Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group

October 24, 2012 @ 7 PM
Buddie Ford Nature Center
5750 Sanger Avenue, Alexandria
Agenda

I. Approval of October 1 2012 Meeting Summary
II. Discussion of Seminary / Beauregard Alternatives Report
III. Public Comment
IV. Rezoning Application Submission(s)
V. Recommendations Matrix
VI. Next Steps
Role of the Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group

- Review technical analysis
- Provide recommendations and comments (to be included with DSUP application staff reports)
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

Alternatives Analyzed

- No Build
- Parallel Road
- Traffic Circle
- Grade Separation Options
- Ellipse
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

Technical Reviews

• VDOT
• City of Alexandria
• RK&K
• AECOM
• STV
• Wells and Associates
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

No Build

- Maintains existing triple WB left turns
- Adds VDOT Short / Mid term projects
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

No Build Impacts

- **Pros:**
  - Cost effective
  - Minimal Utility / ROW Impacts
  - At-grade construction
  - Maintains access to roads/driveways
  - Compatible with proposed BRT Operations

- **Cons:**
  - Future WB queues on Seminary impact I-395 (AM peak)
  - Not pedestrian friendly
  - Weaving issues on WB Seminary
  - Doesn’t adequately address future growth
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

No Build - Impacts

Wide Pedestrian Crossing

Weave Issues

WB Queues impact I-395
Beauregard / Seminary
Alternatives Report

Parallel Road

- Maintains existing triple WB left turns and VDOT improvements
- Builds parallel road from Seminary to Beauregard Town Center
Beauregard / Seminary
Alternatives Report

Parallel Road Impacts

• Pros:
  o Diverts traffic demand along Beauregard and provides additional capacity
  o Improved weaving compared to No Build
  o At-grade construction
  o Maintains access to roads/driveways
  o Compatible with proposed BRT Operations

• Cons:
  o Requires acquisition of 12 to 17 townhomes
  o Places more traffic on residential streets
  o Increased noise through residential areas
  o Significant ROW Cost
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Parallel Road Impacts
Traffic Circle

- Traditional 4-legged Traffic Circle
- Signals at each approach
- All movements require use of circle
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Traffic Circle Impacts

• **Pros:**
  - At-grade construction
  - Opportunity for gateway feature / Green space
  - Improved weaving condition compared to No Build
  - Maintains access to roads/driveways
  - Compatible with proposed BRT Operations

• **Cons:**
  - Significant queues / delays to intersections and I-395
  - Doesn’t adequately address future growth
  - Moderate ROW impacts
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Traffic Circle Impacts

Delays at Traffic Circle Approaches

WB Queues impact I-395
Grade Separation Option 1

- Flyover configuration with compressed diamond interchange
- Beauregard over Seminary
Grade Separation Option 1 Impacts

• **Pros:**
  - Minimizes delay for through traffic on Beauregard Street
  - Gateway Opportunity
  - Pedestrian improvements at grade
  - Compatible with proposed BRT Operations

• **Cons:**
  - Significant weave/merge issues on WB Seminary, and increased accident potential
  - High Cost ($41.9m), and Maintenance
  - Possible high delays for turning vehicles at and pedestrians (at ramps)
  - Significant ROW impacts to Southern Towers parking
  - Steep grades for overpass
  - Utility Impacts due to bridge / retaining walls
  - Extensive signal timing coordination
  - Not compatible with character of planned development
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Grade Separation Option 1 Impacts

- Ramp Constraints
- Steep Grade
- ROW / Parking Impacts
- Weave Issues
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Grade Separation Option 2

- Flyover configuration with compressed diamond interchange
- Seminary over Beauregard
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Grade Separation Option 2 Impacts

• Pros:
  o Minimizes delay for through traffic on Seminary Road
  o Gateway Opportunity
  o Pedestrian improvements at grade
  o Compatible with proposed BRT Operations

• Cons:
  o Significant weave/merge issues on EB and WB Seminary, and increased accident potential
  o High Cost ($42.3m), and Maintenance
  o Possible high delays for turning vehicles at and pedestrians (at ramps)
  o Significant ROW impacts to Southern Towers parking
  o Steep grades for overpass
  o Utility Impacts due to bridge / retaining walls
  o Extensive signal timing coordination
  o Not compatible with character of planned development
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Grade Separation Option 2 Impacts

Weave Issues
Steep Grade
ROW / Parking Impacts
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Ellipse

- Modified Roundabout (Maintains thru traffic on Seminary)
- Eliminates left turns to Beauregard
- Adds storage capacity
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

Ellipse Impacts

• **Pros:**
  - At-grade construction
  - Gateway Opportunity
  - More storage for WB left turns
  - Better intersection operation
  - Reduced weaving issues
  - Accommodates future planned growth
  - Maintains access to roads / driveways
  - Compatible with proposed BRT operations
  - Environmental impacts / noise similar to existing conditions
  - Maintains at-grade pedestrian / bicycle circulation
  - Compatible with SAP recommendations

• **Cons:**
  - Unconventional compared to a standard intersection and requires special design
  - Moderate ROW impacts
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Ellipse Impacts

- Vehicular storage
- Pedestrian movements
- Crosswalk
- Signal
- Landscaped Barrier
- Wayfinding signage

Tighten corner to slow vehicles and improve pedestrian visibility

Hilton Hotel

Southern Towers Development

Hekemian Development
# Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

## Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>Parallel Road Extension</th>
<th>Traditional traffic circle</th>
<th>Grade-separated Options</th>
<th>Ellipse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td><img src="x" alt="Cross" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="x" alt="Cross" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="x" alt="Cross" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Access</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Accessibility</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Impacts</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="x" alt="Cross" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Impacts</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics and Compatibility with Urban Environment</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td><img src="." alt="Full-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
<td><img src="." alt="Half-Moon" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Good**
- **Fair**
- **Poor**
- **Fatal Flaw**
Beauregard / Seminary Alternatives Report

Summary

The Alternatives Report confirms that the Ellipse is the only alternative that accommodates the trips associated with development in the small area plan without a fatal flaw.
CDD Applications
SAP Implementation

Governing Documents: Amount of Detail
# CDD Applications

## SAP Implementation

### MATRIX

**WORKING DRAFT**

**Beauregard Small Area Plan Recommendation Matrix**

**Updated October 19, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Method of Addressing</th>
<th>Coordinated Development District (CDD)</th>
<th>Design Standards &amp; Guidelines</th>
<th>Development Special Use Permit (DSUP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Urban Design Standards and Guidelines are required as part of any future rezoning(s) to ensure implementation of the recommendations and intent of the Plan.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(Require the streets and blocks depicted in the Framework Plan to be constructed as part of any redevelopment.) The final location of the non-framework streets will be determined through the CDD zoning, design standards and development review process.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The building setbacks for new buildings will be 30 feet on North Beauregard Street, excluding the required retail areas, to enable a double row of street trees and 10ft. sidewalk/street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The trees within the median and street trees on North Beauregard Street will be a minimum of 4” caliper at installation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>The building setbacks for new buildings on Seminary Road will be a minimum of 20 feet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Development blocks will be sufficiently sized for market acceptable building floor plates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>The blocks as part of the redevelopment are recommended to generally be 400 ft x 400 ft. Block sizes of 300 ft x 300 ft are encouraged. Ensure permeability of the blocks and streets to encourage walking and appropriate block sizes with mid-block connections and alleys.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>The residential multi-family and townhouse buildings without ground floor retail will have setbacks, front yards and/or courtyards. The final requirements will be approved as part of the Urban Design Standards and Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Create seven unique and identifiable neighborhoods, which will be compatible with the existing neighborhoods. The identity of each neighborhood will be reinforced through the use of scale, height, architecture and open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Encourage the use of history as inspiration for the design of open space, public realm and buildings. Encourage the use of public art to reinforce the distinct neighborhood identities and create unifying themes for the neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Incorporate the parks -open spaces depicted in the Framework Plan within each neighborhood as a defining element of each neighborhood. (Figure 14).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Encourage a mix of building types and innovative building types within each neighborhood.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>The neighborhoods should be connected to one another as much as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Explore the possibility of providing cultural and civic uses to reinforce the character of each neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>While each neighborhood will have unique design and character, consistent and unified elements such as the streets and streetscapes will unify the neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Improve and enhance the North Beauregard Street frontage with streetscape improvements, buildings, and landscaping. (Figure 18A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beauregard SAP Recommendations Matrix AG 10.19.12
CDD Applications
SAP Implementation
APPLICATION SHEET

Beauregard Rezoning
Advisory Group
Meeting #4  Wednesday, October 24, 2012
Meeting Date Discussion

Possible dates:

• Wednesday, November 14th

• Saturday, December 1st (Design Guideline Charrette)

• Wednesday, December 12th