

Docket Item #2-B
CDD #99-01
DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 15, 1999

ISSUE: Consideration of a request for approval of a Coordinated Development District (CDD) Concept Plan for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens site.

APPLICANT: Commonwealth Atlantic Properties Inc.
by J. Howard Middleton, Jr., attorney

LOCATION: 3601 Jefferson Davis Highway
Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens site

ZONE: CDD-10/Coordinated Development District

CITY COUNCIL ACTION, SEPTEMBER 8, 1999: On a motion by Councilwoman Pepper, seconded by Vice Mayor Eulle and carried on an unanimous ROLL CALL vote, Council approved the concept plan by adopting the resolution that was before it (Resolution #1931), and added a paragraph to read as follows: “(g) Amended the Urban Design Review Board by increasing it from five to seven members, and the two members would represent the Potomac West area.”

Mayor Donley asked Mr. Middleton, for the record, if his client would be agreeable to state on the record tonight that you will work with the staff and the Alexandria Commission on Archaeology about some suitable recognition of historic sites on the property. The response was “yes.”

City Attorney Sunderland noted that there will be a public use easement for the Town Center but the ownership is going to reside with CAP and its successor, so the fee of that land will be with CAP, the maintenance responsibilities with CAP, and, in his view, the naming rights are going to go with CAP as well, in consultation with Mr. Snyder.

With respect to the retail mall strip, City Attorney Sunderland stated that there are three different issues on the retail center. One is its length and its life. Second an enlargement and expansion issue, he referred to the letter he wrote to Mr. Hendrickson in which he stated that he didn’t believe that it can be done. The third issue is redevelopment. To him the question then is whether because it is a concept plan use, that redevelopment can be done pursuant to a preliminary development plan and pursuant to a special use permit. In which case, the city would have some control over the redevelopment. The City Attorney suggested that on all three of these parts that Mr. Middleton and he exchange a letter and sign off on exactly what they have consented to and make it a part of the record.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, JUNE 15, 1999: On a motion by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Komoroske, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposal, subject to all applicable codes and ordinances and the amendments listed below. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

Amendments:

1. A change to condition #7 to require all of the proposed open spaces except the “neighborhood parks” and those within “Landbay E” (Four Mile Run) to be dedicated to the City as public open spaces. [See amended condition #7 on p. 44 of this staff report.]
2. A new condition 15A which relates to the possible siting of a new public school. [See new condition #15A on p. 54 of this staff report.]
3. A change to condition #10 to allow on street parking to be counted for “Granny Flats.” [See amended condition # 10 on p. 45 of this staff report.]
4. The addition of a specific requirement within the Design Guidelines for convenient storage and screening of trash receptacles in alleys. [See p. 56 of the amended Concept Plan Design Guidelines.]
5. The addition of a specific prohibition within the Design Guidelines against curb-cuts on Route 1 and Potomac Avenue. [See p. 33 of the amended Concept Plan Design Guidelines.]
6. Revisions to the urban design guidelines and concept maps to incorporate changes necessary to bring them into conformance with the above amendments. [See pp. 40 and 41 of the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and p. 41 of the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines.]

Reason: The Planning Commission generally agreed with the staff analysis, and expressly noted the inclusion of the concept plan condition which requires the potential straightening of Route 1 in the future (Condition 1).

The one change to the concept plan made by the Commission which was not recommended by staff related to the extent to which proposed open spaces within the project are to be dedicated for public use. Staff had recommended that only the playfields, Potomac Yard Park and a portion of rail park be dedicated for public use, whereas the applicant also wished to dedicate the Potomac Greens park

(wetlands and resource protection area), the finger parks (at Howell, Custis and Swann), Potomac Plaza (at Slater's Lane) and Four Mile Run park to the City. The Planning Commission amended the concept plan to provide for the dedication of all of the parks proposed by the applicant for dedication, except for Four Mile Run Park, which staff recommended by developed for commercial recreational uses. The Commission indicated the need for substantial public open space in the City and expressed the belief that having public parks within the development would help to integrate it into the larger city. The attached memorandum from Commissioner Eric Wagner, dated June 15, 1999, describes in more detail the Commission's reasons for designating more public parkland.

It should be noted that one proposed open space in the project, the 1.25 Town Square to be located in the new Town Center at Potomac Yard, was specifically identified by the Commission as a space which should be public because of its potential "civic" nature, including the potential for programming its use for City events. Nonetheless, the Planning Commission's motion did not include this space in the those designated for public spaces, because the space is not separately called out on the list of open spaces in the design guidelines (page 41) but is included within the category of "neighborhood parks." Commission members have confirmed to staff that it was their intent to include this space among those to be dedicated for public use, and would like City Council to consider including it, even though it was not technically part of the Planning Commission's motion. It should also be noted that the Town Center open space, one of the proposed "neighborhood parks," was not proposed by the applicant for public dedication.

Speakers:

Howard Middleton, representing the applicant.

Richard Gilchrist, representing the applicant.

Tom Tyler, representing Environmental Policy Commission, spoke in support of the plan.

Lynn Hampton, representing Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the plan.

Matthew Tallmer, representing Braddock Place Condominiums, spoke in support of the plan.

Carol Ann Perchovic, representing Inner City Civic Association, spoke in support of a plan with open space and density changes, a metrorail station and no bridge straightening.

Jack Taylor spoke in support of the plan.

Marilyn Doherty, representing League of Women Voters raised concerns about height, density and lack of affordable housing.

Judy Gose-Noritake, representing Parks and Recreation Commission, spoke in support of proposed playfields within the plan.

Barbara McMurray, resident of Colecroft, spoke in support of the plan.

Ruby Tucker, representing Lynhaven, spoke in support of the plan.

Randy Kell, representing Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the plan.

Maria Wasowski, resident of Mt. Jefferson, spoke in support of the plan with the change to public open space.

Kimberly O'Donnell, resident of Warwick Village, spoke in support of the plan.

Duane Shields, representing Mt. Jefferson Civic Association, spoke in support of the plan.

Mansfield Williams, resident of Northeast Old Town, spoke in support of the plan.

Vincent Kelso, representing Potomac Crossing, indicated the association had no consensus except that a Metro station should be provided along with additional improvements to Route 1.

Lloyd Martin, representing Potomac West Business Association, spoke in support of the plan.

David Smith, resident of Clifford Avenue, spoke in support of the plan.

Cheryl Court, representing the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, spoke in support of the plan but proposed more concentration of uses and a Metro station.

Anna Issacs spoke in support of the plan.

Don Cope, resident of Monroe Avenue, spoke in support of the plan.

Bill Clayton, representing Northridge Civic Association, spoke in support of the plan.

Beata Boodell Corcoran, resident of N. Columbus Street, spoke in support of the plan.

Mark Eaton, representing the Alexandria School Board, requested that a site be designated for the schools and that the land be deeded to the Alexandria Schools.

Claire Eberwein, member of the Alexandria School Board, requested that a site be designated for the schools and that the land be deeded to the Alexandria Schools.

Allen Lomax, resident of the West End, spoke in support of the plan.

Jacqueline Mead, resident of Mt. Jefferson, spoke in support of the plan.

Sue McGerger, resident of Del Ray, spoke to need for additional transportation improvements, including a Metro station.

Samuel Smallson, representing the Alexandria Soccer Association, spoke in support of the plan, particularly the proposed playfields.

Karen Holbert, resident of Del Ray, spoke to the need for a designated school site.

Wilma Proust, resident of Brighton Square, raised concerns about traffic on W. Glebe Road and need for S. Glebe Road improvements.

Stuart Swartz, resident of Oronoco Street and representing Coalition For Livable Communities, spoke in support of project, with Metro and land reserved for future light rail.

Kathy Green, resident, raised concerns about the amount, usability and quality of the open space provided.

Al Collins, representing Del Ray Citizens Association, spoke in support of the proposed plan with a straightened Route 1 bridge, area preserved for future Metrorail station, seven acres for public facilities, all open space as public open space and with only E. Glebe, Swann and Monroe as definite connections across Route 1 into the project.

Keith Burner, resident of Monroe Avenue, spoke in support of the plan.

Thad Carpin, representing the Travel Soccer Association and Alexandria resident, spoke in support of the plan.

Peter Ramsberger, representing Old Town North Community Association, spoke in support of the plan but suggested more commercial development be provided and raised concerns about traffic.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

Jean Caldwell, resident of Northeast, spoke to need for more information about proposed traffic improvements, including the straightening of Route 1.

Curt Fedder, representing the Parks and Recreation Commission, spoke in support of the plan, requesting that any school site designation not be on proposed park land.

Marguerite Lang, representing Rosemont Civic Association, spoke against the straightening of Route 1, the need for a Metro and recommended a reduction in block size.

Mark Stenberg, resident of Powhatan Place, spoke against the bridge straightening and against the high densities proposed in the plan.

Shawn Doherty, resident of Del Ray, spoke against the project, noting sewer problems.

Gail Rueter, resident of Del Ray spoke in support of the plan.

Bob Plankton, resident of Hume Avenue, spoke in support of the plan.

Dave Epstein, resident of Northridge, spoke in support of the plan.

Bruce Dwyer, representing the Alexandria Bicycle Committee, spoke in support of the plan, particularly the proposed Potomac Yard park.

Phil Keating, member of the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the plan.

Poul Hertel, representing the Northeast Civic Association, indicated the association did not yet have a position on the plan, but raised concerns about the proposed Town Center, the density of Landbays H&I, and the lack of a Metro station.

Alison Meyer, resident of Del Ray, spoke in support of the plan but raised concerns about traffic impacts on local roads.

Jim Handley, member of the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce and Youth Sports Task Force, spoke in support of the plan, particularly the proposed playfields.

Jon Rak, representing Charles E. Smith, noted traffic concerns for the record.

Alethea Camp, representing Warwick Village, spoke in support of the plan and encouraged the pursuit of a Metro in the project, as well as additional open space.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

David Fromm, resident of Randolph Street, raised concerns about the traffic management plan, requested that all parks be public and requested stronger language in the design guidelines to ensure compliance.

Andrew MacDonald, resident of Alexandria, spoke against the plan, noting its density, the lack of open space and the tremendous negative impact on the environment.

Ellen Pickering, resident of Alexandria, supported the elimination of GW Parkway access and requested that no parking reduction be permitted, a proportionality rule be included, a school site be provided and specific changes to the guidelines addressing open space and amenities.

Steven Kendrick, resident of Auburn Village, spoke in support of the plan and provided list of twenty additional supporters who attended the public hearing but did not speak.

Bill Hendrickson, Del Ray Citizens Association, spoke to need to require straightened bridge in plan approval.

Katie Cannady, resident of Rosemont, spoke against the bridge straightening.

Carol O'Shaughnessy, resident of Rosemont, spoke about taking care of Senior citizen's needs within the project.

Gail Blackley, resident of Parkfairfax, spoke in support of the project.

Anne Haines, resident of Old Town, spoke in support of the project.

Paul Winehan, resident of Monroe Avenue, spoke for himself and for Herbert Munday in support of the plan.

Angus Lamont, resident on Braddock Road, spoke in support of the plan.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

The report on the proposed Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Plan is organized into five sections, including the staff recommended conditions for the Concept Plan, located in the last section:

<u>1: Overview</u> -	overview of the proposed developmentp. 9 overview of staff's recommendation on the plan
<u>2: Background</u> -	site characteristicsp. 12 zoning and development history of the site summary of existing development on the site
<u>3: Staff Analysis</u> -	detailed description and staff analysis by plan subarea.....p. 15 staff analysis on open space, street design and parking staff analysis on procedural issues <i>*Note: The analysis of the traffic impact study and transportation issues is contained within the staff report for the Transportation Management Plan for Potomac Yard.</i>
<u>4: Recommendation</u> -	summary of staff position and recommendations.....p. 38
<u>5: Conditions</u> -	staff recommended concept plan conditions.....p. 40

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED CONCEPT PLAN

The proposed concept plan provides for development of the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens tract as a mixed use community of office, retail and residential uses. The overall development program provides for a maximum of 1.9 million net square feet of office space, a 625 room hotel, 735,000 net square feet of retail space (including 600,000 square feet at the existing Potomac Yard Retail Center) and 1,927 residential units. The plan is structured by an interconnected network of streets and open spaces.

The streets in the project form a grid system, connecting east-west across Jefferson Davis Highway physically linking with the existing neighborhoods at East Glebe Road, Swann Avenue, Custis Avenue and Howell Avenue Street, and connecting north-south to Crystal City and the Monroe Avenue Bridge via a new spine road. A hierarchy of streets is provided, ranging from arterial streets such as Potomac Avenue down to residential streets and alleys. All of the new streets are proposed to be public, and the street sections show streets similar to existing streets in Old Town and Del Ray.

Another defining feature of the plan is a hierarchy of open spaces, tied to existing open spaces in the region and to each other through a system of bike trails and pedestrian connections. Roughly sixty acres of common open space is planned, and all is proposed to be dedicated to the City as public open space. The open spaces include playfields and other active recreational facilities as well as passive spaces, and range in size from two large 20+ acre spaces to small neighborhood-oriented open spaces of less than half an acre.

The focal point of the development is intended to be the “Town Center,” which is to be located immediately south of the existing Potomac Yard Retail Center. Higher density residential and office uses, and a hotel and retail uses, are concentrated at this location, organized around a large open space such as a plaza or town green. Additional concentrations of office space are also proposed toward the south, on either side of the existing Monroe Avenue bridge. Smaller scale office uses are also located along Route 1.

The remainder of the development is primarily residential. As proposed, roughly one-third of the residential units on the site would be townhouses, one-third would be stacked townhouses, and one-third would be other types of multifamily units. In addition to the Town Center, higher density multi-family residential uses are also proposed to be concentrated at the southern end of the site, near the Monroe Avenue Bridge, mixed with the office uses. On the remainder of the site, including Potomac Greens, the residential development would be in townhouses and stacked townhouses.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff believes that the proposed concept plan for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens CDD now before the City for consideration is a fundamentally good plan, with numerous benefits to the City, and recommends that it be approved, with some changes which are important but do not fundamentally change the nature of the overall plan. In staff's opinion, the overall design concept plan and the design guidelines, if approved, will form the basis for a high quality residential and mixed use development on the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens tract. Staff believes that the plan successfully integrates many of the concerns raised by citizens at numerous public meetings held by the applicant with many of the design principles of a successful mixed use community, and successfully knits the project within the fabric of an existing community.

The plan provides for a series of neighborhoods, both residential and mixed use. The proposed Town Center, with office, retail, residential and hotel uses organized around a town green or plaza, could, if successful, evolve into a vibrant activity center not unlike Reston Town Center for residents of the new development. The development along Route 1, with proposed commercial and residential uses and some ground-floor retail space, could change the character of this street, an important entryway into the City. The neighborhoods within the development are linked to the existing neighborhoods of Del Ray by pedestrian-friendly, tree-lined streets modeled after those in Old Town and Del Ray, and by a significant number of open spaces which serve both the development and the greater City.

Although a number of changes to the plan are proposed by staff, in staff's opinion only four of these changes are major. The most significant of these is the proposed straightening of the Route 1 Monroe Avenue bridge, with a realignment of the street system and proposed land uses in the southernmost portion of the tract. The second major change proposed is the relocation of one of three proposed playfields from the Potomac Greens site to a less isolated location near the Monroe Avenue Bridge or, if the bridge is straightened, adjacent to Simpson field. The third major change proposed is an increase in office density in the Town Center, with a comparable decrease on the southern portion of the site. The final major issue between staff and the applicant is the extent to which the proposed open spaces are to be public. The applicant proposes that all but a few of the smallest neighborhood parks be dedicated to and maintained by the public; staff is recommending that many of the parks remain in private ownership with private maintenance.

Staff is recommending approval of the applicant's proposed concept plan, with the major changes noted above as well as other changes, but with a two-tiered level of approval for the portion of the site affected by the Monroe Avenue bridge straightening, the area south of Howell Avenue. This two-tiered approach provides for approval of plans both with and without the straightened bridge, with the final decision on whether or not the bridge is straightened made by the City at some time in the future in conjunction with a detailed assessment of the costs--including potential costs for the City--of the straightening. This approach effectively makes the final approval of the applicant's

plans for the area south of Howell Avenue contingent on a finding by the City in the future. The applicant has agreed that this approach is acceptable since they will concentrate development on other portions of the Yard in the next few years. This two-tiered approval approach is discussed in more detail in the report.

Timing and the By-Right Plan

The applicant has indicated to the City that they need to secure approval of a plan--at least through the Planning Commission--before the summer break in order to proceed with coordinated development of the Yard. CAP has indicated that if approvals are not secured, they will abandon coordinated development and proceed with development of the Yard pursuant to the underlying zoning, the so-called "By-Right" plan. In order to assess the potential By-Right plan, staff produced an illustrative plan of one potential "By-Right" scenario; it includes townhouse development on Potomac Greens and the area south of the Monroe Avenue bridge, additional retail uses adjacent to the existing Potomac Yard Center and office and warehouses on the remainder of the site. Staff estimates that a total of 3.8 million square feet of By-Right development could reasonably be located on the tract, including the existing uses.

Staff has no way of knowing whether or not CAP will proceed with By-Right development on the site if the current proposal is delayed or not approved, but Planning staff does find it a plausible outcome. The amount of infrastructure needed to support By-Right development is substantially less than that needed to support the proposed CDD development, making it easier as well as less risky for the developer to proceed with the By-Right alternative. The existing shopping center has proven to be highly successful, and additional retail uses are not difficult to imagine on the Yard, nor are additional warehouse and storage or parking uses such as the GSA warehouse and Avis facility.

Staff believes there are many negatives for the City with the By-Right plan. These include an increased level of truck traffic, no parks or playfields for public open space, no integration with the surrounding community and, possibly, no spine road to ease Route 1 congestion.

Staff believes the high potential for By-Right development is a reason for the City to proceed with the approved CDD plan in a timely fashion. If the CDD plan were not fundamentally a good one, the risk of the By-Right plan might be a reasonable risk for the City to take. But, as noted, staff believes the CDD plan provides for high quality development on a parcel of land that has long been underutilized, with numerous benefits to the City, and recommends that the City proceed with approving the plan.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND

The applicant, Commonwealth Atlantic Properties (CAP) is requesting approval of a Coordinated Development District (CDD) Concept Plan for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens tract. In conjunction with the Concept Plan approval, CAP also seeks approval of an amendment to the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Small Area Plan chapter of the City’s 1992 Master Plan and section 5-600 of the zoning ordinance in order to amend the CDD guidelines for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Tract (Case MPA#99-0004 and REZ#99-0004). Approval of a special use permit for a transportation management plan for the site is also requested (Case SUP#99-0020).

THE SITE

The Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens site is a 295 acre tract of land located in the northeast area of the City. A former railroad yard, the parcel is linear in nature and is divided into two main parcels-- Potomac Yards and Potomac Greens--by a 120' wide railroad corridor running through the tract. A summary of the site area is provided in the table below.

		<u>Land Area (in Acres)</u>
Total Gross Site Area		294.89
Less Old Town Greens Site.....		<u>-20.10</u>
(previously developed and not included in this concept plan)		
Area Within Concept Plan.....		274.79
Less Areas Not Developable.....		<u>-39.73</u>
Railroad/Metro Corridor	36.94	
Four Mile Run	2.79	
Developable Site Area.....		235.06
Less Potomac Yard Center.....		<u>-69.07</u>
Remaining Developable Site Area.....		165.99

The site has a great number of physical constraints which affect development. First is the shape of the site itself, which is long and narrow, reflecting its previous use as a railroad yard. Four Mile Run, the Monroe Avenue Bridge and the railroad and Metrorail tracks running through the site create physical barriers which isolate and fragment the site. The Potomac Greens portion of the site has a number of environmental constraints which preclude development on a significant portion of the site; these include the flood plain, wetlands and a resource protection area. The location of the site within the flight path for National Airport create noise impacts, particularly on the eastern part of the tract, and also limits heights.

ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Starting in 1987, about the same time the City began updating the 1974 Master Plan for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens portion of the site, the previous owners of Potomac Yard, RF&P Railroad, began to explore development alternatives for the Yard because it was no longer being used for the classification of trains. The first proposal for the Yard, Alexandria 2020, was a mixed-use, neighborhood development which continued the street grid of the adjacent neighborhoods and replicated typical setbacks, heights and architectural styles. The plan included a tree lined interior boulevard, parks and interesting pedestrian gathering places not unlike the current proposal. Most importantly, however, the plan included a metro station near the center of the Yard, with the potential for commuter rail service and bus connections. The densities proposed in the 2020 plan were much higher than what is proposed with the current plan:

- 5.8 million sq.ft. of office space,
 - 440,000 sq.ft. of retail uses,
 - 180,000 sq.ft. for hotel uses, and
 - 6,450 residential units (an estimated 9.67 million sq.ft. @1,500 sq.ft./unit)
- Total development: about 16 million square feet**

The 2020 plan was never formally submitted to the City for approval, but the City did approve new zoning for the site in the context of the Master Plan update in 1992. The new zoning, CDD, provided for a lower overall density of development than was proposed with Alexandria 2020, with:

- 2.75 million square feet of office space,
 - 300,000 square feet of retail uses,
 - 625 room hotel, (an estimated 456,250 sq.ft. @ 650 sq.ft./room + 50,000 sq.ft.)
 - 3,500 residential units (an estimated 5.25 million sq.ft. @ 1,500 sq.ft./unit)
- Total development: about 8.8 million square feet.**

Immediately after approving these development levels through the zoning of Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens, a proposal to locate Jack Kent Cook football stadium at Potomac Yard was pursued by the owner of the Potomac Yard tract. This proposal was successfully fought by the City, but as part of the negotiations related to the stadium, the zoning on the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens site was changed to allow increased levels of development on the site:

- 3.75 million square feet of office space,
 - 425,000 square feet of retail uses,
 - 625 room hotel (an estimated 456,250 sq.ft. @ 650 sq.ft./room + 50,000 sq.ft.)
 - 4,500 residential units (an estimated 6.75 million sq.ft. @ 1,500 sq.ft./unit)
- Total development: about 11.4 million square feet**

In 1997, there was another proposed change to the CDD guidelines in the Master Plan in order to allow for the location of a Patent and Trade Office at Potomac Yard. While the office buildings were within the maximum office square footages, a height increase was requested, as well as two other changes to the Master Plan CDD guidelines which were not related to the PTO proposal. One of the proposals was a change to the definition of the “rule of proportionality” which required a certain amount of residential development concurrent with any commercial development on the site, and the other was to permit a more dense housing type, stacked townhouses. The request was denied by Planning Commission and withdrawn by the applicant prior to the City Council hearing.

The type and density of development on Potomac Greens has been the subject of a lawsuit regarding access from the George Washington Parkway. Just recently an agreement has been reached between the developer and the National Park Service confirming that no access shall be provided from the Parkway to Potomac Greens.

Interim and By-Right Uses

A number of uses have been developed on the Potomac Yard, Potomac Greens tract during the 1990s. All of these interim uses have proceeded pursuant to the underlying provisions of the site’s CDD zoning. The first development came in 1994, when the Planning Commission approved a site plan (SP#94-0021) for a 106,622 sq.ft. warehouse building to be constructed on the site in the area near Custis Avenue the building is utilized for GSA storage. A second use, an Avis vehicle storage facility, was added to the Yard immediately to the south in 1995 (SUP #95-0154).

In 1995, the applicant requested and received approval of a change to the underlying zoning provisions of the CDD zoning for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens, changing the underlying zoning for the portion of the site known as the “Piggyback Yard” from RB/Residential to CRMU-L/Commercial Residential Mixed Use Low Density in conjunction with a development plan for the construction of 273 residential units. That project, now known as Old Town Greens, was approved by City Council in 1995 (SUP #95-0120) and is now nearing completion. This tract is now under separate ownership and is already developed and is, therefore, not included within this CDD concept plan.

Finally, in 1995, the owner of Potomac Yard/Greens received approval from the Planning Commission for the construction of a 600,000 square foot shopping center on the northern portion of Potomac Yard (SP #95-0020). This approval was amended in 1997 to replace a portion of the retail uses in the rear of the center with a sixteen screen movie theater (SUP #96-0091). Although originally presented as being interim uses, with leases limited to a life of 20 years, the shopping center use is now being incorporated as a permanent use in the CDD plan now proposed for the site.

SECTION 3: STAFF ANALYSIS

Note: The T&ES analysis of transportation, including the assessment of the traffic impact study, is located within the report on the transportation management plan for the project.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAN AND STAFF ANALYSIS

This section describes in detail each subarea of the proposed plan for Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens, and provides staff comment and analysis for each area. This neighborhood analysis is followed by an analysis of the open space, the street system and parking, and of other, primarily procedural, issues related to the proposed concept plan.

Areas East of the Railroad Tracks

The area east of the railroad tracks includes the site known as “Potomac Greens” (Landbay A) and the land located within the traffic circle that will be formed by the new Slater’s Lane one-way pair of streets (Landbay C). Except for a small amount of retail use proposed for Landbay C (15,000 sq.ft.), the remainder of this area is to be developed entirely for residential and open space uses. The existing and under construction 273 unit Old Town Greens residential townhouse and stacked townhouse development is located between Landbay “A” and Landbay “C”.

Landbay A, Potomac Greens, contains a total of 33 acres. Of this area, 20 acres (60% of the site) is proposed to be maintained in open space. A large portion of this open space, sixteen acres located on the north and eastern edge of the site, is environmentally protected wetlands. CAP proposes to provide pedestrian and bicycle paths, including interpretive trails, through the wetland area, as well as seating and picnic facilities, creating a destination public open space. An additional 2.5 acres located adjacent to the wetland’s is proposed for a public multipurpose field with a small parking area next to the field. In Landbay A there would also be an additional 1.5 acres for neighborhood parks. Residential development on the site is proposed to be a mix of townhomes (174 units) and stacked townhomes (44 units). All townhomes will have rear-load garages, either attached or detached, with access from alleys, except the units facing the Parkway may have front-entry garages if necessary to comply with Board of Architectural Review standards.

Landbay C, which the applicant refers to as “Potomac Plaza,” is a 3.1 acre area of land located within the Slater’s Lane traffic circle, but not including a portion of the circle not owned by CAP. It is proposed for a small amount of community serving retail space, up to 15,000 sq.ft., with surface parking and open space. The space includes a well-landscaped passive space at the eastern end, to denote Slaters Lane as a gateway from the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and a park at the western end proposed for neighborhood use, containing facilities such as a children’s playground.

Also located east of the main-line railroad tracks is a proposed “rail park” which is between the rail tracks and Metrorail tracks. The park is a 4.5 acre elongated strip of land varying in width from a narrow triangular piece of land between the two tracks to approximately 150' at its widest point. At-grade access into the park would be provided only at the southern end, in the area of the existing Old Town Greens development. However, two additional pedestrian access points to the park would be provided via footbridges from Potomac Greens at the north and south ends of the park. The applicant has proposed a variety of potential uses in the rail park, including a community garden plot, tennis courts or volleyball courts, exercise stations and a dog run area.

No access into this area is provided from George Washington Memorial Parkway. In addition to being prohibited by the City’s master plan, such a connection is also not permitted pursuant to an agreement between CAP and the National Park Service. Therefore, the only vehicular access into this portion of the development is via Slaters Lane to Potomac Greens Drive. A pedestrian bridge over the mainline railroad tracks will provide pedestrian access from Potomac Greens to the remainder of the Yard.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff is highly supportive of the proposed residential development at Landbay A in Potomac Greens, which will form a natural extension of the neighborhood now under construction at Old Town Greens, directly to the south. Although the general types of units being proposed for Potomac Greens--stacked townhouses and townhouses--are similar to those under construction at Old Town Greens, the new development will be distinguished by the absence of curbcuts, because parking for almost all of the new townhouse and stacked townhouse units within the entire Potomac Yard project will have parking serviced by alleys from the rear, creating a more traditional, pedestrian-oriented streetscape. In addition, the design guidelines proposed by the applicant are likely to result in somewhat higher quality, more traditional units because they apply standards on items such as height variety, utility location, building materials, etc.

A significant amount of open space is proposed in the area east of the railroad tracks, almost all of which CAP proposes for public open space. The proposed open spaces include the playfield, the wetlands area, the rail park and the park located in the Slater’s Lane traffic circle.

One of staff’s major proposed changes to the plan is the relocation of the proposed playfield from Potomac Greens to the Monroe Avenue bridge area, adjacent to another proposed playfield. Staff finds the location of this proposed field at Potomac Greens problematic. First, access to this portion of the site is extremely limited, with only one road (Potomac Greens Drive) serving this portion of the development. The isolated location at the end of a street deep within what will be a somewhat exclusive residential complex is not the most

desirable location for a public playfield. Staff is concerned that the adjacent residents will naturally come to expect some level of control over the use of the playfield within the midst of their development, leading to conflict that will not allow the use of the field to be maximized for the City. In addition, the Director of RP&CA has indicated that the costs of maintaining the field, because of its relative isolation, would be higher than the costs associated with maintaining a field located adjacent or near other fields. Staff's proposed location for this relocated field would most likely create fewer conflicts with neighbors, be much more accessible to residents of Potomac Yard and the surrounding community, and make maintenance much easier for the City. The alternative location would also allow the field to be illuminated without impact to an immediately adjacent residential community, increasing the extent to which the field could be utilized.

City staff is recommending that the City not accept dedication of any of the open space within this area except for a small portion of the Rail Park to be utilized for a Dog Run area. Staff believes the remainder of the open spaces should be maintained as private common open space for use of the residents of the project and their visitors. Staff does not believe that the proposed spaces are of major benefit to the remainder of the City, and does not, therefore, support their dedication, because of the high costs associated with maintaining such spaces. And, in any case, it would be unusual for all of the open space within a project to be public, as has been proposed here.

Because of limited access to the rail park, the police have expressed concerns about public safety and because of the questionable desirability of such a narrow space located between two rail corridors, the Recreation Director recommends not accepting the space as a public park, except for an area toward the south of the space, to be utilized for a public dog-run area.

Slaters Area

Staff has some concern about the proposed uses of Landbay C, called "Potomac Plaza" by the applicant, in particular, the park related uses on the western end of the site. It does not seem to staff that the center of what is effectively a traffic island with no traffic lights to allow children to cross is an appropriate place for active open space, particularly for the tot lot proposed by the applicant. Staff is highly supportive of retail use for this parcel; a plan for such uses was previously shown to staff for the site and such uses are certainly needed within the neighborhood. Staff would even support additional retail square footage at this location. Staff recommends keeping the remainder of the space on this site as privately owned, highly landscaped greenspace in order to visually improve this entryway into the City.

Town Center

The focal point of the proposed new development is the Town Center (Landbay G), located just south of the existing Retail Center at Potomac Yard. The Town Center, incorporating about 20 acres, is planned to be the most dense portion of the site, providing the greatest variety of uses, with office uses, a concentration of retail uses, a hotel and high density residential uses. The commercial and hotel uses, with first floor retail space, would be organized around a large open space plaza or green, roughly the size of Market Square at City Hall. The retail square footage for the entire project is concentrated in this area; the applicant has proposed up to 80,000 square feet in retail use within the Town Center, nearly 60% of the new retail space proposed for the project (excluding the Potomac Yard Center). The majority of the buildings in the Town Center would be 60-80 feet in height, with a maximum height of 110' permitted for up to five buildings. The hotel would be among the tallest buildings and would provide the visual anchor of the Town Center. Residential uses in the town center will be concentrated on the outer rings of the landbay and to the east near the linear park. The Town Center is purposefully located directly adjacent to the Potomac Yard Shopping Center, including Hoyt's Theaters, and is intended to "draw upon the success of Potomac Yard Center" and to enhance the single use nature of the Potomac Yard Center by adding a variety of uses in close proximity.

The eastern edge of the Town Center landbay is defined by Potomac Avenue and the linear Potomac Yard park, which forms an open space connection throughout the length of the development. Potomac Avenue provides vehicular access to the eastern side of the Town Center. Main Street also passes thorough the town center and connects to the existing street in front of the retail center, providing north-south access throughout Potomac Yard. East Glebe Road terminates at Town Center, providing the main east-west access. The reserved location of a potential Metrorail station is located on a portion of the Linear Park area, directly adjacent to the Town Center.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff believes the proposed Town Center could provide a vital and vibrant center of activity which will serve not only the residents of the development but which could also draw people from a larger area. In concept, the proposed Town Center is not unlike Reston Town Center, which successfully functions as a pedestrian-oriented area. The existing Reston Town Center has about the same overall level of development on the same land area as is proposed at the Town Center for Potomac Yard. However, the amount of retail (the type of use which actually activates the space) proposed at the Potomac Yard Town Center (80,000 sq.ft.) is only one-third the level of that provided at Reston Town Center (220,000 sq.ft.). The applicant is hopeful that the adjoining Retail Center, with the 16 theater screens and a total of almost 600,000 sq.ft. will help to activate the Town Center, even though a majority of the retail center and movie theater are a good walking distance away. Staff agrees that the existing retail center and theaters do attract a significant number of people to the area, and

we believe that this may help to some limited extent to support the Town Center. In any case, we do not believe that the existence of the adjoining center will be detrimental to the success of the Town Center.

Of critical importance to the success of such a Center is the level of development concentrated in the immediate area; it is the concentration of office and residential density that supports the retail shops and restaurants, and it is the retail area which creates the desirable activity. While the applicant has proposed locating significant levels of office and residential uses within the Town Center, as well as the project's single hotel, staff supports moving additional office from other parts of the proposed development to the Town Center in order to increase the potential viability of the proposed retail uses.

CAP has requested that the office use be shifted from south of the Monroe Avenue bridge to the Town Center under the staff recommended concept plan. With a second playfield located at the Monroe Avenue bridge, CAP sees the site as a less desirable one for office uses and prefers to proceed with residential development in the area south of the bridge. (Changes south of the bridge are discussed in more detail later in the report.) Therefore, staff is recommending that 600,000 square feet of office use located south of the bridge under the applicant's proposal be shifted to the Town Center, increasing the total level of office to 1,000,000 square feet in the Center.

The applicant has provided information to staff which shows that the increased floor area can be accommodated within the Town Center within the maximum height limits permitted, while still maintaining a variety of heights and a mix of uses within the blocks. With a total of about 2.0 million square feet of development in Landbay "G" (including the 600,000 square feet of additional office density), staff has estimated that the average density of development on the development parcels within Landbay "G" will be about a 2.5 to 3.0 floor area ratio, a level of density similar to that found and permitted within the central business district of Alexandria (2.5 FAR) and around the City's Metrorail stations (3.0 F.A.R.).

In the event the Monroe Avenue bridge is straightened, there is more land area available for development south of the bridge, and the applicant would prefer to maintain some office in that area. Therefore, under this alternative scheme, the amount of office in the Town Center drops from 1.0 million square feet to 800,000 square feet, still twice the level proposed originally by CAP for the Town Center.

Metrorail Station

The area where a future Metrorail station would be located is immediately adjacent to the planned Town Center, another reason, in staff's opinion, why density should be concentrated within the Town Center. Although a Metrorail Station was previously a requirement for

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

development under the CDD guidelines on the Potomac Yard, a Metrorail station has not been proposed as part of this plan. Staff agrees with the applicant's contention that the overall level of development proposed for the tract---roughly 6,000,000 million square feet-- is not sufficient to support the cost of building a new Metrorail station on the site.

Therefore, as part of the plan, staff is recommending that the applicant 1) specifically identify the land area that would be required for a future Metrorail station and 2) that the proposed development not preclude the development of any such future station. In addition, future owners in the area may be required to participate in a tax financing district to offset a reasonable proportion of the costs of such a new Metrorail station.

Main Body of the Yard

The main body of the Yard, the blocks south of the Town Center to the Monroe Avenue Bridge, is divided into four development landbays (H, I, and J) and several significant open spaces, including the bulk of the Potomac Yard Linear Park and a playfield on the north side of the Monroe Avenue Bridge (Landbay K). Except for the blocks facing Route 1, where a mix of residential and office with ground floor retail uses is proposed, this area is to be developed in residential uses, primarily townhouses and stacked townhouses.

Route 1 Development

The blocks along Route 1 include a mix of uses, both office and residential, many with the potential for retail on the first floor. Heights of buildings are generally proposed to be 50-65', descending from 80' at the Town Center along Route 1, and increasing to 90' on Route 1 on the blocks just north of the proposed playfield at the Monroe Avenue Bridge, where a substantial concentration of office uses--663,000 square feet--has been proposed.

The developer is proposing an access road parallel to Route 1, which would provide one travel lane and on-street parking in front of the buildings. The access road is intended to provide a front-door facing Route 1 for buildings on Route 1, with accessible surface parking facilities. It is also intended to create a more pedestrian friendly scale to Route 1, by placing parked cars between the pedestrian and the Route 1 travel lanes. In addition, improvements to Route 1 would be completed similar to the improvements in front of the retail center, where a tree-planted median is provided.

Residential Development

The remainder of the area between the Town Center and the Monroe Avenue bridge is developed for townhouse and stacked-townhouse residential uses and for open spaces. Main Street and Potomac Avenue frame this residential area, with more narrow residential streets running east-west, including extensions of Swann, Custis and Howell. The stacked townhouses, 45-55' in height, are proposed to be located along the wider north-south streets--Main Street and Potomac Avenue, with more traditional single family townhouses, 35'-45' in height, fronting the remainder of the streets.

All of the houses will be oriented toward the street, with parking at the rear of the units, accessed from a system of alleys. No curb cuts for individual garages will interrupt the sidewalk and on-street parking will be provided on at least one side--and in most cases both sides--of the street. Street widths are comparable to those in Old Town and Del Ray, and will adequately provide for travel lanes, parking lanes and sidewalks and street-trees on both sides of the street. Houses will be located on the front property line or set back no more than 15', depending on the unit type, creating a house-to-sidewalk relationship similar to Old Town.

All east-west streets will terminate to the east at the linear Potomac Yard Park, providing views into a green landscaped area. The Potomac Yard Park is a 20+ acre park extending the length of the project just west of the railroad track, connecting the project with a series of trails and providing both active and passive open space opportunities. At the southern end of this area, just north of the Monroe Avenue Bridge in Landbay K, the Park expands westward to include a proposed regulation size soccer field, with parking provided under the bridge.

Landbay H and I have two long and narrow “finger parks” at Swann and Custis Avenue connecting Route 1 and the linear Potomac Yard Park. A third park containing .7 acres will be located in Landbay J, called Howell Park. In addition to these three park spaces, there will be smaller neighborhood parks comprising up to 3/4 acre located throughout the residential area which the applicant has proposed as private, neighborhood serving parks. The finger parks and the neighborhood parks are intended to provide green space and passive open space for residents and include such amenities such as tot lots, benches, and walkways.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

These landbays, along with Potomac Greens, form the core of the residential neighborhoods. Except along Route 1, where a mix of office and residential uses are provided, the area is comprised of residential townhomes and stacked townhomes. The new residential neighborhoods will be distinguished by the absence of curbcuts, because all parking for the units will be accessed from alleys to the rear of units. Along with the proposed wider streets, street trees and sidewalks, the absence of curb-cuts will create a traditional, pedestrian-oriented streetscape in the residential neighborhoods.

Townhouses

In terms of height and scale, the proposed townhouses are typical of the maximum allowed by the city’s residential townhouse zones, and are like those found within most new developments in the city; a maximum of three full stories in height will be permitted, with dormers in the gabled roof sometimes providing a partial fourth story, for heights ranging from 35' to 45'. Lots are proposed to range in width from 18' to 25' and in length from 55' to 100'. The length of the lot is determined by whether a detached garage is provided. Some of the detached garages show a granny flat or small apartment, with no more than 400 square feet, above the garage. Many of the units will not have a detached garage, but will have a single or double garage within the unit, similar to most townhomes now built in the City.

Stacked townhouses are larger in overall mass than the single family townhouses, but aesthetically not significantly different than the proposed townhouses. Each of these buildings contains two units and is proposed to be no more than five stories in height, including the gable roof/dormer floor, with a maximum height of 55'.

In terms of density, the proposed units exceed the typical densities found in most recent projects in the City and also exceed typical densities of residential development in Old Town and Del Ray. The table below provides the densities for some recent projects in the City and for some established blocks in Old Town and Del Ray. Density has been calculated in two different ways for comparative purposes, as “block density” and as “average density.” The “block density” calculation is for a typical residential block within the proposed project, and includes only the house lots and the alleys serving the lots; it does not include land area devoted to streets, sidewalks, or neighborhood open spaces. This measure allows us to compare density to typical blocks in Del Ray and Old Town, and with some small new development projects in the City that do not have internal street systems or common open spaces. The other measure “average density” is used to compare the proposed residential neighborhoods in Potomac Yard with some larger residential developments recently built in the City. The calculation of “average density” includes most streets and sidewalks in a project, as well as any small open spaces located within the residential development.

<u>Project/Area</u>	<u>Density</u>	<u>Average Density</u>
Potomac Yard Blocks H&I townhouse/stacked townhouse blocks*¹	30.0 du/acre	23.0 du/acre
 <u>New Development</u>		
Cameron Station Phase I		16.6 du/acre
Old Town Greens		16.8 du/acre
Stonegate D-1, A		16.9 du/acre
Old Town Village (Townhomes only)		17.7 du/acre
Rivergate (without River park)		24.8 du/acre
Portners Landing (townhouses only)	28.8 du/acre	
Hearthstone Mews	31.5 du/acre	
 <u>Del Ray and Old Town Blocks</u>		
Del Ray Block* ²	11.0 du/acre	
Old Town Block-Yates Gardens	16.8 du/acre	
Del Ray Rowhouse Block ³	17.4 du/acre	
Old Town Block* ⁴	21.9 du/acre	
Old Town Block-Newer Construction ⁵	22.6 du/acre	

¹ Estimated by staff from applicant’s illustrative plans & design guidelines

² Turner/Clifford/Montrose/LaVerne

³ 500 block E. Nelson (north side)

⁴ N. Royal/Queen/N. Pitt/Princess

⁵ Queen/N. Union/Princess/N. Lee

These numbers suggest that, in terms of density, the bulk of the residential neighborhoods in the Yard will feel most similar to the Hearthstone Mews and Portners Landing (townhouses only) projects, and staff believes this to be an accurate characterization. However, whereas the Portners and Hearthstone Mews townhouse projects each cover less than a block, in the case of the Potomac Yard, this residential form will cover a contiguous area roughly equivalent to ten Old Town Blocks within these landbays.

The density is higher primarily because most units do not have back yards, a contemporary development pattern which places increased importance on common open spaces. There is no question that this is a very urban form of development and that the interiors of the residential blocks will be very tight, with virtually zero open space or landscaping. However, the experience of this density within the public realm will, in staff's opinion, be significantly softened by the well-designed streetscape and, also, by the variety of open spaces provided throughout the project.

A Note on Granny Flats

One alternate townhouse type that may be constructed is a unit with a detached garage separated from the house by a small yard, or partially attached. The applicant has proposed granny flats--small 400 sq.ft. accessory apartments--be permitted as a second story on some of these garages. Staff is enthusiastic about the concept, because it provides a small yard space which may be more conducive to families and provides a limited mix of house types for rental or extended family. However, staff also believes the accessory unit should be counted as a dwelling unit and that at least one parking space should be provided for the unit (requirements that would apply elsewhere in the City), whereas the applicant does not wish to count the units or provide parking for them; therefore few of these granny flats are actually likely to be provided.

Route 1 Development

Along Route 1, the concept plan provides for a mix of office and residential uses, with some limited ground floor retail. The applicant has proposed to construct an access road along the frontage of Route 1 from the Town Center south in order to improve the character of the corridor and also to provide on-street parking for uses facing the street.

Staff finds both of these goals laudable, but cannot support the proposed access road. Experience with access or service roads elsewhere in the City, such as at Duke Street near the new library and at Bradlee Center, has suggested that they do not work well and create conflicts at intersections; the City has in fact been eliminating existing service roads over time, where possible. In lieu of the access road, staff is proposing that lay-bys be permitted for buildings facing Route 1, where they can be safely accommodated. These will allow convenient drop-off at the front door of a building for taxis and quick deliveries. The Director of T&ES has indicated that he believes laybys are workable in this area.

Elimination of the service road will also allow sidewalks along Route 1 which are wider than those proposed. It will also allow a wider central median to be provided down Route 1; the wider median would allow street trees to be provided even where turn lanes are also provided, giving continuous rather than limited and sporadic trees down the center of the street.

Office Concentration

CAP is proposing that office uses be concentrated at the southern end of this area in Landbay "J"; 663,000 sq.ft. of office uses are proposed in this area, the most of any landbay. Staff does not object to creation of an office center at the southern part of the area, along Route 1 as one approaches the Monroe Avenue bridge; however, the level proposed by the applicant seems somewhat implausible. Further, in order to accommodate that level of office use, CAP has proposed increasing the height limits for the area to 90' from the 77' now permitted by the master plan. Staff proposed to CAP the shifting of 200,000 sq. ft. Of office from this area to the Town Center, to increase density in the Town Center. CAP has agreed to this shift under the straightened bridge scenario, where the land area available for office within this landbay decreases. However, under the staff recommended plan without the straightened bridge, CAP expressed a desire to maintain full office at this location, instead shifting all of the office from south of the bridge to the Town Center. While staff is not convinced that either level of office--463,000 sq.ft. or 663,000 sq.ft.--is plausible, staff has no real objection to setting this as the maximum limit, provided the design guidelines are followed, including the height limit recommended by staff.

Staff is recommending that the maximum height in this area be limited to 82', the height limit in the King Street Metro area. The existing master plan provided for maximum heights of 77' in this area, and staff believes somewhere around this height is appropriate, given the low-scale nature of the surrounding neighborhoods. The extra 5', to 82', helps to accommodate the potential for ground floor retail.

Straightening of Route 1

In addition to the shift of office uses associated with the proposed straightening of Route 1, other changes occur in this area, primarily to the street system and open space, when the bridge is straightened. A detailed description of the other changes resulting from the bridge straightening is provided in the next section.

South of Monroe Avenue Bridge (Landbay “L”)

South of the existing Monroe Avenue bridge, on the 11 acre landbay “L”, the applicant is proposing another concentration of high density office uses--673,000 square feet--and 319 multifamily residential units. The applicant has indicated that density is being concentrated in this area because it is the portion of the site closest to the Braddock Road Metrorail station. Heights are proposed at 110' for up to four buildings, with the majority of heights reaching no higher than 60'.

The project's Main Street continues under the Monroe Avenue bridge into this portion of the project, providing the only vehicular access into the area. Main Street extends to the southern portion of the site to culminate in a cul-de-sac located approximately 675' feet from Braddock Road. This cul-de-sac is proposed to be a drop-off point to the Metrorail for the proposed shuttle bus system serving the Yard. No vehicular connections are provided to the neighborhoods to the west, although pedestrian connections are suggested to align with existing streets in the area.

The linear Potomac Yard park extends along the railroad along the eastern edge of this parcel, but narrows substantially, providing room for only a bike/pedestrian trail and landscaping.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

One of the goals of the adopted Master Plan for Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens is the extension of the existing neighborhood grid into the site, creating an integration between the projects and existing neighborhoods. While the streets north of the bridge do an admirable job in this respect, the narrow southern tail of the plan has no such integration. As proposed by the applicant, development proposed within the tail is completely isolated from the surrounding community.

The most substantial change to the conceptual plan proposed by staff is the straightening of the Route 1 Monroe Avenue bridge. In staff's opinion, this change, combined with a reconfiguration of the local street system in the area of the bridge and south, transforms the southern portion of the site from a series of isolated land uses located on a dead end street (S. Main Street), into a more cohesive development which forms a natural extension of the surrounding neighborhood. An illustrative plan for the area around and south of the Monroe Avenue bridge with a straightened bridge is provided in the attached drawing set (Attachment B-1).

The straightening of the bridge affects the plan starting at or around Howell Avenue and extending southward (Part of Landbay “J” and Landbays “K” and “L”). A straightened bridge creates a greater amount of land for development south of the new bridge and results in less severe grades around this area because the length of the bridge span is reduced and the embankment for Monroe Avenue is eliminated, allowing Monroe Avenue to be at-grade.

The reconfigured Monroe Avenue would go under the straightened Route 1, connecting directly with Main Street, the new spine road, and, ultimately Route 1. While a direct connection from southbound Route 1 onto Monroe Avenue is maintained under the reconfiguration via a ramp/access Road, the connection from Monroe Avenue to Route 1 and from Route 1 north-bound to Monroe Avenue would no longer be as direct as it is today. Rather, Monroe would connect directly into the Main Street of the new development at Potomac Yard, becoming part of a more neighborhood oriented network of streets, from which Route 1 would then be accessed. The new spine road would intersection Route 1 at grade at the foot of the north end of the new Route 1 bridge. In the opinion of the Director of T&ES, the reconfigured bridge also provides enhanced traffic operations and increases safety. These transportation issues are discussed in detail in the transportation analysis for this plan, contained in the Transportation Management Plan report.

The straightened Route 1 has, in the opinion of staff, substantial land-use benefits for the area. Simply eliminating the embankments makes the land in the area more developable. But, also, the reconfiguration allows the neighborhood street grid to be extended into the development from both the north and west, creating the opportunity for development which relates better to the surrounding communities. Staff's proposed plan with the bridge straightening shows that a mix of uses similar to those in the proposed concept plan, including office and higher density housing, could still be located in the same area south of the bridge, with townhouse units providing a transition to the existing lower-scale residential in the area. However, the heights and scale of the new development could have a much better relationship to the small townhomes of the existing neighborhood by keeping the new blocks small and the street vistas open. It locates the taller office building on Monroe avenue adjacent to the new Route 1 bridge and looking over Simpson Field and substantially enhances the value of several underutilized commercial buildings in the vicinity.

This alternate plan also substantially increases the accessibility of the existing neighborhood to the streets and parks of Potomac Yard, while providing greatly improved access for the new development from Monroe Avenue, relative to the plan without a straightened bridge. The existing neighborhood streets--Nelson, Alexandria, Luray and Glendale Avenues--could be extended eastward through the project, connecting to Main Street. Because these existing streets are quite narrow, new north-south streets connecting to Monroe Avenue would be designed to carry the majority of traffic from the new development, minimizing impact on the existing neighborhoods.

As previously discussed, staff recommended the shift of a playfield from Potomac Greens to the area immediately south of the Monroe Avenue bridge, where it would be immediately adjacent to the other proposed playfield and share parking located under the bridge with that playfield. Another benefit to the City in general, and the community in particular, under the bridge straightening alternative is that the reconfiguration allows the two proposed playfields at Monroe Avenue Bridge to be located on the west side of Route 1 in an expanded Simpson Field. As currently proposed, the fields at the Monroe Avenue bridge, although directly across Route 1 from the Simpson Field recreational complex, is neither visible nor

accessible from Simpson Field. The expanded Simpson Field complex also could provide a potential location for a future school site, should the city need one in this area.

The question for the city is whether the benefits of straightening the bridge are substantial enough to warrant the estimated additional cost of \$12-\$15 million over what the applicant has proposed for transportation and infrastructure improvements. According to the applicant, they will spend about \$100 million dollars on infrastructure for the Potomac Yard project as they have designed it; this includes construction of the spine road, Route 1 improvements, and other street improvements; utilities; and open spaces. CAP has indicated that if the straightening of Route 1 was cost-neutral and development program-neutral, they would not object to the reconfigured street system and land uses. However, the change is not cost-neutral, and the applicant asserts that they simply cannot afford these additional costs; if they are required to absorb them, they will not proceed with the plan.

Staff believes that the land use benefits to the City are substantial, and therefore have begun to explore potential funding sources to offset the additional costs associated with the straightened Route 1 proposal. Because it is not possible to resolve the funding issues immediately, and because staff wishes to move the plan forward, staff is recommending that the approval of the CDD move forward with a two-tier approval for the southern portion of the site. This approach would approve the staff proposed concept plan--without the bridge straightening, with a condition that would allow the alternative plan, with a straightened bridge, to be "triggered" by the City, thereby becoming the operative concept plan. The "trigger" involves the City assessing, in detail, the costs associated with the straightening of the bridge and committing to funding these additional costs associated with the straightening. This approach effectively makes the approval of a portion of the plan (generally south of Howell Avenue) contingent on a finding by the City in the future; however, the applicant has agreed that this is acceptable, since they will most likely concentrate development in other portions of the Yard over the next few years.

Office Concentration

Regardless of whether or not the bridge is straightened, staff believes the amount of office within this area should be decreased. The applicant proposes the highest concentration of office--673,000 sq.ft.--at this difficult location, arguing that it is the most Metro accessible area within the Yard. While it is true that this site is physically the closest to Metrorail, it is still 1,500-2,500 ft. walk from the station to the location of the proposed office uses. And more significantly, this site has the worst vehicular access of any area in the Yard, unless the bridge is straightened. And, if the bridge is straightened, high levels of office use become somewhat less appropriate because of the increased connectedness to the adjoining low scale residential neighborhoods. Therefore, staff is recommending that office uses be shifted from this area under either scenario. If the bridge is straightened, at least 200,000 sq.ft. of office should be shifted from this area to the Town Center to enhance that center of development. The applicant has indicated that they would prefer to eliminate all office uses from this landbay if the staff's concept plan (without the bridge straightening) is approved,

shifting them to the Town Center and throughout Landbays “H”, “I”, and “J”. With the second playfield located in this area under that scenario, the applicant feels that insufficient space is available to create a true office center. Development within this landbay would then become all residential use, with a small amount of retail, which staff supports and finds a more plausible use for this area than office.

Heights

Staff is recommending that heights in this area be decreased from the 110' maximum proposed by the applicant to a maximum of 82', with the majority of heights less than 60' and reducing as the lower neighborhoods to the west are approached. Staff does not support the increase from the 77' now permitted by the master plan for this area, which is predominately low scale in nature. A minor increase to 82' is reasonable to allow retail uses on the first floor; this is the height of office buildings on Duke Street and at the King Street Metro.

Braddock Road Turn Around

One small change strongly recommended by Staff and agreed to by the applicant is moving the Main Street turn-around near Braddock Road closer to Braddock Road. The turn-around is intended to be the terminus of the project serving shuttle bus to the Braddock Road Metro. However, as currently proposed it is approximately 675' from Braddock Road and even farther to the Metro station itself. The applicant has indicated that they believe they can move the turn around much closer to Braddock Road if the school agrees a land swap to accommodate the change. Staff is supportive of moving the turn around as close as possible to the street which will increase the likelihood that people will use the shuttle bus to get to the Metro, especially if the bus runs frequently. In addition, short-term parallel parking along this street is desirable to serve the adjacent recreation fields.

Open Space

Most of the proposed open spaces have been described and discussed in the preceding sections as each landbay has been analyzed. This section provides a summary of the proposed open spaces within the project, provides an overview of the open space issues, and provides some additional staff analysis on more comprehensive open space issues.

The plan provides for a variety of open spaces linked by a system of trails and sidewalks both to each other and to the regional trail system. About 58 acres of common open space is planned, and all except the smallest neighborhood parks are proposed to be dedicated to the City as public open space. The open spaces include playfields and other active recreational facilities as well as passive spaces, and range in size from large two large 20+ acre spaces to small neighborhood-oriented open spaces of less than half an acre.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

The table below shows all of the open spaces proposed by CAP within Potomac Yard. All of the spaces, except for the neighborhood parks, are proposed to be public parks, dedicated to and maintained by the City.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSED PARKS AT POTOMAC YARD		
Open Space Name	Description	Land Area
Potomac Yard Park	Linear Park on west of the railroad tracks providing open space link between Four Mile Run and Braddock Road. Includes trails, courts (tennis, basketball, volleyball), a multi-purpose lawn area, playgrounds and fitness course.	24.2 acres
Braddock Field	Soccer field located primarily on George Washington Middle School property to be rebuilt as regulation-sized field utilizing a portion of Potomac Yard land area.	2.0 acres
Monroe Field	Soccer field located on the north side of the Monroe Avenue bridge with parking provided underneath the bridge.	Area included in Potomac Yard Park area.
Potomac Greens Park	Passive recreation and nature area, with trails, including interpretive trails, through the wetlands and picnic area and playground.	20 acres
Potomac Greens Field	Soccer field/multi-purpose area located adjacent to passive recreation area.	Area included in Potomac Greens Park area.
Potomac Plaza	Area located within parcel created by east and west bound Slaters Lane proposed to include landscaped areas and neighborhood park, with potential playground.	1.5 acres
Rail Park	Linear park located between the Metrorail lines and the main line railroad tracks accessed at-grade from the south at Old Town Greens. Additional pedestrian connections into the park proposed include two low pedestrian footbridges from Potomac Greens and a pedestrian bridge from the main body of the Yard. Area proposed to include tennis courts, community gardens and a dog-run area.	4.2 acres
Four Mile Run Park	Area including Four Mile Run, the bridges over Four Mile Run, and a narrow strip along the southern embankment proposed for general "waterfront opportunities."	4.4 acres
Howell Park	Neighborhood park located along extension of Howell Avenue; primarily open, landscaped space.	0.7 acres
Finger Parks	Linear neighborhood parks located at extension of Custis and Swann Avenues, primarily green space with sidewalk.	0.8 acres
Neighborhood Parks	Small parks located throughout project providing seating areas, dog runs, tot lots and landscaped green space.	3.6 acres
	Total Land Area in Parks	61.4 acres

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Some of staff's most significant recommended changes to the plan relate to open space. Overall, a substantial amount of open space--an estimated 50% of the developable site (excluding Four Mile Run, the Railroad tracks and streets)--has been provided, and staff believes the spaces will generally serve the project well. While it is true that nearly half of the open space proposed is on sites CAP cannot develop, i.e. the Rail Park, the wetlands and Four Mile Run Park, the proposed open spaces do form a network of spaces incorporating a broad range of uses which will serve the residents of the project. Only a few of the spaces are likely to be of interest to the public who do not occupy the site.

One key open space issue is staff's proposed relocation of one proposed playfield from Potomac Greens to the area just south of the Monroe Avenue bridge, or with the straightened bridge alternative, adjacent to Simpson Field. This issue has been discussed in more detail in the analysis on Landbay A.

Aside from the proposal to shift the playfield, the key issue related to open space is the extent to which the proposed open spaces should be public. The applicant proposes that 57.8 acres (94%) of the total 61.4 acres of open space be dedicated for public open space, leaving only 3.6 acres (6%) in private open space throughout the entire development. In theory, the idea of the city receiving extensive new public open spaces is an appealing idea. But, in fact, for almost 100% of the open space in the project to be public is unprecedented, and not entirely positive because it will result in spaces which are largely for the use of the immediate project residents being maintained by public funds. A typical residential development is required to have approximately 30-40% open space, either on individual lots or in the case of some developments, in common area which is privately maintained. The townhomes and stacked townhomes in this project, totaling two-thirds of the residential units in the development, have no open space on the individual lots and rely entirely on nearby parks.

In addition, some of the proposed spaces, although theoretically potentially usable open spaces, are marginal in quality, in staff's opinion, and therefore are not appropriate for public acquisition and maintenance.

Staff believes only five of the spaces--the 2 playfields and a portion of land for a third at George Washington Middle School, the large linear Potomac Yard Park and a portion of the Rail park--have benefits to the greater City and should be dedicated to the city for public use and public maintenance.

Proposed Public Parks

Three playfields are proposed in conjunction with the development: one at the Monroe Avenue Bridge, another primarily on land owned by the school at George Washington Middle School, and the third, proposed at Potomac Greens and proposed by staff to also be

relocated to near the Monroe Avenue Bridge. (Or in the case of the straightened bridge scenario, the two Monroe Bridge fields become adjacent to Simpson Field.) Staff believes the playfields are the open spaces most likely to be utilized by the public.

Potomac Yard Park stretches the entire length of the site adjacent to the railroad corridor. It covers approximately 24 acres including about 5 acres where a playfield at the Monroe Avenue bridge is located, and provides bike trail connections to the north and south and to the east, via a pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks. The park is intended to provide a mix of active and passive uses. Proposed active uses include tennis courts, basketball courts, volleyball courts, trails, a lawn area sufficient in size to serve as an informal playfield, a fitness trail and children's playgrounds. The remainder of the area will be well landscaped, with trails and seating areas.

The final space recommended for dedication to the City is the southern end of the space known as "Rail Park," which is the land left over between the Metrorail tracks and the main line tracks, with access to the south at grade to Old Town Greens, to the east to Potomac Greens via a low footbridge over the Metrorail tracks and to the west to the Potomac Yard Park via a pedestrian bridge. The applicant has proposed a variety of uses for this park, including tennis courts, a dog run and community gardens. Staff finds this space problematic, in large part because of its shape (very linear) and its location (between two railroad tracks) and sees little value to the City in accepting the space for public use, requiring public maintenance. The Police Department expressed concern about their ability to maintain surveillance of the area. The Director of Recreation expressed concern about the utility of so long and inaccessible an area, but did believe that a portion of the Park might be of value as a large dog-run area on the southern, most accessible, portion of the site if provided with fencing, benches, water and a gravel surface. Therefore, staff is recommending that this area become public. The remainder of the site could be developed as open space for the residents of Potomac Greens and Old Town Greens, or, alternatively, could be left unutilized as planted green area.

Four Mile Run Park

One park which has not previously been discussed is Four Mile Run park, which consists primarily of the bridges over Four Mile Run and a thin strip of land on the south side of the Run (as well as a small area of land within the City north of Four Mile Run). The applicant has not clearly defined potential use of this space as a park, but has indicated a desire for some "waterfront related activities" and for the space to be dedicated to the City. Because this site is somewhat isolated from the remainder of the development (aside from the shopping center) and relates more to the development at Arlington at this time, staff has some doubts about its utility to the residents within the Alexandria portion of the project; it is more likely to be of interest to the Arlington County portion of Potomac Yard. Staff also has concerns about accepting the dedication of this space to the City because of potential future maintenance costs related to the bridges. Staff has proposed that the applicant market these bridges for commercial recreational use, although it is not clear to staff whether such

uses would be truly viable. If the space cannot be commercially developed for recreation, staff is recommending that the applicant return with a plan for this space in the future.

Other Parks

Staff recommends that the remaining open spaces--the resource protection area on Potomac Greens, the open space at Slaters Lane, the remainder of the Rail Park and all of the finger parks and neighborhood parks, be maintained as privately owned common open space for the use of all residents of the project. Staff does not believe that the proposed spaces are of major benefit to the remainder of the City, and does not support their dedication as public open spaces, because of the costs associated with maintaining such spaces.

Street Design

As part of the concept plan approval, the applicant has proposed the general location for major arterial streets; Route 1, Potomac Avenue, Main Street and the east-west through streets of East Glebe, Swann, Custis and Howell provide the framework of the Yard plan. Proposed street sections are provided in the Design Guidelines for all streets and alleys within the project, and include some deviation from City standards. All streets are proposed to be public; only alleys would be private.

Potomac Avenue is the proposed spine road through the project, connecting at the Monroe Avenue Bridge near the existing intersection of Route 1 and Slater's Lane, and over Four Mile Run into Arlington County. Potomac Avenue is proposed to have four travel lanes, two in each direction, separated by a 15' median and a row of parallel parking on the western (southbound) side.

The applicant proposes to maintain Route 1 as four through lanes, with a 15' median/turn lane area in the center, similar to the improvements already constructed on Route 1 in conjunction with construction of the Potomac Yard Shopping Center. In addition, the applicant proposes to build an access road along the eastern edge of Route 1 in front of the project. The access road would be separated from Route 1 by a landscaped median and would provide one travel lane and one parking lane.

Main Street runs through the center of the project connecting the entire development together from the Retail Center to the Braddock Road turn-around. The street is proposed to have one traffic lane in either direction and parking on both sides of the street, except below the Monroe Avenue Bridge, where Main Street provides the only access. At this location, Main Street would have two traffic lanes in each direction, with parking permitted on the street only in off-peak periods.

East-west streets and the residential streets within the development would have two lanes of traffic, one in either direction, and parking on both sides of the street. Four east-west streets are proposed to connect across Route 1 from the project: East Glebe, Swann, Howell and Custis.

The applicant has also proposed a type of street called a yield street. The street would permit two way traffic and parking on both sides, but would not easily accommodate two-way traffic, therefore requiring one car to yield to another. There is no City street standard equivalent to this street type. One-way streets, measuring 20' wide with one travel lane and one lane for parking, would be located around neighborhood parks.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The street network provides not only the means for traffic movement within the project, but also provides a key organizing element for the neighborhoods. Although staff does have some issues with the proposed street sections, in general staff believes the streets are very well developed and will serve, almost more than any other feature of the plan, to create a character within the development which is consistent with Old Town and Del Ray.

Street Design

All of the streets are proposed to be public, and all of the street rights-of-way, except the proposed yield and one-way streets, are about as wide or wider than the typical Old Town Street (60'-85' versus 66'). All streets have street-trees on both sides. All but a few streets have sidewalks on both sides, and the exceptions, where sidewalks are provided only on one side, are appropriately located, i.e. next to parks where trails provide walkways. Most of the streets have on-street parking on both sides, the remainder have parking on at least one side. It is these characteristics which will distinguish this proposed development from other projects the City has seen over the past decade. With the exception of Carlyle, other projects generally have narrower streets without street trees and with little on-street parking. For example, except for the two public streets through the project (Cameron Station Boulevard and Brennan Park Drive), Cameron Station streets are typically 26' in width, with sidewalks on only one side and little on-street parking.

Staff does have concerns about two of the proposed street sections, those for "one-way" and "yield" streets. The "one-way" street issue is easily resolved by adding some width to bring it up to City standards. The "yield" street is modeled, according to the applicant's design team, after some of the more narrow Del Ray Streets, where two-way traffic and parking on both sides of the street is permitted, but the width does not adequately accommodate all of this movement and parking. Hence the name "yield," because in order to pass, traffic moving in opposing directions must pull over to allow oncoming traffic to pass. While the applicant proposes to utilize this type of street in only limited locations, the Director of T&ES does not believe the design is safe or adequate for any location, and it clearly does not meet City standards. Therefore, staff is recommending elimination of the "yield" street to be replaced with typical two-way streets.

Parking

As part of their application for concept plan approval, the applicant has indicated that they will seek reductions below the required levels of parking for uses within the development. The table below shows the levels of parking proposed by the applicant, along with the zoning ordinance requirements for parking.

Land Use	Applicant’s Proposal	Zoning Ordinance Requirement
Townhouse	1 to 2 spaces per unit	2 spaces per unit
Stacked Townhouse	1 to 2 spaces per unit	1.3 spaces per 1/bedroom unit 1.75 spaces per 2/bedroom unit 2.2 spaces per 3+/bedroom unit
Multi-Family Residential	1 space/bedroom, maximum 2 per unit	1.3 spaces per 1/bedroom unit 1.75 spaces per 2/bedroom unit 2.2 spaces per 3+/bedroom unit
Commercial Office	2 spaces per 1,000 gross sq. ft.	2 per 1,000 net sq.ft.
Hotel	0.5 spaces per room	1.15 spaces per room
Town Center Retail	3 spaces per 1,000 leaseable sq.ft.	4.4 to 5 spaces per 1,000 net sq. ft.
Other Retail	None	4.4 to 5 spaces per 1,000 net sq.ft.

Any actual parking reductions for the project would have to be approved in conjunction with the submission of preliminary development plans for actual buildings, but the proposed parking levels contained in the concept plan establish the City’s policy toward parking in the project.

Staff believes that it may be reasonable to request some parking reductions for commercial uses, particularly the hotel use and some retail uses. However, rather than establish the appropriate parking levels at this time within the concept plan, staff believes that decisions are best made when additional information is provided in conjunction with specific development plans. Therefore, staff has added a condition to the concept plan approval which indicates that parking reductions for commercial uses may be requested and shall be considered in conjunction with development plans.

Staff believes there is no basis for granting any reductions to residential parking in this project and recommends that such a policy be set within this concept plan by including a condition that disallows any parking reductions for residential units. Had a metrorail station been provided within this project there may have been some basis for small parking reductions in the Town Center, but as proposed, the residential neighborhoods planned for this area are no different from other urban residential neighborhoods in the City, which are required to provide full parking.

In addition to the proposed reductions in the number of parking spaces provided, the applicant has indicated that they may wish to satisfy parking requirements by providing some of the parking spaces for residential units on the public streets. Staff also does not support this proposal. Within the residential areas, the on-street parking will provide visitor parking for all of the open spaces (except the playfields, which have their own parking). (In the commercial areas, the on-street spaces may provide some of the critical parking for the retail uses.) Information provided by the applicant suggests that as much as 20-25% visitor parking might be available on the streets. It is true that 20-25% parking exceeds the parking that has typically been required by the City, but staff believes it is not an excessive level, particularly in a project where a fair amount of the parking provided is likely to be located in tandem parking. Tandem parking is somewhat less likely to be used, because people will tend to park on the street. For example, at Cameron Station, 15% visitor parking has been provided throughout the development, yet questions have been raised about the adequacy of the level of visitor parking. Therefore, staff also does not support allowing the on-street spaces on the public street to be counted for required parking for residential units, and has included this restriction as a condition of the concept plan.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Phasing

The CDD concept plan application proposes that the development be phased by landbay, with a separate preliminary development plan submitted for each landbay, but also includes language that would allow the applicant to bring in a development plan for a much smaller section of development, as small as a single building. The application also requests that the order in which landbays be developed be left unspecified.

Staff believes that it will be necessary to review at least the basic elements of a development plan for an area no smaller than a landbay in order to achieve *coordinated* development by effectively assessing compliance with the applicant's proposed design guidelines. The design guidelines provide development criteria for each landbay, including the number of units, the range of heights, the level of open space and other criteria guiding the development of that landbay. On the other hand, staff understands the applicants reluctance to be held to a preliminary development plan for an entire landbay. Such an approach may be difficult in some instances, because the detailed information typically required for preliminary development plan approval will not likely be known for each building within the landbay at the onset.

As a solution, staff proposes a preliminary development plan review process for individual buildings which incorporates approval of a more general plan for the entire landbay. As proposed, the applicant would be required to submit a generalized preliminary development plan covering the entire land area within a landbay for approval by the Planning Commission and City Council in conjunction with their request for approval of the initial building in each landbay. This generalized plan would show all proposed streets (except alleys) and open spaces required by the design guidelines, as well as any other basic infrastructure required by the City. Rather than showing detailed building footprints and/or building elevations, the preliminary landbay plan would show a

general allocation of the permitted land uses, floor area and heights within the landbay. Along with the design guidelines and other elements of the approved concept plan, this preliminary development plan would establish the permitted framework for development within the landbay. Thereafter, smaller sections, or even an individual building, could proceed through the typical preliminary development plan process, with approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Interim and By-Right Uses

The CDD provisions of the zoning ordinance allow the land within a CDD to be utilized for uses other than those ultimately approved for development under the concept plan for the CDD. Two such types of uses are allowed: “by-right” uses and “interim uses.”

By-Right Uses

“By-right” uses are those uses permitted within the CDD without approval of a concept plan for the CDD. The GSA warehouse, Avis and the Retail Center were constructed pursuant to the “by-right” provisions of Potomac Yard’s CDD zoning. The CDD provisions allow the “by-right” uses to continue to be located on the portions of the tract where no preliminary development plan has been approved, even after approval of a concept plan for the CDD, provided that:

- 1) the by-right use meets the zoning requirements for that use, including the approval of a site plan and/or special use permit, where necessary, and
- 2) does not preclude development consistent with the conceptual design plan.

The potential “by-right” uses on the Potomac Yard include, depending on the portion of the site, uses listed in the I/Industrial, CSL/Commercial Service Low and RB/Residential Townhouse zones.

Any by-right uses proposed by CAP will be assessed as to whether they interfere with development under the CDD; if they are determined to do so, they may be disapproved by the City. Otherwise, they must be permitted, pursuant to the regular site plan or special use permit regulations governing that use.

Existing “By-Right” Uses on the Site

CAP proposes to allow the existing Retail Center to continue and “to be authorized within the Conceptual Design Plan submitted with the application.” Although CAP has often spoken of the Retail Center as an interim use, the Retail Center is shown on the concept plan as the ultimate use for the portions of the tract which they occupy, and staff supports the approach of incorporating the existing “by-right” approvals under the approved concept plan.

For the other two existing uses, the GSA warehouse and Avis, CAP proposes in their application to authorize the uses' continuance for the length of the economic life of the buildings or until such time as CAP proposes to redevelop the two sites in accordance with the CDD. Pursuant to the CDD zoning provisions, these uses are authorized to continue as "by-right" uses until such time as a preliminary development plan is approved for the area including the use, unless they *preclude development consistent with the conceptual design plan*. It is possible that the City may require some changes within the footprint of these existing uses, in order to proceed with CDD development or that the City may require the uses be eliminated if, at some point, they interfere or become incompatible with the progressing CDD development. For example, to construct the spine road, changes to the Avis parking lot will likely be required.

At such time as a preliminary development plan is approved for CDD development for the portion of the site occupied by Avis or the GSA warehouses, these uses would then have to be specifically authorized as "interim uses" as part of that preliminary plan approval in order to continue operation.

Interim Uses

Once a concept plan has been approved for Potomac Yard, "interim" uses may be approved as part of a preliminary development plan on a portion of the site, provided that such "interim" uses were listed in the concept plan approval as potential "interim" uses on the site. The applicant is requesting that any "by-right" uses which may be in place on the site at the time of application for preliminary plan approval be permitted to be considered for "interim uses," and staff supports this approach to interim uses. This approach would allow the applicant to request that an existing "by-right" use be allowed to continue for some period of time even after development within the landbay proceeds; the City would have the opportunity at the time of approval of the preliminary development plan approval for that area to determine whether or not to allow the interim use to continue.

SECTION 4: SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The previous section has described in detail staff’s assessment of the proposed concept plan for Potomac Yard, along with staff’s proposed changes. The following table provides a brief summary which highlights the differences between the different proposals before the city: the applicant’s proposed concept plan, staff’s recommended concept plan and staff’s recommended alternative concept plan. This summary descriptions are followed by an overview of the approval documents and proposed two-tier approval approach.

	(1) Applicant’s Proposed Concept Plan	(2) Staff Proposed Concept Plan	(3) Staff Proposed Alternative Concept Plan
Density	about 6 million sq.ft.	Same as (1)	Same as (1)
Town Center	Mixed use center, with concentration of office uses (400,000 sq.ft.), higher density residential uses, hotel and retail.	Same as (1), except 1,000,000 sq.ft. of office in Town Center	Same as (1), except 800,000 sq.ft. of office in Town Center.
Main Body of the Yard (Landbays H, I and J)	Mix of office, residential and retail uses along Route 1. Concentration of office uses immediately north of the Monroe Avenue bridge (663,000 sq.ft.). Townhouses and stacked townhouses on remainder of the area.	Same as (1)	Same as (1), except slightly less office north of the Monroe Avenue bridge (463,000 sq.ft.)
South of the Bridge (Landbay “J”)	Mix of office (673,000 sq.ft.) and higher density residential uses	Higher density residential; no office.	Uses same as (1), but slightly less office (473,000 sq.ft.), some townhouse residential, and uses configured differently.
Potomac Greens	Townhouses and Stacked Townhouses	Same as (1)	Same as (1)
Spine Road	Yes, connecting at the southern foot of the Monroe Avenue Bridge.	Same as (1)	Yes, but north of the realigned Route 1 bridge.
Route 1	Four through-lanes, center landscape median with turn-lanes, access road with one travel and one parking lane along western side.	Same as (1) except access road eliminated and lay-bys permitted; center median widened to allow continuous landscaping.	Same as (2)
Streets	All public; all except yield streets and one-way streets meet city standards; on-street parking, sidewalks and street trees provided.	Same as (1) except two street types not meeting city standards (yield and one-way streets) eliminated or modified and minor adjustments to other proposed street sections.	Same as (2)
Parking	Reductions in parking requirements permitted.	No reductions permitted for residential uses.	Same as (2)
Open Space	60 acres provided; all but neighborhood parks is public	Same as (1) except portion of Rail Park eliminated as open space, one playfield shifted from Potomac Greens to Monroe Avenue area, active recreation space eliminated from Slaters Lane park, and only about half of the total open space is dedicated for public open space (Playfields, Potomac Yard Park and a small portion of Rail Park)	Same as (2), but location of two playfields at Monroe Avenue shifted adjacent to Simpson Field.

Approval Documents and Procedures

The changes proposed are reflected in the approval documents for the plan which include, in addition to the staff recommended conditions contained at the front of this report, 1) a plan sheet showing generalized land-use and transportation elements and 2) design guidelines.

The applicant has submitted a set of these two documents, along with other supporting materials, which reflect their version of the proposed plan. Staff has provided “marked-up” versions of these two documents--the concept plan sheet and the design guidelines--for approval as the staff recommended plan, along with the staff conditions. A set of marked-up documents is provided for both the alternative without the straightened bridge (staff’s proposed “concept plan”) and the alternative with the straightened bridge (staff’s proposed “alternative concept plan”) so that under either alternative it can be clearly understood exactly what is being approved.

Staff is recommending approval of the proposed “concept plan” with a condition which essentially allows for the “alternative concept plan” (the straightened bridge) to be required by the City at some time in the future for the portion of the site south of Howell Avenue. Staff understands that the “two-tiered” approval being recommended for the plan is complex, and unusual, but we believe that the benefits of the straightened bridge alternative for the City are substantial and should be maintained as an alternative for the plan, if at all possible. On the other hand, we do not wish to delay the approval process until such time as the complex costs issues related to the straightened bridge can be completely resolved, because delay could result in abandonment of any coordinated development and the undertaking of by-right development on the site, and staff believes that by-right development would provide much less benefit to the City. The proposed approach, going forward with an approved plan which leaves open the straightening of the bridge as an alternative--with the choice made by City Council at some later date--seems to staff to be the best approach to the plan approval. And it is an approach to which CAP has agreed, although they still prefer approval of their original proposed plan.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the City approve staff’s proposed “concept plan” which includes future potential, as described in the staff conditions, for implementation of the “alternative concept plan” subject to all of the proposed staff conditions. This approval would incorporate all of the changes reflected on the staff proposed “concept plan sheet,” “alternative concept plan sheet,” “concept plan design guidelines,” and “alternative concept plan design guidelines.”

SECTION 5: CONDITIONS

Introduction -- Findings

F-1. The applicant, Commonwealth Atlantic Properties (“CAP”),¹ has submitted various documents related to its application for approval of a concept plan for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Coordinated Development District,² less the portion of the district known as Old Town Greens, which is located on the east side of the Metro rail tracks, between Slater's Lane and the Potomac Greens site.³ Two of these documents are considered to constitute the applicant's Proposed Concept Plan for this CDD: (1) the plan sheet entitled “Conceptual Design Plan, Overall Plan, Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Coordinated Development District,” dated “05/99” (hereinafter referred to as the “Proposed Overall Plan Sheet”); and (2) the document entitled “Potomac Yard Urban Design Guidelines,” dated March 12, 1999, and reissued April 28, 1999 (referred to as the “Proposed Design Guidelines”).⁴

¹ Unless the context plainly indicates otherwise, the term “CAP” includes any successor to the applicant CAP's interest in any of the property which makes up the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Coordinated Development District. Thus, obligations imposed on CAP by these conditions are also imposed on those to whom CAP conveys property within the Coordinated Development District.

² Other documents submitted by CAP in conjunction with its application, including the application itself, the illustrative concept plan, and responses to issues raised by the City are considered background and information materials, and are not included in any concept plan that is being recommended for approval. CAP's entire concept plan application is contained in a separate three-ring binder.

³ Hereinafter, the terms “Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Coordinated Development District” and the “CDD” shall refer to the portion of this coordinated development district that is covered by CAP's concept plan application.

⁴ The Proposed Overall Plan Sheet and the Proposed Design Guidelines are set out following tab 2 and tab 3, respectively, in the separate three-ring binder that contains CAP's concept plan application.

- F-2. The concept plan that is being recommended for approval for the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Coordinated Development District (the “**Concept Plan**”) consists of the following:
- (a) the Proposed Overall Plan Sheet, as modified by staff to reflect the changes which staff is recommending to the applicant's proposal (this modified sheet is referred to as the “**Concept Plan Sheet**” and is attached as Attachment A-1);
 - (b) the Proposed Design Guidelines, as modified by staff to reflect the changes which staff is recommending to the applicant's proposal (these modified guidelines are referred to as the “**Concept Plan Design Guidelines**” and are attached as Attachment A-2); and
 - (c) the conditions set out below under the heading, “Plan Conditions” (the “**Concept Plan Conditions**”).
- F-3. In addition, an alternative to the Concept Plan is also being recommended for approval, although this recommendation, as explained below in paragraph 4, is conditioned upon the occurrence of certain events in the future. This alternative concept plan is referred to as the “**Alternative Concept Plan.**” The Alternative Concept Plan consists of the following:
- (a) the Concept Plan Sheet, as modified by staff to reflect the changes which this conditional plan makes to the Concept Plan (this modified sheet is referred to as the “**Alternative Concept Plan Sheet**” and is attached as Attachment B-1);
 - (b) the Concept Plan Design Guidelines, as modified by staff to reflect the changes which the conditional plan makes to the Concept Plan (these modified guidelines are referred to as the “**Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines**” and consist of the Concept Plan Design Guidelines less the pages of these guidelines which need to be revised to incorporate changes called for by the conditional plan, plus replacement pages for the removed pages that contain these changes (the “**Replacement Pages**” which are attached as Attachment B-2); and
 - (c) the conditions set out below under the heading, “Plan Conditions” (the “**Alternative Concept Plan Conditions**”).⁵

⁵ The Alternative Concept Plan Conditions differ primarily from the Concept Plan Conditions in that they contain additional provisions that address the construction of the New Route 1 Connector (a term defined in paragraph 4), the demolition of the Monroe Avenue bridge and the realignment of Monroe Avenue.

- F-4. The major land use distinction between the Concept Plan and the Alternative Concept Plan involves the portion of the CDD that lies west of the relocated rail lines and generally to the south of Howell Avenue (extended into the CDD). In this area, the Alternative Concept Plan primarily differs from the Concept Plan in that it provides: (i) for the elimination of the current Monroe Avenue bridge and of the current Route 1 roadway between Monroe Avenue and Howell Avenue; (ii) for the construction of a new road structure that provides a direct and relatively straight connection between the intersection of Route 1 and Slater's Lane, at the east end of the current Monroe Avenue bridge, and Route 1 in the vicinity of Howell Avenue (the "New Route 1 Connector"); (iii) for the realignment of certain streets, including Monroe Avenue and its tie-in to the New Route 1 Connector; and (iv) for changes in proposed land uses and proposed areas of open space largely in this portion of the CDD.

Plan Conditions⁶

The Alternative Concept Plan Trigger Condition

1. The Concept Plan shall be the operative concept plan for the CDD, under § 5-604 of the Zoning Ordinance, unless and until the condition set forth in this paragraph (the "Trigger") is timely satisfied and written notice of its satisfaction is provided by the City Manager to CAP, in which case the Alternative Concept Plan shall become and remain the operative concept plan for the CDD until amended or rescinded by City Council. The Trigger is as follows:
 - (a) On or before October 1, 2000, CAP shall prepare, and submit to the City for its review and its approval or disapproval (which review shall not exceed 120 days), construction documents, in sufficient detail to obtain construction bids, for both the infrastructure to be constructed and the related work to be undertaken pursuant to the "Route 1/Monroe Avenue Bridge/Potomac Avenue Connection Design -- Concept Plan," (the "Concept Plan Connection Design") and the infrastructure to be constructed and the related work to be undertaken pursuant to the "Route 1/Monroe Avenue Bridge/Potomac Avenue Connection Design -- Alternative Concept Plan" (the "Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design.") (These two "Connection Designs," which show alternative ways of connecting the new "spine road," or Potomac Avenue, with Route 1 and, more generally, the different infrastructure schemes for the portion of the CDD that lies, generally, between the northern side of Howell Avenue (extended into the CDD) and the southern side of the Monroe

⁶ These conditions are applicable to, and are a part of, both the Concept Plan and the Alternative Concept Plan, except where otherwise expressly provided in the paragraphs below or where it is obvious from a condition that it applies only to one plan.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

Avenue bridge, are shown in the document entitled "Route 1/Monroe Avenue Bridge/Potomac Avenue Connection Concept Design --Two Options," which is attached as Attachment C.)

- (b) After receiving the City's approval of the construction documents, CAP shall obtain from construction and engineering (and any other appropriate professional) firms, which are acceptable to the City, estimates of the construction cost for each of these two Connection Designs. The cost estimate for the Concept Plan Connection Design shall be known as the "Concept Plan Cost Estimate," and the cost estimate for the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design shall be known as the "Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate." No later than 120 days after receiving the City's approval of the construction documents, CAP shall submit the Concept Plan Cost Estimate and the Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate, along with detailed information showing the basis for each estimate, to the City for its review and approval. The City shall have 150 days from its receipt of the Concept Plan Cost Estimate and the Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate to review and determine whether or not to approve them.
- (c) No later than 90 days after its approval of the Concept Plan Cost Estimate and the Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate (the "Trigger Deadline"), and based on these estimates, the City shall determine whether it will assume responsibility for the difference between (i) the actual cost for constructing the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design generally in accordance with the construction documents approved by the City pursuant to subparagraph (a) (the "Alternative Concept Plan Actual Cost") and (ii) the projected "actual" cost for constructing the Concept Plan Connection Design (the "Concept Plan Projected Actual Cost"), such difference to be known as the "Plan Cost Difference."

The Concept Plan Projected Actual Cost shall be the sum of (i) an amount equal to the Concept Plan Cost Estimate less the Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost -- Total (as defined below), multiplied by the fraction which has as its numerator an amount equal to the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Cost less the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Special Cost -- Total (as defined below), and as its denominator an amount equal to the Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate less the Alternative Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost -- Total (as defined below), and (ii) an amount equal to the sum of five individual amounts calculated separately on the basis of the following formula for each Special Cost (as defined below): the Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost (as defined below), multiplied by the fraction which has as its numerator the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Special Cost (as defined below) and as its denominator the Alternative Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost (as defined below).

For each Special Cost, the Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost shall be defined as the portion of the Concept Plan Cost Estimate that is estimated for the particular Special Cost; the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Special Cost shall be defined as the portion of the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Cost that consists of the particular Special Cost; and the Alternative Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost shall be defined as the portion of the Alternative Concept Plan Cost Estimate that is estimated for the particular Special Cost. The Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost -- Total shall equal the sum of the Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost for all Special Costs. The Alternative Concept Plan Actual Special Cost -- Total shall equal the sum of the Alternative Concept Plan Actual Special Cost for all Special Costs. The Alternative Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost -- Total shall equal the sum of the Alternative Concept Plan Estimated Special Cost for all Special Costs.

A Special Cost shall be defined to be the cost to accomplish, or the cost otherwise associated with, each of the following matters which relate to activities that will be undertaken in the course of implementing the Concept Plan Connection Design, the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, or both.

- (1) Special Cost -- Demolition: the cost to remove the existing Monroe Avenue bridge, including removal of bridge abutments, approach lanes to the bridge, and subsurface structures supporting the bridge, and disposal of waste materials, but excluding any cost premium or cost saving under subparagraph (c)(5). It is anticipated that this cost, for the most part, would be incurred in the implementation of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, but not in the implementation of the Concept Plan Connection Design;
- (2) Special Cost -- Maintenance of Traffic: the cost of activities required to maintain acceptable traffic conditions on Route 1 (e.g., placement or construction of temporary structures) and of the consequences that such activities or other traffic maintenance requirements will have on other construction activities (e.g., increased cost due to construction activities having to be performed outside of normal hours, or due to limitations being placed on the hours in a period during which construction activities may take place), but excluding any cost premium or cost saving under subparagraph (c)(5). It is anticipated that this cost would be incurred in the implementation of both the Concept Plan Connection Design and the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, but that the cost would be higher under the latter plan;
- (3) Special Cost -- Relocation of Utilities: the cost to relocate existing underground utilities, but excluding any cost premium or cost saving under subparagraph (c)(5). It is anticipated that this cost would be incurred in the implementation of both the Concept Plan Connection Design and the

Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, but that the cost would be higher under the latter plan;

- (4) Special Cost -- Soils: the cost of activities associated with the foundation systems of the bridge or bridge system connecting Route 1, at its intersection with Slater's Lane, with a roadway within the presently-defined Potomac Yard, which activities are required by actual soil conditions within the Yard that differ from the conditions that were used in preparing the cost estimates under subparagraph (b) above, but excluding any cost premium or cost saving under subparagraph (c)(5). It is anticipated that this cost would be incurred in the implementation of both the Concept Plan Connection Design and the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, but that the cost would be higher under the latter plan; and
 - (5) Special Cost -- City Construction: the cost premium or the cost saving, regardless of the cost item, due to the City itself undertaking the construction of a portion of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design pursuant to subparagraph (e) below. This cost premium or cost saving, if any, would be incurred only if the Alternative Concept Connection Design were constructed and the City were to decide to construct a portion of this connection design.
- (d) If the City determines that it will assume responsibility for the Plan Cost Difference, and if it conveys this determination in writing to CAP on or before the Trigger Deadline, then the Concept Plan shall no longer be of any force or effect, and shall be replaced by the Alternative Concept Plan as the operative concept plan, under § 5-604 of the Zoning Ordinance, for the CDD. If the City determines that it will not assume responsibility for the amount of the Plan Cost Difference, or if it conveys no determination to CAP before the Trigger Deadline, then the Concept Plan shall remain the operative concept plan, under § 5-604 of the Zoning Ordinance, for the CDD.
- (e) If the City determines that it will assume responsibility for the Plan Cost Difference, then it shall exercise that responsibility either by constructing a portion of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design that has a construction cost equal to the amount of the Plan Cost Difference, by contributing the amount of the Plan Cost Difference toward CAP's construction of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, or by otherwise making funds equal in amount to the Plan Cost Difference available for the construction of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design. Whether the City constructs a portion of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design, contributes toward the construction of the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design or otherwise makes funds available toward such construction is a determination to be made by the City in its sole discretion.

- (f) In the event that the Alternative Concept Plan becomes the operative concept plan pursuant to subparagraph (d) above, within 90 days of submission by the Applicant to the City of the preliminary development plan for a development consisting of 250,000 square feet or less or, if larger, for a development consisting of a single building, which development, upon completion, would require, in order to secure a certificate of occupancy for all its square footage, completion of the infrastructure improvements described in subparagraphs 15(a) and 15(d) below (the "Trigger Plan"), the City shall provide the Applicant with evidence that funds for the Plan Cost Difference will be available for the purpose of constructing the Alternative Concept Plan Connection Design within one year of the date such evidence is provided. In the event that such evidence cannot be provided by the City within the required time period, then the Alternative Concept Plan shall no longer be of any force or effect, and shall be replaced by the Concept Plan as the operative concept plan, under § 5-604 of the Zoning Ordinance, for the CDD.
- (g) In the event the City disapproves construction documents submitted to it by CAP under subparagraph (a), or disapproves the Concept Plan Cost Estimate or Alternative Plan Cost Estimate submitted to it by CAP under subparagraph (b), the City shall, at the same time it notifies CAP of its disapproval, inform CAP of the basis for its disapproval. Thereafter, and within a reasonable period of time, CAP shall revise the construction documents or adjust the cost estimates to address the basis for the City's disapproval, and submit the revised documents or adjusted estimates to the City for its approval or disapproval, which the City shall provide within 60 days of its receipt of the CAP submission. This process shall continue until City approval of the construction documents or cost estimates has been obtained. Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the City shall not unreasonably withhold its approval of any construction documents or any costs estimates submitted to it by CAP.

General Conditions

2. Any preliminary development plan for the CDD, filed or pursued under § 5-605 of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be consistent with, and shall meet all requirements which are part of, the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan, including the design guidelines which are part of the operative concept plan; provided, that no preliminary development plan for any portion of the CDD to the west of the relocated rail lines and to the south of Howell Avenue (extended into the CDD), and no site plan proposing a permitted or special use in this portion of the CDD, may be filed or pursued by CAP prior to the Trigger Deadline.
3. CAP may transfer square footage that is approved in the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan from one to another landbay, with the approval of the Director of P&Z, subject to the following limitations:

- (a) no transfer shall cause the net square footage of retail use or office use, or the number of dwelling units, in a landbay (i.e., whether the transferor or transferee landbay) to increase or decrease by 15% or more from the net retail square footage or the net office square footage, or the number of dwelling units, approved for that landbay in the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan;
 - (b) no transfer shall cause or result in the transfer of any square footage of retail use from landbay "G" (the "Town Center"); and
 - (c) no transfer shall cause or result in a change to any element in or part of the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan other than an increase or decrease in the amount of retail or office use, or in the number of dwelling units, that is consistent with subparagraph (a).
4. For purposes of these concept plan conditions, "retail" is defined to include retail shopping establishments, restaurants, personal service establishments, banks, amusement enterprises, health clubs and any other activity that involves a significant degree of pedestrian activity, as determined by the Director of P&Z. Within landbay "G," space approved for "retail" use shall only be occupied by retail use. In landbays other than landbay "G," space approved for retail use may be utilized for a non-retail use if, after two years of continuous, reasonable marketing efforts, the space remains vacant.
5. In addition to the preliminary development plan approval that is required for every building constructed within the CDD pursuant to an approved concept plan, any use locating within such a building, which is a "special use" under the regulations in effect at the time of this concept plan approval for the CD, CG or CL zone in the City's Zoning Ordinance, shall obtain a separate special use permit, pursuant to section 11-500 of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. Accessory residential units (e.g., Granny Flats) may be constructed within the CDD only if they are counted as residential units and all required parking is provided.

Open Space Conditions

7. The following open spaces within the CDD shall, upon the completion of their improvements, be dedicated by CAP to the City:
- (a) the portion of Braddock Field, which is within Potomac Yard Park, as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines (this portion of the field lies within the CDD and will be combined with public land adjacent to the CDD to form the field that is to be improved by CAP);
 - (b) Monroe Field No. 1, which is within Potomac Yard Park, as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines;

- (c) Monroe Field No. 2, which is within Potomac Yard Park (a playfield that staff has relocated from Potomac Greens to the Yard), as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines;
- (d) the remainder of Potomac Yard Park (i.e., Potomac Yard Park, less the three fields identified in subparagraphs (a) through (c); also referred to below as the “Potomac Yard Linear Park”), as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines;
- (e) the southern portion of CAP’s proposed Rail Park (i.e. all of the proposed park except the northern most approximately 1.2 acres) that is described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines;
- (f) Howell Park, as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines;
- (g) the finger parks along Custis Avenue and Swann Avenue, as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines; and
- (h) the portion of Potomac Greens Park that consists of approximately 16 acres of environmentally-protected land located in the northern and eastern portions of landbay A, and an additional parcel of approximately one acre located immediately adjacent to said portion of the park at the north end of the landbay A development, as described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines.

All improvements to these and to the other open spaces within the CDD that are described in the Concept Plan Design Guidelines and the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines, including the portion of the improvements to Braddock Field that will occur on the public property which is currently part of George Washington Middle School, shall be designed and constructed, including with respect to infrastructure and uses, in conformance with the Concept Plan Design Guidelines or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan Design Guidelines, and shall be completed in accordance with the schedule in paragraph 15 below. The improvements to the open spaces identified in subparagraphs (a) through (h) above shall be completed by CAP, and accepted by the City, prior to the space being dedicated to the City. All dedicated open space, following its acceptance by the City, shall be maintained by the City. The remainder of the open spaces in the CDD shall not be owned by the City, and shall be privately maintained. However, a public access easement shall be conveyed by CAP to the City for all such non-dedicated open spaces (except the non-dedicated northern portion of Rail Park) which will provide access to these open spaces to members of the public (including, where appropriate, access for bicycle purposes); provided, that access to and use

of one of such spaces, the Town Green on landbay G, may occasionally be limited to the owners and tenants of adjacent or nearby buildings, and their invitees, with the consent of the Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Affairs, which consent may not be unreasonably withheld.

8. Landbay “E” (Four Mile Run) shall be made available by CAP for commercial recreational uses, such as an ice rink, a tennis facility, a rock-climbing barn, a health club facility or a boating facility and may be made available for an ancillary restaurant use, commencing with approval of this concept plan for the CDD; provided, that, to the extent the approval of the National Park Service is necessary for such uses of this landbay, its approval shall be obtained. Landbay “E” shall be made available for these commercial recreational uses at rates that will attract and support them. If this landbay is not fully utilized in this manner at the time that 2,000,000 square feet of CDD development, including the retail square footage in landbay F (the Retail Center), has received final site plan approval, then CAP shall submit to the City an alternative plan for the landbay which provides for the provision of recreational amenities directly by CAP. Following final site plan approval for this 2,000,000 square feet of development, no applications for preliminary development approvals within the CDD will be processed by the City until such an alternative plan for landbay “E” is presented and approved.

Grading Condition

9. The portion of the CDD to the west of the relocated rail lines and to the south of Howell Avenue (extended into the CDD), to the district's southern boundary, shall be graded so that the grades in this part of the CDD are designed in accordance with good engineering practices and blend gradually, without any abrupt changes, into the existing grades of the adjacent neighborhoods and the George Washington Middle School.

Parking Conditions

10. No parking reductions shall be requested for any residential uses within the CDD, except for “Granny Flats” where the requirement may only be reduced to one space per flat and where a limited number of on-street parking spaces may be used to meet the parking requirement.
11. A minimum of 15% visitor parking, which may be on- or off-street, shall be provided for all residential uses.

Phasing and Preliminary Development Plan Processing Conditions

12. The CDD Landbay, Infrastructure and Open Space Phasing Plan

- (a) The very first preliminary development plan application (excluding the preliminary development plan for Braddock Field) that is filed for the CDD shall be accompanied by a “**CDD Landbay, Infrastructure and Open Space Phasing Plan**” (the “CDD Phasing Plan”), which shall be updated and submitted with each subsequent preliminary development plan application that seeks approval of one or more buildings or structures within the CDD. No such preliminary development plan shall be approved unless the Director of P&Z and the Director of T&ES have approved the CDD Phasing Plan which accompanies the development plan application. The initial and each updated CDD Phasing Plan is intended to inform the City of CAP's projections regarding the timing and nature of landbay, infrastructure and open space construction activities, and to ensure that the construction of the infrastructure systems identified below in subparagraph (b)(ii) is pursuant to a comprehensive plan, covering the entire CDD, that has been approved by the City. Notwithstanding the above, CAP may, at its discretion, submit an updated CDD Phasing Plan from time to time for review and approval by the Director of P&Z and the Director of T&ES; provided, that no such submission shall relieve CAP of the requirement that it submit an updated CDD Phasing Plan with each preliminary development plan application that seeks approval of one or more buildings or structures within the CDD.
- (b) The initial and each subsequent CDD Phasing Plan shall satisfy the following conditions and requirements.
 - (i) As to landbays, the plan shall provide, for each landbay within the CDD, a general outline of the landbay and CAP's most up-to-date projection of the times when construction of the different land uses (i.e., office, retail, hotel and residential) described in the operative concept plan for the landbay is likely to commence.
 - (ii) As to infrastructure, the plan shall provide, for each of the systems of infrastructure identified below in this subparagraph, (x) the general location and layout of the major components, or the backbone, of the system (such components to be determined by the Director of T&ES), and (y) the times when construction of these major system components is expected to commence (provided, that the projected times for the commencement of construction of these components shall be consistent with the schedule in paragraph 15 below). The systems of infrastructure to be addressed are:

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

- (A) the system of major streets to be constructed within the CDD, which shall consist of the streets identified below in paragraph 15 and the four major east-west streets to be constructed within the CDD (East Glebe, Swann, Custis and Howell);
 - (B) the sanitary sewer system to be constructed within the CDD, including the Trunk Sewer (as defined below in paragraph 22);
 - (C) the stormwater sewer system to be constructed within the CDD; and
 - (D) the utility systems to be constructed within the CDD (e.g., electricity, water, gas, phone/communications and cable).
- (iii) As to open spaces, the plan shall provide, as to each open space area identified in the design guidelines (except neighborhood open spaces) for the operative concept plan, (x) the general location of the open space, and (y) the time when construction of the improvements to the open space is expected to commence (provided, that the projected times for the commencement of construction of the improvements shall be consistent with the schedule in paragraph 15 below).

13. The Landbay Preliminary Infrastructure, Open Space and Use Plan

- (a) The first preliminary development plan that proposes the construction of a building or structure within a landbay in the CDD shall be accompanied by a “**Landbay Preliminary Infrastructure, Open Space and Use Plan**” (the “Landbay Preliminary Plan”). This plan shall (i) show, at a level of detail defined by the Director of T&ES, all streets and sidewalks, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and utilities (e.g., electricity, water, gas, phone/communications and cable), and any other infrastructure items identified by the Director, that will be constructed within or otherwise to serve the landbay, (ii) show all the open spaces within the landbay, whether public or private, that are described in the operative concept plan, and (iii) show the general locations within the landbay of the other uses identified for the landbay in the operative concept plan. It is anticipated that the Director of T&ES will require the Landbay Preliminary Plan at least to contain preliminary plans and profiles for the streets and sidewalks, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and utilities to be constructed within or otherwise to serve the landbay. The Landbay Preliminary Plan that accompanies the first preliminary development plan for a landbay shall be submitted to City Council along with the development plan, and shall be approved by Council in conjunction with its approval of the development plan.

- (b) Any subsequent preliminary development plan for the same landbay that requires or involves modifications (including additions) to the previously approved Landbay Preliminary Plan shall be accompanied by a new Landbay Preliminary Plan which includes all such modifications and complies with subparagraph (a). This new plan shall be submitted to City Council along with the preliminary development plan, and shall be approved by Council in conjunction with its approval of the development plan.
 - (c) Within 60 days of the approval of the first preliminary development plan for a landbay, and within 20 days of the approval of all subsequent preliminary development plans for such landbay, the Director of T&ES shall identify the components of the landbay's streets and sidewalks, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and utilities (and other infrastructure items identified by the Director under subparagraph (a)) that are shown in the approved Landbay Preliminary Plan, and the components of the landbay's open spaces that are shown in that Landbay Preliminary Plan, for which final engineering plans, profiles and, where applicable, calculations shall be submitted along with the final site plan for the landbay development that has just received development plan approval. No final site plan for a building or structure within a landbay shall be released unless the Director of T&ES has received as part of the final site plan submission, and has approved, the engineering plans, profiles and calculations for the infrastructure and open space components which the Director had identified.
14. The Directors of T&ES and P&Z may require that infrastructure, open spaces, land uses and other matters located outside of the landbay that is the subject of a preliminary development plan application also be shown and addressed in the application, if they deemed it necessary to properly assess the proposed development plan.
15. Construction of the infrastructure and open space improvements identified in the schedule below shall be commenced or completed in accordance with the dates or events in the schedule, unless a variation from the schedule is approved by City Council in conjunction with the approval of a preliminary development plan for the CDD. Following the completion of their construction, the new streets and the improvements to existing streets, which are identified in the schedule, shall be dedicated by CAP to the City.

Infrastructure Improvement

Commencement or Completion

Date/Event

Streets

- (a) Potomac Avenue (Spine Road)⁷ ----- Construction of this road from its tie-in with South Glebe Road or Crystal Drive in Arlington, to either, if the Concept Plan is in effect, a tie-in with Route 1 at its current intersection with Slater's Lane and the east end of the Monroe Avenue bridge, or, if the Alternative Concept Plan is in effect, a tie-in with the New Route 1 Connector (see paragraph 15(d)), shall be completed before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the earliest of the following:⁸ (i) for 800,000 square feet of new office development in the portion of the CDD west of the relocated rail lines (including office development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval; (ii) for 1,750,000 square feet of any new development in this portion of the CDD (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses, but excluding hotel uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval; or (iii) for 3,250,000 square feet of any new development in this portion of the CDD and/or in the

⁷In the event the Alternative Concept Plan is in effect, and the City elects, under paragraph 1(e) above, to construct all or a portion of Potomac Avenue (the Spine Road), then the Applicant's ability to develop and receive certificates of occupancy within the CDD shall be affected by the date on which the construction of Potomac Avenue is completed only (i) if the City commences construction at or before the time that the construction would have been commenced by Applicant in order to have the construction completed within the deadlines in this subparagraph (a), and (ii) if the City thereafter diligently pursues the construction to completion.

⁸ Where a condition requires an act or event to occur prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for a specified amount or type of development, if the act or event has not occurred at the time the certificate of occupancy is sought, the certificate shall not be issued until the occurrence of the act or event.

Arlington County portion of the Potomac Yard (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses, but excluding hotel uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval. Notwithstanding anything in this subparagraph (a) to the contrary, unless construction of this road has already occurred pursuant to this subparagraph, construction of the Spine Road from its tie-in with either South Glebe Road or Crystal Drive in Arlington to a tie-in, at grade, with current Route 1 in the vicinity of Windsor Avenue (or another location determined by the Director of T&ES) shall be completed before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for 2,000,000 square feet of any new development in this portion of the CDD and/or in the Arlington County portion of the Potomac Yard (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses, but excluding hotel uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval.

- (b) Main Street and South Main Street----- Construction shall occur in phases with each landbay, and such construction shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for the landbay

- (c) Route 1 Improvements⁹ ----- Construction shall commence within 30 days of final site plan approval for 250,000 square feet of new development in the portion of the CDD west of the relocated rail lines (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses), for which final

⁹ The Route 1 Improvements under the Concept Plan differ from those under the Alternative Concept Plan. The primary difference is that, under the Concept Plan, the improvements run from Monroe Avenue to East Glebe Road. Under the Alternative Concept Plan, which calls for the removal of the Monroe Avenue bridge and the realignment of Monroe Avenue, the improvements run, generally, from Howell Avenue to East Glebe Road.

site plan approval has been given after the date of concept plan approval, and shall thereafter be diligently pursued to completion; provided, that no construction shall occur between Monroe Avenue and Windsor Avenue until after the Trigger Deadline, and then only if the Concept Plan remains the operative concept plan following the deadline

- (d) Monroe Avenue bridge removal, -----
New Route 1 Connector and
Monroe Avenue realignment¹⁰
- Demolition of the current bridge, construction of the new connector and realignment of Monroe Avenue shall be completed before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the earliest of the following: (i) for 800,000 square feet of new office development in the portion of the CDD west of the relocated rail lines (including office development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval; (ii) for 1,750,000 square feet of any new development in this portion of the CDD (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses, but excluding hotel uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval; or (iii) for 3,250,000 square feet of any new development in this portion of the CDD and/or in the

¹⁰ These infrastructure items are only required under the Alternative Concept Plan. See paragraph 4 above. Realignment of Monroe Avenue shall include tying the avenue into the street system within the CDD in a manner approved by the Director of T&ES. In addition, in the event the Alternative Concept Plan is in effect, and the City elects, under paragraph 1(e) above, to undertake all or a portion of the Monroe Avenue bridge removal, or of the construction of the New Route 1 Connector or the Monroe Avenue realignment, then the Applicant's ability to develop and receive certificates of occupancy within the CDD shall be affected by the date on which the construction of the New Route 1 Connector or of the Monroe Avenue realignment is completed only (i) if the City commences the removal or construction, or if applicable both the removal and construction, at or before the time that it would have been commenced by Applicant in order to have the removal and construction completed within the deadlines in this subparagraph (d), and (ii) if the City thereafter diligently pursues the removal and construction to completion.

Arlington County portion of the Potomac Yard (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses, but excluding hotel uses), for which final site plan approval is given after the date of concept plan approval

- (e) East Glebe Road¹¹ ----- Construction shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for landbay G
- (f) Swann Avenue----- Construction shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for landbay H
- (g) Custis Avenue ----- Construction shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for landbay I
- (h) Howell Avenue ----- Construction shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for landbay J

Sewers

- (i) Trunk Sewer¹² (to the wastewater ----- See paragraphs 22 and 23 below treatment plant operated by the Alexandria Sanitation Authority)
- (j) Collection System¹³ ----- See paragraph 24 below
- (k) Stormwater sewers ----- See paragraph 26 below

Stormwater Treatment

- (l) Master stormwater quality concept----- See paragraph 27 below plan

¹¹ The streets addressed in subparagraphs (e) through (h) are east-west streets that are to be constructed within the CDD.

¹² The Trunk Sewer is defined in paragraph 22 below.

¹³ The Collection System is defined in paragraph 24 below.

Open Space Improvement

Commencement or Completion
Date/Event

- (m) Braddock Field¹⁴ ----- A preliminary development plan for the construction of this field shall be submitted to the City within four months of CAP's receipt of all necessary City and School Board consents to use public property on the site of the George Washington Middle School (see note 14); a final development plan shall be submitted to the City within two months of preliminary development plan approval; construction shall commence within three months of City approval of such final development plan, and shall thereafter be diligently pursued to completion.
- (n) Monroe Fields (final fields) ----- In the event the City determines not to assume responsibility for the Plan Cost Difference under paragraph 1 above, a preliminary development plan shall be submitted to the City within three months of such determination, a final development plan shall be submitted to the City within two months of the approval of the preliminary development plan, and construction shall be commenced within three months of the approval of the final development plan and thereafter diligently pursued to completion; in the event the City determines to assume responsibility for the Plan Cost Difference under paragraph 1 above, construction shall commence within three months of completion of construction of the New Route 1 Connector and there-after be diligently pursued to completion.

¹⁴ Braddock Field includes public land that is currently part of George Washington Middle School. The improvement of Braddock Field, therefore, requires the cooperation and consent of the City and the School Board.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

- (o) Monroe Fields (interim fields)¹⁵ ----- A plan for the construction of these fields shall be submitted to the City within four months of concept plan approval; construction shall commence within three months of City approval of such plan, and shall thereafter be diligently pursued to completion

- (p) Pedestrian Bridge across rail tracks ---- Construction shall commence within 30 days of final site plan approval for 1,000,000 square feet of new development within the CDD (including development consisting of interim, permitted and special uses), for which final site plan approval has been given after the date of concept plan approval, and shall thereafter be diligently pursued to completion.

- (q) Potomac Yard Linear Park¹⁶ ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of each landbay which is adjacent to the Linear Park, and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for the landbay; provided, that construction of the entire park shall be completed before the approval by final site plan of 2.5 million square feet of new development within the CDD

- (r) Rail Park ----- Construction, including only the planting of a ground cover acceptable to the Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Affairs, on the

¹⁵ The final Monroe Fields are unlikely to be constructed for many years. Therefore, CAP shall construct two fence-enclosed, regulation-size interim soccer fields, with parking for 65 vehicles and vehicular access to Route 1, at a location within the portion of the CDD west of the relocated rail lines which is approved by the Director of P&Z. Once the construction of these fields has been accepted by the City, the fields shall be operated and maintained by the City. These interim fields shall remain in use until construction of the final Monroe Fields is completed or, if earlier, the City determines no longer to utilize the interim fields.

¹⁶ Potomac Yard Linear Park is the portion of Potomac Yard Park that lies along the rail lines on the east side of the Yard. It does not include Braddock Park, Monroe Field No. 1 or Monroe Field No. 2, all of which are also part of Potomac Yard Park.

CDD #99-01
POTOMAC YARD/POTOMAC GREENS

northern 1.2 acres of this park, shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “A,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

- (s) Potomac Greens Park ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “A,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

- (t) Howell Park ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “J,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

- (u) Swann Finger Park ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “H,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

- (v) Custis Finger Park ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “I,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

- (w) Neighborhood Parks ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of the landbay in which the particular neighborhood park is located, and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for the landbay

- (x) Landbay “C” landscaping ----- Construction shall occur in conjunction with the development of landbay “A,” and shall be completed by the date or event described in the initial preliminary development plan approval for this landbay

15A. Possible Future School Site

- (a) A portion of the component of Potomac Yard Park consisting of Monroe Fields No. 1 and No. 2 — the portion to be identified by the Director of P&Z and the Superintendent of the Alexandria Public Schools (“ACPS”), and not to exceed three acres — shall be reserved and made available for the construction of a new ACPS school if, in the future, it is jointly determined by the city council and the school board to locate a new school at this site. If such a determination is made, and it is further determined by the council and board that more than the reserved land is needed for construction of the new school, then up to an additional two acres of adjacent land will be made available for the new school. Notwithstanding the prior provisions of this paragraph, the area that is identified by the Director and Superintendent shall be improved in accordance with the operative concept plan and paragraphs 15(n) and 15(o) above, and shall thereafter be both maintained as public open space and utilized for active recreation purposes until such time as it is determined to utilize the area for a new ACPS school.
 - (b) In recognition of the possibility that, in the future, a portion of Potomac Yard Park may be removed from active recreational use and placed in school use, CAP shall improve an area of approximately three acres, for active recreational use, in the Potomac Yard linear Park (see note 15) , in the general vicinity of land bays “H” and “I,” and at a specific location to be determined by the Director of P&Z. The size of this area and the precise nature of these recreational improvements shall be determined by the Director of P&Z , after consultation with the City’s Parks and Recreation Commission, the Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Affairs, and CAP. Construction of these improvements shall occur at the time that development in this portion of the Linear Park is to occur under paragraph 15(q), and shall comply with applicable design guidelines.
16. A separate preliminary development plan shall be submitted by CAP for each of the open space areas that is to be dedicated to the City (see paragraph 7 above). The plan shall be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council, pursuant to the provisions of section 5-600 of the Zoning Ordinance.

17. A Potomac Yard Design Advisory Committee (the “PYDAC”) shall be established to assist the city in reviewing applications for preliminary development plan approval.
- (a.) The PYDAC shall consist of seven members to be appointed by City Council for staggered terms of no more than two years each. The Committee shall include two members representing the Potomac West area; the remaining five members shall be from the City at-large and shall include three representatives of residential neighborhoods and the business community and two qualified professionals skilled in architecture.
 - (b) The PYDAC shall be authorized to review applications for preliminary development plan approvals for compliance with the “Potomac Yard Urban Design Guidelines,” which are contained within the Concept Plan Design Guidelines or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Design Guidelines, and shall send its recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council for their consideration.
 - (c) The Director of P&Z shall send a copy of any proposed preliminary development plan for the CDD to the PYDAC, and the PYDAC shall send its comments to the Director of P&Z in time to be sent out with the staff report to the Planning Commission on the proposed plan . Each applicant for a preliminary development plan approval will be encouraged to discuss its proposal with the PYDAC, including prior to the time an application is filed.
 - (d) The PYDAC shall establish a regular schedule which provides for meetings once a month. Additional meetings may be scheduled at the discretion of the PYDAC.

Permitted/Special/Interim Use Conditions

18. The Avis and GSA facilities presently located within the Potomac Yard are acknowledged to be, and shall be treated as, existing permitted uses. Nonetheless, in the event that compliance with the schedule in paragraph 15 above requires the construction of an infrastructure or open space improvement in the area occupied by one or both of these existing uses, then whatever modifications to these uses are required to accommodate the required improvement shall be made; if such modifications are not made, no further development in the CDD pursuant to the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan may proceed. Further, unless approved as interim uses as part of the approval of the first preliminary development plan for the landbay in which they are located, the Avis and GSA facilities shall cease operation within 180 days of the date of approval for that preliminary plan.

19. Land uses not approved in the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan, which are proposed for a landbay in the CDD for which no preliminary development plan (other than a development plan addressing only the development of open space) has been approved, shall be evaluated under the provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for the underlying zone applicable to the landbay. If defined as a special use under those provisions, such uses shall require a special use permit and, if defined as a permitted use, shall only require site plan approval; provided, that no such uses may proceed if they would “preclude development consistent with the conceptual design plan” (section 5-603(A)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance). A proposed permitted or special use shall be determined to “preclude development consistent with the conceptual design plan” if:
- (a) development pursuant to the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan, and in the landbay where the proposed use is to be located, is expected to commence before the expiration of the period during which the proposed use will be permitted to, or is reasonably expected to, continue;
 - (b) the use is proposed for a landbay that is adjacent to a landbay for which a preliminary development plan has been approved by City Council, and the Director of P&Z determines that the proposed use is incompatible with one or more of the uses identified in that approved development plan; or
 - (c) the use, if undertaken, would preclude the delivery of an infrastructure improvement identified in paragraph 15 above by the time set out in that paragraph.
20. Any land use that is lawfully existing in a landbay within the CDD, whether as a permitted or special use, at the time the first preliminary development plan for the landbay (other than a development plan addressing only the development of open space) is submitted to the City shall be eligible to be approved as an interim use, as part of City Council's approval of the preliminary development plan. No other land uses shall be eligible for approval as interim uses within the landbay.

Affordable Housing Condition

21. Every preliminary development plan shall meet the requirements of the city-wide affordable housing policy that is in effect as the time the plan is submitted.

Sanitary and Storm Sewer Conditions

22. No preliminary development plan for any landbay west of the relocated rail lines, or for any portion of a landbay, which proposes the construction of a building or buildings pursuant to the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan, shall be approved by City

Council until (i) a new sanitary sewer line (the “Trunk Sewer”) from Potomac Yard to the Alexandria Sanitation Authority (“ASA”) wastewater treatment plant has been designed by CAP to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES and the Engineer/Director of ASA, and (ii) construction of the sewer has commenced. No Certificates of Occupancy shall be issued for any building, structure or facility within any landbay west of the relocated rail lines until the Trunk Sewer has been completed, has been accepted by the City, and is in service; provided, that, notwithstanding the status of the Trunk Sewer, certificates may be issued for buildings, structures or facility within landbay “F” (the Retail Center at the north end of the Yard), and within the warehouse complex in the Yard located generally to the east of the intersection of Route 1 Howell Avenue, which are buildings, structures or facilities that the City understood, at the time the sewage retention tank at the Four Mile Run Pump Station was constructed, were to be served by that retention tank.

23. At a minimum, the Trunk Sewer shall be designed and constructed in conformance with the following: (i) the length of the forced main and associated facilities (such as pump stations) shall be minimized; (ii) the Trunk Sewer shall be a gravity sewer for the maximum distance possible within the limits of current technology; (iii) the Trunk Sewer shall accept all the sewage now flowing to the ASA River Road Pump Station; (iv) the Trunk Sewer shall be capable of accepting a portion (to be determined by the Director of T&ES) of wet-weather flows from ASA's Four Mile Run Pump Station; (v) the Trunk Sewer shall be capable of accepting all flows from the Slater's Village/Potomac Greens Pump Station (Slater's Village is also known as Old Town Greens); and (vi) the Trunk Sewer shall be capable of accepting all the sewage from the Retail Center in landbay "F" in the event any portion of the retail center continues in operation beyond January 1, 2018. Further, the Trunk Sewer shall be built on an alignment designated by the Director of T&ES and the Engineer/Director of ASA. The closure of travel lanes on City streets and the disruption of neighborhood activities shall be minimized during construction of the Trunk Sewer.
24. No preliminary development plan for any landbay west of the relocated rail lines, or for any portion of a landbay, which proposes development pursuant to the Concept Plan or, if in effect, the Alternative Concept Plan, shall be approved by City Council until a gravity/forced main sanitary sewer collection system (the "Collection System") has been designed by CAP to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES and the Engineer/ Director of ASA, and construction of the system has commenced. At a minimum, the Collection System shall be designed to: (i) minimize the amount of forced mains and associated facilities, such as pump stations; (ii) redirect sewage flows from the ASA River Road Pump Station, and a portion (to be determined by the Director of T&ES) of wet-weather flows from the Four Mile Run Pump Station, to the Trunk Sewer; and (iii) redirect flows from the Retail Center in landbay "F" to the Trunk Sewer, in the event any portion of the Retail Center continues in operation beyond January 1, 2018.

25. No final site plan for any development within the CDD east of the relocated rail lines, shall be approved by the City, unless one of the following events has occurred:¹⁷
 - (a) a new gravity sanitary sewer has been constructed by CAP from the termination point of the forced main in Slater's Lane to the existing City sewer in Lee Street, and this new sewer has been accepted by the City and is in service; or
 - (b) the forced main from the Slater's Village/Potomac Greens Pump Station has been redirected to connect with the Trunk Sewer, and the Trunk Sewer has been accepted by the City and is in service.
26. All storm drainage systems within the CDD shall conform to the Potomac Yard Master Drainage Plan approved by the City on October 25, 1996.
27. Prior to the submission of the first preliminary development plan for any landbay within the CDD west of the relocated rail lines, a master stormwater quality concept plan for the CDD, which includes stormwater quality calculations, a description of the best management practices ("BMPs") proposed to be employed and the location of those BMPs, shall be submitted to and approved by the Director of T&ES.
28. Prior to the removal or abandonment of any existing storm or sanitary sewer that is located within the CDD, a replacement sewer shall be in place and in service, and all necessary dedications and easements relating to the replacement sewer shall have been granted and recorded.

Transportation Conditions¹⁸

29. Shuttle bus service to and from the Braddock Road Metro station and/or the Metro station in Crystal City shall be provided. The nature and extent of this service, the time when it shall commence, the time when it may terminate and similar issues shall be assessed and determined by the City in conjunction with its review of transportation management plan amendments which CAP must file along with its applications for preliminary development plan approvals.

¹⁷ This paragraph is a restatement of condition # 47 of SUP 97-0010. That SUP approved the Old Town Greens residential development now under construction between Slater's Lane and Potomac Greens, and it remains in effect.

¹⁸ Most transportation conditions for the CDD have been recommended for inclusion in the Transportation Management Plan special use permit.

30. (a) Unless and until otherwise authorized by the City as an amendment to the operative concept plan, CAP shall reserve, and shall undertake no activities (except those reasonably required for maintenance and others approved by the Director of T&ES) in, an area in the CDD, between Potomac Greens and the Potomac Yard, that would be suitable for the location of a WMATA rail station (the “Metro Site”). In order to reserve the Metro Site in this manner, CAP shall convey a deed of easement to the City, or any other party identified by the City, which entitles the grantee to use or to authorize the use of the site for a WMATA rail station and for any ancillary purposes. The deed of easement shall also provide for reasonable access to the Metro site, by users of a rail station on the site, from both the adjacent Potomac Greens site and the adjacent Potomac Yard. Within 60 days of the approval of the concept plan for this CDD, CAP shall submit to WMATA a drawing which shows, and a statement which describes the boundaries of the Metro Site, and conveys CAP’s view that the Metro Site contains sufficient land for the construction of a WMATA rail station and for reasonable bus, pedestrian and bicycle access to the station. CAP shall thereafter request, and diligently pursue, from WMATA a certification that the Metro Site contains sufficient land for the construction of a WMATA rail station and for reasonable bus, pedestrian and bicycle access to the station; provided that, with respect to this requirement for a WMATA certification, CAP shall be considered to have not satisfied the requirement only if WMATA affirmatively states that the Metro Site does not contain sufficient land for the construction of a WMATA rail station and for reasonable bus, pedestrian and bicycle access to the station.
- (b) In the event funding from sources other than CAP becomes available in the future for the construction of a WMATA rail station at the Metro Site, and the City concurs in the decision to proceed with such construction, CAP shall: (i) convey the Metro Site to WMATA, or another entity identified by WMATA, at no cost to the grantee party, for construction of a rail station (the “WMATA Conveyance”); (ii) if requested by the City, cooperate in the establishment of a special service tax district, or another district or area having a comparable purpose, within the CDD, or a portion thereof, to assist in financing the construction of the rail station, in accordance with the requirements of law; and (iii) to the maximum extent feasible, re-locate the uses in landbays G and H, as shown in the Concept Plan and the Alternative Concept Plan, in order to increase the utilization of the WMATA station by persons residing and working in these landbays. In the event that CAP, other than in a WMATA Conveyance, conveys any of the Metro Site property to another party, it shall ensure that the reservation required, and the other obligations imposed upon it, by this paragraph 30 shall continue and shall be binding upon the grantee party.
- 30A. In the event that funding from sources other than CAP becomes available in the future for a light rail or another similar transit system (apart from a heavy rail system that is addressed by paragraph 30 above) within the CDD, and the City concurs in a decision to proceed with the implementation of such a system, CAP shall, if requested by the City, cooperate in the

establishment of a special service tax district, or another district or area having a comparable purpose, to assist in financing the system's implementation, in accordance with the requirements of law. In addition, at no time shall CAP undertake any activities within any of the rights-of-way that are shown in the operative concept plan, or within any of the open spaces shown in such plan that are to be dedicated to the City, that would preclude the construction or operation of a light rail or another similar transit system; provided, that in the event of such an activity, every effort shall be made to accommodate the intent of the design guidelines. Nothing in this paragraph shall affect activities undertaken pursuant to the operative concept plan outside of the rights-of-way and open spaces identified above.

31. The New Route 1 Connector, between its intersection with Slater's Lane and with the existing Route 1 (in the vicinity of Howell Avenue), shall provide, on both sides of the roadway, a minimum 8-foot walkway for use by pedestrians and bicycles.
32. Any traffic signalization proposed by CAP and approved by the Director of T&ES, or required by the Director, shall be shown on the final site plan for the portion of CDD in which or adjacent to which the signalization is to be installed. The costs to acquire and install all traffic signalization equipment that is approved or required by the Director shall be the responsibility of CAP, and payment of such costs shall be made to the City prior to the release of the site plan showing the signalization. Any signalization approved or required by the Director shall be installed and properly operating prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building which is to be served by the signalization.

Miscellaneous Conditions

33. All utilities serving the CDD, whether located within or outside of the CDD, shall be placed underground, and the cost of doing so shall be the responsibility of CAP.
34. A permanent storage area within the CDD, no smaller than 20 feet by 20 feet, shall be made available by CAP for use by the City to place, on a short-term basis, sweeper debris. The area shall be acceptable to the Director of T&ES, and shall be made available to the City at the time a certificate of occupancy for 1.5 million square feet of new development within the CDD has been issued. The storage area shall be easily accessible by street sweeping and debris removal equipment, and may be incorporated in the waste disposal area of a building within the CDD.
35. If the Alternative Concept Plan becomes the operative concept plan for the CDD, CAP shall work with the City in the relocation of the Virginia Power substation, presently located at the west end of the Monroe Avenue bridge, to a new location along the existing Virginia Power underground transmission corridor, in order that pedestrian-oriented buildings may be constructed along the entire Monroe Avenue frontage facing Simpson Fields. The substation shall be architecturally integrated into the surrounding CDD development to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z.

36. CAP shall be responsible for updating the Concept Plan Sheet and Concept Plan Design Guidelines, and the Alternative Concept Plan Sheet and the Replacement Pages (see paragraphs 2 and 3 above), so that these documents are current at all times. Before the very first preliminary development plan is filed with the City pursuant to this concept plan approval, CAP shall provide the City with two copies of the Concept Plan Sheet and Concept Plan Design Guidelines, and the Alternative Concept Plan Sheet and the Replacement Pages, which reflect the Concept Plan and Alternative Concept Plan approved by City Council. Thereafter, within 30 days of any modifications being approved to the Concept Plan and/or the Alternative Concept Plan, whether approved by City Council or approved pursuant to a concept plan condition, CAP shall file with the City two updated copies of the Concept Plan Sheet and the Concept Plan Design Guidelines, and if appropriate two updated copies of the Alternative Concept Plan Sheet and the Replacement Pages, which reflect the approved modifications. CAP shall not be able to file any application for preliminary development plan approval within the CDD unless fully updated and current concept plan documents have been previously provided to the City.
37. Any inconsistencies in the approved concept plan design guidelines shall be resolved by the Director of P&Z.
38. Notwithstanding any contrary provisions in the Zoning Ordinance, both the approved Concept Plan and, in the event it becomes the operative concept plan for the CDD pursuant to paragraph 1 above, the approved Alternative Concept Plan shall remain valid for 25 years from the date of City Council approval of the Concept Plan.

STAFF: Sheldon Lynn, Director, P&Z
Tom O’Kane, Director, T&ES
Kimberley Johnson, Chief/Development, P&Z
Stephanie Sechrist, Urban Planner, P&Z
Al Cox, City Architect, P&Z