentation referred to the provision of "subtle" lighting. Mr. Shriber responded that the lighting details and luminance levels will be required as a part of the lighting plan required in Condition #52. Staff has reviewed the proposal and believes the proposed lighting is appropriate, subtle, and does not project outward from the face of building. Its purpose is to highlight the architectural features of building. Mr. Thomas, the applicant's architectural lighting consultant, described the proposed architectural lighting and agreed to provide photometric details documenting the low luminance level. Commissioner Malis responded that she would like documentation on what would constitute lighting subtlety. Mr. Shriber responded that the condition would specify the luminance level so that staff will have guidance when photometric plan is filed.

Commissioner Cole asked if a condition should be added to require the same brightness standards for the architectural lighting as was recently approved in the sign standards for rooftop signs. Commissioner Savela responded that it would be difficult to determine the level of brightness of the architectural lighting as compared to roof top signage. Commissioner Cole stated that it should include standards to limit architectural lighting brightness. Mr. Thomas responded that the brightness of the architectural lighting can be quantified and would be significantly lower than the standards for rooftop signage.

Commissioner Harner stated that it is clear the intent of the urban design guidelines to ensure harmonious architectural design from block to block. The proposed project is very exciting, but the Commission needs to understand and be clear about how each project fits into the block plans. He sees many subtle shifts in building massing from urban to very suburban.

Commissioner Malis thanked staff and the applicant for providing very good presentations and a good set of materials to help the Commission talk through the issues. She noted that staff has said a number of times that the proposed site plan is “consistent” with the Sector Plan; however, she needs a better understanding of this consistency because of Commissioner Harner’s point that there are subtle differences. Commissioner Harner has stated that the building reads as rectangular, which is suburban. She asked if we can expect all subsequent buildings to be rectangular in shape, from top to bottom, as that appears to be “consistent” with the urban design guidelines in the Sector Plan. She now wonders whether the guidelines are appropriate or whether they should be reconsidered. Mr. Shriber responded that subsequent buildings do not have to be designed as rectangular. Certain sites encourage a more linear treatment. Each block is configured differently; therefore, it is dependent on the site configuration and the architect’s approach. Commissioner Malis responded that there is a tendency to maximize density on many sites and questioned the incentive the developer has to follow contours or taper tops of buildings and not simply max out on density. Mr. Fusarelli responded that the block plans establish a preferred public realm by identifying the street and sidewalk networks. This determines the geometry of the building, and its placement and massing. The Sector Plan has a fundamental goal of providing a balance of residential and commercial uses, and residential and hotel buildings have a different massing than office buildings. With regard to the subject block, the street alignment has resulted in a more rectangular building. Commissioner Malis stated that the building is slightly offset from the build-to line at the north corner, and questioned whether the right guidelines are in place to ensure that we get the desired design.

Commissioner Kumm expressed concern for the lack of distinction between the building podium, tower and top. She also commented that the Crystal Drive façade is less articulated. Commissioner Kumm suggested that these concerns be captured in the Commission’s motion, as the applicant should be encouraged to provide more sculpting in the building design.

Commissioner Cole expressed concern that Sector Plan’s form standards combined with the incentive applicants have to maximize density may well result in many/most buildings having the same or very similar forms. He asked for the applicant’s perspective. Mr. Pickard responded that the Sector Plan does a great job of describing the vision for the area while not being too prescriptive. As they try to execute a vision for the building, the Sector Plan guidance allowed them to create an interesting building. Future buildings will provide different design approaches. If the guidelines are too prescriptive, then all of the buildings will look alike. He confirmed that Vornado wants to

provide a special building and, while they are concerned about the economics of the building, they are attempting to do the right thing and create a landmark project.

Commissioner Monfort expressed concern about the building definition issues addressed in the staff report, especially on the western elevation. Mr. Pickard explained the transition between the podium and the tower of the building's east and west elevations.

Transportation: Is the proposed public infrastructure adequate to meet projected traffic demand, for cars, pedestrians and bicycles? Should the applicant be allowed to deviate from County sidewalk paving standards?

With regard to the sidewalk paver issue, Commissioner Ciotti asked if the County has changed its sidewalk treatment standards from non-beveled pavers to poured-in-place concrete. Mr. Shriber clarified that the County standard is to use poured-in-place concrete within the pedestrian clear zone and areas outside the clear zone can be treated with pavers. From a maintenance and accessibility standpoint, the County is focusing on the pedestrian clear zones and providing a consistent treatment throughout the County. The Crystal City Sector Plan reinforces the County standard. While the retail block to the south provides a nice looking paving treatment, it was approved prior to adoption of the Sector Plan. With any new development, there is the opportunity to implement the new County standard. The applicant is requesting leniency for the sidewalk paver treatment that does not meet the County standards; however, it cannot be guaranteed that project adjacent to this will want to provide the same treatment. Mr. Gibson added that the County will be investing significant funds to implement a sidewalk improvement program throughout the County, which will bring the sidewalks into compliance with the new standard of 6-foot wide poured-in-place concrete pedestrian zones with paver bandings.

Commissioner Kumm recognized staff's concern to not facilitate a hodge-podge of sidewalk treatments. However, Crystal City's sidewalk treatment is predominantly pavers, albeit a mix of pavers. The paver treatments create a distinct sense of place and identity for Crystal City. The extent of the paver treatment throughout Crystal City is significant and she believes the applicant is right to want to continue the treatment. Commissioner Kumm stated that the real issue is maintenance. If the applicant agrees to maintain the non-standard sidewalks, then she does not understand why the County will not agree to the provision of a high quality non-standard treatment. Mr. Shriber responded that the County feels this is important and is investing significant dollars to make changes Countywide. He confirmed that while the site plan conditions require the applicant to maintain the sidewalks, not all site plans currently have this requirement. The County will be making sidewalk improvements in advance of redevelopment of many sites such as along South 18th Street adjacent to this block.

Commissioner Monfort reminded the Commission that this issue has been discussed at previous Commission meetings and the Commission recommended maintaining the County standard until and unless there is a new standard. He suggested that Commissioner Kumm attempt to address the issue as a policy change through the right County process or venue. Commissioner Malis added that not everyone believes poured-in-place concrete is inferior and this is the crux of the problem. The Commission is bound to maintain the County standard.

Commissioner Ciotti inquired about the County standard for poured-in-place concrete described by Mr. Gibson. He added that, while there is the risk of poor installation, with site plans the County can go back to the developer and require that they correct poor installations.

Commissioner Monfort asked for assurance that the plan for temporary circulation during construction, as required in Condition #6, will include maintenance of bicycle lanes on both sides of the streets. Mr. Gibson agreed and explained that during construction roadways sometimes must be relocated, but it is the County's goal to maintain all modes of transportation.

Commissioner Fallon inquired about the \$47,185 financial contribution to the Arlington County Commuter Services as outlined in Condition #50.D.3 and how it compares to other site plans of this size and adjacency to metro stations. Mr. Gibson responded that the total is comparable to what was approved with the Rosslyn Gateway project and is an amount calculated on the square footage of the building, at \$.064/sf. He added that Crystal City is one of the most transportation-connected areas and well served through multi-modal transportation means.

Commissioner Kumm stated that while the Sector Plan recommends a minimum sidewalk pedestrian clear zone of six feet, she wants to echo the previous point that future projects should include more than the minimum clear zone. Rosslyn Gateway included wider sidewalks than transportation multi-modal plan recommended.

Commissioner Forinash inquired if the minimum six-foot wide pedestrian clear zone for Crystal Drive is consistent with the Master Transportation Plan. Mr. Gibson responded yes, adding that the sidewalk width ranges from 20 to 15.5 feet at the pinch point. It is wide enough to accommodate outdoor cafes and a street tree zone. This project proposes a wider sidewalk than required that includes the required six-foot clear zone. Commissioner Forinash stated that the Transportation Commission raised concerns regarding the 15.5-foot wide pinch point located adjacent to the pedestrian stairway leading to Center Park. The sidewalk width at that point includes a 6.5-foot street tree zone and a 6-foot pedestrian clear zone, leaving a 3-foot shy zone which the Transportation Commission believed was insufficient given the size of the building. Mr. Gibson responded that although the Sector Plan recommends a 15- to 18-foot wide sidewalk on Crystal Drive, he understands the concern about the sidewalk width at the pinch point. He added that Crystal Drive has tight boundaries and the County is concerned about shifting its configuration as the street needs to accommodate various modes of transportation. The proposed sidewalk width is consistent with the Sector Plan and Master Transportation Plan. The Transportation Commission recommended an additional six inches, but given the size of the building it would not be noticeable. Commissioner Forinash stated that while he recognizes that the sidewalk width meets the requirements, it is still not wide enough.

Commissioner Savela stated that she anticipates conflicts between the roadway, transit way and development construction. She inquired as to how this will be coordinated, who will get priority for entering and exiting sites, what the potential delays might be, and if there will be implications to the County or others. She inquired if a condition would be needed to ensure a collegial process to work through potential conflicts, given that there could be significant costs to the County and the applicant should either party's contractors be delayed. Mr. Shriber responded that staff will work with the applicant and the County Attorney to consider appropriate condition language.

Chair Sockwell stated that he shares Mr. Ahl's concern about the incremental progress on intersection improvements. The staff report indicates that there are many intersections that are not operating at acceptable levels of service, and that proposed improvements to the intersections will not degrade them any further. He asked if there would be opportunities to improve the intersections' level of service. Mr. Gibson responded that the issue is with Route 1 and there are no methods to resolve the issues in the short-term. It is a significant challenge and will require re-thinking how Route 1 operates. The Crystal City Sector Plan indicated that there would be certain intersections that will not reach a level of service of D or E, which are considered acceptable. However, there will be significant intersection improvements along the Route 1 corridor in Arlington and Alexandria, including major intersection connectivity. One such improvement is the Potomac Avenue bridge that has now opened and links Alexandria to Crystal City by a new route that parallels Route 1. With the proposed and future projects having garage entrances on multiple streets, there will be a tendency for traffic to find the least congested routes for trips. Chair Sockwell summarized Mr. Gibson's response, noting that there are significant problems beyond the subject project that cannot be ameliorated through it.

Commissioner Cole expressed his concern that the block plans show the existing BNA (Crystal Mall 2) building will remain; however, the Sector Plan shows a portion of the Center Park expanding to South 18th Street. He asked if the block plan could be altered to show the park expanded consistent with the Sector Plan. Mr. Fusarelli responded that the Sector Plan process was far reaching and did not get into the details of the various grade differentials. In showing the park expanding toward South 18th Street, the plan did not take into account such details as the grade changes and conditions on South 18th Street and what might be needed to accommodate access for the existing BNA building. Staff can point out that the current block plan shows conditions associated with the retention of the BNA building; however, should it be redeveloped in the future, then staff would rely on the guidance provided by the Sector Plan to extend the park to South 18th Street.

Commissioner Monfort stated that if there is a possibility for extending the decking, maybe it should be considered. Mr. Shriber responded that the proposed block plan scenarios do not show this; however, if the applicant decides to address the BNA building in the future, there is nothing that would preclude them from requesting an amendment to the block plan. The Sector Plan does not preclude redevelopment of the BNA building. Commissioner Cole noted that it is this site plan on which the South 18th Street entrance is located, not the BNA building site; any change to require the park extend over a loading/parking entrance would need to be part of the Block Plan related to this site.

Modification of Use Requirements: Is the proposed density exclusion appropriate? Does the Planning Commission support counting tandem parking spaces as standard parking, with the proposed parking management condition?

Commissioner Fallon noted that 16% of the total parking would be tandem spaces and asked about recent site plans approved with tandem spaces. Mr. Gibson responded that the garage would be managed similar to the Rosslyn Gateway project, which had a 100% managed-parking garage. He added that Rosslyn and Crystal City have similar operational issues with parking. In response to the question raised by Commissioner Fallon, Mr. Shriber stated that if the 121 tandem spaces were constructed as fully compliant spaces, then one additional garage level would be required to house

the spaces. Commissioner Fallon asked if this many tandem spaces could affect the marketability of the office building, to which Mr. Wepler responded no.

Commissioner Fallon inquired about the density modification for the site plan amendment to SP #56 and the effect of excess density (under the current zoning category) upon future community benefit calculations when the rest of the block redevelops. Mr. Shriber explained that 3.7 acres would be removed from the site plan's site area, so the effective FAR would be 3.95. The proposed modification would permit the as-built condition to remain, and would not affect future actions from a density standpoint as the base density for the block is 3.8 FAR which will be used for the basis of computing community benefits for future projects on the block.

Commissioner Klein stated that the Commission should fully support the proposed tandem parking because it would help in achieving the County's sustainability goals.

Commissioner Malis inquired about the location of the tandem spaces, which staff responded are on many of the garage levels. She followed up asking about the dedication of retail parking spaces, to which Mr. Shriber responded that the proposed retail and office parking ratio is 1:999 sf, the total for all commercial parking. Commissioner Malis inquired as to whether the retail parking will be identified in the parking management plan, to which Mr. Gibson responded that they should be identified as short-term parking available to the general public. Commissioner Malis followed that the short-term spaces should not be tandem spaces, and asked if this should be addressed in a condition. Mr. Shriber responded that the Rosslyn Gateway site plan had a condition requiring that the PMP include a description of how the parking would be managed. Commissioner Malis followed that tandem spaces are tough for short-term users and that they discourages retail parking. Mr. Wepler noted that the short-term parking spaces would be located on the garage's highest level as is indicated on the site plan documents.

Community Benefits

Commissioner Fallon expressed concern that the proposal's community benefits package may be light, given the scope of the project, and asked how it differs from a comparable project in Rosslyn or Ballston. He added that he appreciates the language in Condition #84 that requires renegotiation of the community benefits package if the applicant has not commenced construction of the building within four years. He suggested staff consider making this a new standard condition on all future site plans.

Mr. McCauley provided an explanation of how the community benefits compare to "C-O-Rosslyn" projects. He stated that the County Manager has been consistent in her intent to incentivize the proposed development. Part of that decision had to do with the desire to capture the value of the extraordinary community benefits and the significant challenges associated with this project and moving Crystal City forward. At \$55/square foot for the additional density above the base, which is approximately 400,000 square feet, it would result in a \$22 million community benefit package, which is similar to a "C-O-Rosslyn" project. Much like the "C-O-Rosslyn" projects, there are the typical site plan condition requirements for contributions to affordable housing, public art, transportation demand management, and utility undergrounding. The value of the four pipe hydraulic system is reflective of calculations above the LEED and community facilities bonuses.

The value of the interim park and associated contributions is \$8.1 million. The Crystal City Redevelopment Credit is an attempt to get the economics of the project back in line so that the building can be built. The Sector Plan addresses this issue. The \$22 million community benefit package, plus the value of the existing building, results in a residual land value that will be well in excess of what the market can support for the new construction which is why the redevelopment credit is needed. Staff will be presenting to the County Board criteria to establish when it would be appropriate to utilize the redevelopment credit to incentivize redevelopment, as not every project in Crystal City would need it.

Commissioner Savela questioned why the applicant's LEED commitment was not factored into the community benefits analysis. Mr. Shriber responded by stating that the bonus density for LEED Gold (0.35 FAR) has been added to the base density before determining the amount of requested additional density over the base. This Crystal City approach differs from that used in C-O Rosslyn, where standard bonus densities are not included as part of the base density.

Commissioner Cole stated that the block plan process requires the review of a community benefits inventory and this was not discussed at LRPC. Mr. Shriber responded that he agrees it should have been a part of the analysis at LRPC, but the inventory had not been finalized. Mr. Fusarelli added that the draft inventory was developed concurrent with this site plan. A meeting has been scheduled between staff and Crystal City Citizen Review Council (CCCRC) members to establish benchmarks or standards for evaluating them. A list of desired community services and amenities had previously been attached to a CCCRC report to the County Board, but staff is not aware of any actions on that report. Without the benchmarks or standards, staff will not be able to intelligently inform the County Board. In response to Commissioner Cole's inquiry for an example of a benchmark, Mr Ahl responded that a benchmark could be the provision of a community service. Commissioner Cole stated that the benchmarks should help determine the extent to which benefits to the community have been adequately addressed.

Commissioner Malis noted that Center Park was not identified as a direct community benefit in Mr. McCauley's presentation. Mr. McCauley responded that there is no financial contribution associated with it because it will be a significant part of the Crystal Mall 4 building when it comes in as a site plan. He further indicated that the cost of the Center Park land is at a level far beyond what one or two site plans could contribute. Commissioner Malis observed that given that there are many community benefits associated with the anticipated sites plans it seems that many site plans might be contributing to the acquisition of Center Park.

Commissioner Cole recognized the value of renegotiating the community benefits within four years if the building has not started construction, pursuant to Condition #84. However, he suggested that since the site plan is good for three years, pursuant to Condition #1, rather than four years, he will recommend that that Condition #84 be amended accordingly. Commissioner Cole also commented on two additional community benefit elements. First, this will be the second project to have a four-pipe hydronic system included in its community benefits package in association with district energy preparedness. While he is not opposed to provisions that will promote energy efficiency, he believes that, since such a system ultimately reduces operating costs for the developer, the developer should reimburse the public over time once district energy is in place and savings are generated. Since these funds will benefit the applicant's building, he hoped staff will explore ways to recapture the

funds. Secondly, Commissioner Cole does not view the civic stair and elevator leading to the park as a community benefit because it results in enhancing the environment for the building and creates entrances to the park. This is an element of the site plan proposal and should not be part of the public cost.

Commissioner Savela suggested that a condition be added to require a community meeting space in the proposed building that could be used by a future Crystal City civic association, for example, and asked the applicant to comment. The applicant expressed concern that without a tenant it would be difficult to make this commitment, and suggested that there may be space in another of their buildings in Crystal City that may work. Commissioner Savela indicated that she would be amenable to that if the applicant commits to work with staff to identify another space in Crystal City. The applicant suggested that space in a retail concourse would be preferable to space in an office tower, to which Commissioner Savela agreed that the space could be available much more sooner.

Other

Commissioner Savela inquired about adding a condition to address pile drilling in order to reduce vibration and noise impacts to nearby offices and residences. Ms. Wray indicated that a similar condition was added to the Courthouse Hotel site plan amendment. Mr. Gibson stated that the type of drilling used has to do with the soil type. The applicant responded that they own over 8 million square feet of development in Crystal City and will be very sensitive to the impacts on adjacent developments and will strive for the most responsible construction methods possible.

Planning Commission Motions

Commissioner Monfort moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the County Board adopt the resolution to approve the rezoning request, adopt the Crystal City Block Plan for Blocks J-K (CCBP-JK-1), adopt the ordinance to approve the amendment to Site Plan #56, and adopt the ordinance to approve new Site Plan #421 subject to conditions in the staff report dated August 30, 2012, with the following modifications:

1. Notes should be added to the Proposed Crystal City Block Plan Map scenarios explaining proposed and potential deviations from the Crystal City Sector Plan.
2. The Proposed Crystal City Block Plan Map scenarios should be amended to show potential decking over the South 18th Street parking and loading area.
3. Conditions should be added to SP #421 to address building glass reflectivity and require sensors to control interior nighttime lighting.

Commissioner Klein seconded the motion.

Commissioner Malis asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that Condition #52 be amended to include the illumination measurement that corresponds to the level of lighting proposed for the architectural banding. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Malis asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that the County Board direct staff to develop the plan to acquire Center Park, as referenced in Condition #85,

by a date certain and prior to the approval of any additional site plans. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Cole asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that Condition #84 be amended to change the timing for a new study of the provision of community benefits, requiring the applicant to commence construction of the building within three years, instead of within four years, consistent with the site plan term identified in Condition #1. 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 a condition be added to state, *“In recognition of the County undertaking major reconstruction and realignment of roads, and installation of the transitway and transit stops, there shall be cooperation and coordination for the purpose of minimizing any conflicts that delay either the County’s contractors or the developer’s work, and the applicant and County shall establish a cooperative approach to resolve any conflicts in the most efficient and cost-efficient manner possible.”* There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Kumm asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that a condition be added to require the applicant to revise the proposed building’s northwest façade facing Center Park to provide more articulation to the building wall in order to reduce the tower’s mass and to increase the distinction between the podium, tower and top. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Forinash asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that Condition #21 be amended to increase the minimum sidewalk width on Crystal Drive from 15.5 feet to 20 feet. There was an objection. Commissioner Forinash moved that the Planning Commission amend the motion to recommend that Condition #21 be amended to increase the minimum sidewalk width on Crystal Drive from 15.5 feet to 20 feet. Commissioner Fallon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Forinash explained that the Transportation Commission expressed concern regarding the minimum 15.5-foot wide sidewalk on Crystal Drive and was only able to recommend an increase to 16 feet. He believes 16 feet is still insufficient despite the fact that it meets the minimum guidelines contained in the Crystal City Sector Plan and the Master Transportation Plan, and options to increase the sidewalk width, including eliminating the on-street parking, should be explored.

Commissioner Malis asked for confirmation that Commissioner Forinash supported removing the on-street parking lane to achieve a wider sidewalk on Crystal Drive. Commissioner Forinash responded that he would like to see design alternatives to provide a wider sidewalk especially in the critical section that includes the building entrance and the access to the pedestrian stairway leading to Center Park. Removing the on-street parking is one way to achieve more space, but there may be other ways.

Commissioner Monfort stated that he would vote against the motion. The County Board has adopted two plans that provide minimum standards for sidewalk width, and the Sector Plan was just adopted two years ago. The County has another policy that encourages on-street parking in busy areas such

as Crystal City to facilitate quick and convenient short-term parking. The applicant has designed a project based on these policies and it is unfair to the applicant to change the rules at this late point.

Commissioner Savela stated that she is sympathetic to Commissioner Forinash's point but agreed with Commissioner Monfort and was having a hard time imagining how the curb could be realigned for such a short span while achieving a cohesive street consistent with other design guidelines in the Plan. She hoped the County would reconsider the sidewalk widths in their Plans for high density areas such as Rosslyn and Crystal City, as she has become very concerned about this issue. However, she will not support the motion.

Commissioner Harner stated that he would not support the motion. He expressed concern about removing the on-street parking and planning sidewalks widths block to block on an ad hoc basis. He believes this issue should be addressed comprehensively. Commissioner Harner also stated that it is important to establish principles and follow them, and if changes are needed then the principles should be changed.

Commissioner Forinash responded that the planning documents express minimum, not maximum, widths, and he believes there is sufficient room in these documents for sidewalks that exceed the minimum widths. In Condition #21, South 20th Street appears to be the main pedestrian way adjacent to the building with a width of 18.5 feet, but it is primarily garage and loading driveways. He recognized that in any urban context it is a tradeoff among the various needs for how the space is to be used, but he suggested that on Crystal Drive, which he believes is the front of the building, there should be more space for pedestrians.

Commissioner Kumm stated that she felt torn on this issue, as she agrees with the intent of providing more than six feet of pedestrian clear space. However, it is late in the process and she suggested that with the next proposal the County work to increase the minimum widths that she believes are inadequate for urban areas.

Commissioner Monfort responded that there were four SPRC meetings on this project and this issue was never raised.

The Commission voted 4 – 6 to oppose the amended motion, so the motion failed. Commissioners Cole, Fallon, Forinash, and Sockwell supported the amended motion. Commissioners Harner, Klein, Kumm, Malis, Monfort, and Savela opposed the amended motion.

Commissioner Malis asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that the County Board direct staff to review the Crystal City Sector Plan to evaluate the appropriateness of the minimum sidewalk standards given the expected density of projects coming forward. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Cole asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that a new Condition #87 be added to require the applicant to work with community representatives to identify a location satisfactory to all parties for a community meeting space at the earliest possible time. There was no objection, so the amendment was incorporated into the main motion.

Commissioner Kumm moved that the Planning Commission amend the motion to recommend that – Condition #21.d. be amended to revise the second sentence to read, “*Non-standard materials or surface treatments also may be used in conjunction with a concrete sub-base if maintained by the applicant or the Crystal City BID, subject to approval of the County Manager and under the provisions of the Arlington County Streetscape Standards.*” Commissioner Klein seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cole stated that he will oppose the motion, consistent with the points made earlier by commissioner Monfort. A change is being proposed on a single site plan that takes exception to County policy. He could support a recommendation that the County Board direct staff to review these policies.

Commissioner Monfort stated that he would not support the motion, as the standards should not be changed arbitrarily. There is a process that has to be undertaken to achieve that and he would support beginning that process, but not changing the site plan.

The Commission voted 2 – 8 to oppose the amended motion, so the motion failed. Commissioners Klein and Kumm supported the amended motion. Commissioners Cole, Fallon, Forinash, Harner, Malis, Monfort, Savela, and Sockwell opposed the amended motion.

Commissioner Kumm asked for unanimous consent to amend the motion to recommend that staff study the use of non-standard paving materials in specific areas of the County where there exists a predominance of non-standard paving materials. There was an objection.

Commissioner Malis stated that she does not object to it in theory, but it should be integrated in the County priorities. Every policy can be revisited, but it is a question of priority. There should be a compelling reason to revisit the policy.

Commissioner Savela concurred with Commissioner Malis and suggested that if this is a big issue in Crystal City, and there is a real desire for a treatment other than poured-in-place concrete, the property owners should work with the Crystal City BID to develop a proposal for presentation to the County Board that addresses a standard approach throughout Crystal City which should include the coverage of additional costs incurred by the County-funded sidewalk improvements that the property owners and the BID are financially responsible for. Through this process, including working with the BID and discussions with the Chairs of the CCCRC, something could be officially affected for this one district which should not add to the burden of the Planning Commission or overload staff.

Commissioner Cole concurred with Commissioner Malis, noting that the role of the County Board is to establish priorities for the County. Rather than recommend that staff do the work, he would support a unanimous consent recommending that the Commission express their concern about the paving materials and ask the County Board to consider this as it sets priorities for the County Manager’s work program for the coming year. In response to Chair Sockwell’s question, Commissioner Cole stated that he was not asking for unanimous consent.

The Commission voted 10-0 to support the main motion, with a number of modifications. Commissioners Cole, Fallon, Forinash, Harner, Klein, Kumm, Malis, Monfort, Savela, and Sockwell supported the main motion.

Respectfully Submitted,
Arlington County Planning Commission

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stephen Sockwell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial 'S'.

Stephen Sockwell
Planning Commission Chair

Arlington Planning Commission

Site Plan #421: 1900 Crystal Drive Combined Long Range/Site Plan Committees Report

Project Summary: This project is the first site plan application since the adoption in 2010 of the Crystal City Sector Plan. The proposal includes rezoning to the new C-O-Crystal City zoning district, adoption of the Crystal City Block Plan for Blocks J-K, removal of the subject property from the existing Site Plan #56, and adoption of a new final site plan, #421, to permit construction of a 24-story, 730,000 square foot office building.

Committee Review: The project was reviewed by both the Long-Range Planning Committee (on 12 February 2012) and the Site Plan Review Committee (on 21 February, 26 March, 12 April, and 10 May 2012).

Crystal City Block Plan: The new Crystal City Sector Plan requires the submittal and review of block plans, analogous to Phased Development Site Plans (PDSPs) used to review mid-level development of some other parts of the County. Block plans include such items as existing and potential development (including locations, use mix, tower coverage, and open space), buildable area maps, and existing and proposed street and pedestrian facilities. The major issues discussed for Blocks J-K included use mix (residential v. office), and building location.

- **Use Mix:** The Crystal City Plan proposes a use mix for this block of no less than 70% office; the proposed block outlines three possible use scenarios, involving 98%, 72%, and 60% office use. LRPC members generally supported use mixes with higher levels of residential units, even if the office use falls below 70%.
- **Building Location:** The proposed block plan reflects the Crystal City Plan recommendations on building locations; some LRPC members felt the block plan should be adjusted to allow more residential units to front on the current/future Central Park.

Overall, the block plan, including the three proposed scenarios, appears to be consistent with the sector plan. No major issues were identified.

Building Design: The Crystal City Sector Plan provides overall guidance on allowable building height, massing, frontage requirements, podium design, public ROW encroachments, tower coverage and separation, upper floor design, and penthouses, among other issues. SPRC members generally agreed that the proposed building design is consistent with these guidelines. There is a minor discrepancy in set-back from the RBL, which was generally felt to be appropriate. The building includes a distinctive, “ski-jump” architectural treatment which was supported by some, but not all, SPRC members. Members of the community also raised the issue of glass

reflectivity and night-time lighting (both exterior and interior), which may be addressed in new site plan conditions.

Public Infrastructure: The SPRC reviewed existing and proposed public infrastructure, with a particular focus on the street network and pedestrian access. The applicant's original proposal to move Crystal Drive to the east was dropped due to community concerns. There is an outstanding issue involving the applicant's desire to deviate from County standard paving treatments.

Open Space: The Crystal City Sector Plan envisions an improved Center Park as a major public amenity. Under this site plan, the existing park will remain, with only minor modifications. Concerns were expressed about when the final, improved park would be constructed; staff has recommended two conditions to limit future redevelopment of Blocks J-K until a plan has been submitted to the County Manager outlining a process for the creation of the new Center Park.

The applicant has proposed a new, interim park on the site of the proposed future building JK-2, which was reviewed and generally supported by SPRC members.

Proposed Discussion Outline:

Block Plan: Is the proposed Block Plan consistent with the recommendations of the Crystal City Sector Plan? Are deviations from those recommendations appropriate?

Building Design: Is the proposed building design consistent with the requirements of the Crystal City Sector Plan. Are deviations from those requirements appropriate? Should the building architectural design be further refined? Does the proposed building or any design elements (i.e., reflective glass) adversely affect immediate neighbors? Should the applicant be required to install sensors to control night-time interior lighting?

Transportation: Is the proposed public infrastructure adequate to meet projected traffic demand, for cars, pedestrians, and bicycles? Should the applicant be allowed to deviate from County sidewalk paving standards?

Modification of Use Requirements: Is the proposed density exclusion appropriate? Does the Planning Commission support counting tandem parking spaces as standard parking, with the proposed parking management condition?

Open Space: Is the proposed site plan condition adequate to ensure the construction of the improved Center Park? Is the proposed interim park an effective use of the space?