

BEAUREGARD REZONING ADVISORY GROUP, MEETING #7
Jerome “Buddie” Ford Nature Center
Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Members Present: David Baker, Chair, At-Large Representative; Don Buch, At-Large Representative; Dave Cavanaugh, At-Large Representative; Donna Fossum, Planning Commission Representative; Carolyn Griglione, At-Large Representative; Kevin Posey, Transportation Commission Representative; Catharine Puskar, Developer Representative.

Absent: Stephen Beggs, Parks and Recreation Commission Representative; Mike Caison, Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Representative; Hector Pineda, At-Large Representative; Josh Sawislak, Environmental Policy Commission Representative.

Substitute Present: Judy Noritake, Parks and Recreation Commission Chair, attended for Stephen Beggs.

City Staff Present: Mr. Baier, Director, Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES); Ms. Hamer, Director, Planning & Zoning (P&Z); Mr. Farner, Deputy Director, P&Z; Sandra Marks, Acting Deputy Director, T&ES; Mr. Sindiong, Principal Planner, T&ES; Ms. Contreras, Urban Planner, P&Z; Ms. Friedlander, Urban Planner, P&Z.

Community members present: Pete Benavage; Annabelle Fisher; Ken Wire; Bud Jackson; Thomas Yager; Raka Choudhury; Kay Torpey; Bill McCulla; Pierre Shostal; Judy Cooper; Joe Torpey; Luan Tran; Rebecca Hierholzer; Ron Sturman; James Brown; Shirley Downs; Rachel Leonard.

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by David Baker at 7:10 pm.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Donna Fossum made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the December 1st meeting with the addition of “A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by David Baker at 9:15 am,” seconded by Cathy Puskar.

Motion carried, meeting minutes from December 1 accepted.

Transportation Presentation

Jeffrey Farner introduced the presentation. Sandra Marks told the Group that the idea is to look at the conceptual framework and triggers to be put in place before development.

Dave Cavanaugh expressed concern about whether or not the ellipse was approved by VDOT. TES responds that the letter from VDOT indicates their acceptance (approval) of the ellipse.

Don Buch expressed concern about how phasing makes certain that things get built when they need to be. Staff explained that it is a very complicated process but that the conditions are what will guarantee things are built when they are needed. Don also brought up the possibility of the federal government buying property in the area and how that would affect the process. Staff responded that the City has no regulatory authority over the federal government but if they are leasing rather than purchasing, the City may have more control.

Staff continued to emphasize that exact location of non-framework streets would be determined at the time of DSUP and that traffic studies would be done with each DSUP. Transportation infrastructure plan will be updated with each DSUP to ensure that the pieces fit together.

Dave Cavanaugh asked if WMATA was involved in the transitway and if Fairfax County and Arlington were involved. Sandra Marks responded that TES is working closely with transit planners and DASH to make sure the concerns of bus operators are addressed. Jeffrey Farner responded that staff has had outreach meetings with other jurisdictions to work through the small area process.

Transportation Presentation Part 1 Summary:

Transitway

Operational prior to 1.5 million sq. ft. of development

- Transitway (New Sanger)
 - Phasing within the Greenway neighborhood shall maintain transit operations on either existing Sanger or new Sanger at all times
- Transitway (Southern Towers)
 - Pre-Development public access easement for existing transit and interim transitway

Ellipse

Constructed prior to 2.4 million sq. ft. of net new development

Other roadway improvements

Roads constructed on site have specific schedule

- As individual DSUP applications are processed, all roads (including frontage/streetscape) required for full access / circulation to development site
 - Includes proximate improvements such as pedestrian or bicycle facilities
 - Includes mitigation such as intersection improvements

Summary

Each block to provide:

- Access and circulation for all modes
- Required adjacent roadway / trail improvements
- Transitway required at 1.5 million sq. ft.
- Ellipse required at 2.4 million sq. ft.
- Phasing plan will be updated with each subsequent application

At this point, Dave Baker asked for public comment. The Group decided to continue to the parallel road portion of the presentation before public comment was opened. Dave Baker reiterated that the community had concerns about the road and had suggestions for mitigation. The issue was raised at City Council and Vice Mayor Donley requested that staff meet with the community and report to the AG for approval/endorsement.

Jeffrey Farner provided context for the situation and the reasons behind the current design of the parallel road. During the Small Area Planning process, concern was raised about the proximity of the Duke Property buildings to the neighborhood, so they were pushed towards Beauregard. Parking was put underground to allow for a large, continuous open space. The road was put along the edge because the road can't be over underground parking. All of these issues inform each other and can't be isolated.

Rich Baier talked about how at the DSUP is when these concerns can be more specifically addressed and that now is not the time to lock down any solution as things will change over the next 10-15 years. Flexibility and mitigation need to be balanced.

Judy Noritake emphasized the need for the open space to be contiguous, not linear or pocket park-like. Asked for the future configuration to preserve the utility of the 2 acres of open space.

Kevin Posey asked if traffic calming options, such as geometric solutions, had been discussed. Rich Baier responded that pavement types, designing features in rather than retrofitting later, etc. had been discussed.

Dave Cavanaugh expressed concern about the effect on real estate values the road would have. Carolyn Griglione asked about working with the John Adams school to make sure the road works together with the open space. Staff responded that the City has been working closely with schools on the issue.

Transportation Presentation Part 2 Summary

Parallel Road Concerns

Lighting

- Location / Proximity to residences
- Noise
- View of Parking Garage
- Pollution
- Privacy
- Impacts to Property Values
- Security & Safety
- Transition to Urban Setting

Council Directive

Council receive a report from staff regarding the status of the Parallel road and to identify some potential options and directed the Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group to examine some alternatives to relocate the road or move the road and other mitigation solutions.

Parallel Road Outline

As part of DSUP process, consider the following:

- 45' setback between surface lot and residential
- Explore reassigning some traffic to internal street
- Types of buffer adjacent west side of Adams neighborhood may include:
 - Fencing or masonry wall
 - Residential scale lighting options
 - Landscaping / screening
- Parallel road should be designed to minimize vehicular speed, volume and noise impacts
- Any resurfacing of roadway must consider impacts and utility of the 2 acre open space
- City to provide flexibility with open space, garage placement, etc. as part of DSUP
- Loading / access to be located to minimize impacts to adjacent neighborhoods

Public Comment, opened at 8:04 pm. Dave Baker recognized Judy Noritake as representing the Parks and Recreation Commission.

- a) Shirley Downs – Asked for Judy Noritake to be a part of future meetings so that the community is aware of her concerns. Asked if all parking on the Duke property was underground or if there was additional underground parking at individual buildings. Understands that underground parking is expensive, asked if the garages could go deeper. Asked if there would be space issues if the middle road between the Duke buildings were the primary access.

Staff response: Combination of underground and above ground parking; undergrounding more parking is cost prohibitive; difficult to determine if space issues before redesign, but will be looked at in the future.

- b) Pete Benavage – Asked if the trees next to the houses could be preserved as part of the buffer between the Parallel Road and the neighborhood. Asked about the phasing for New Sanger as it is scheduled for phase 5 – would old Sanger support transit and development prior to New Sanger?

Staff response: The trees in the picture are much less of a buffer than it appears in the aerial; 45' buffer is only in one section of the Parallel Road. The phasing is based on the traffic analysis and the roads will be built according to need at DSUP.

- c) Annabelle Fisher – Transit Corridor C has not been approved, Rt. 1 corridor not working because of funding issues and Arlington & Alexandria not working together. Ellipse not supported by majority of citizens, asked Rich Baier and Faroll Hamer what their agendas were.

Staff response: Transit Corridor C has been approved, Council funded alternative analysis which will start in 2013.

- d) Bud Jackson – Requests that the middle section of the parallel road be reconsidered, moved further from playground and adjacent homes. Understands it would be a lot of work, but senses resistance. Would accept modification as a reasonable alternative. Learned about this road two weeks ago, was never contacted by Duke Properties or by the City. Opposes two lane road as currently proposed, requests group take the time to make it right and will continue work with the City, AG, and Duke Properties.
- e) Pierre Shostal – Said that he had just become aware of the 300-400 person student dorm proposed for the NVCC campus and wanted to know if it was part of the analysis

Staff response: City learned about the plan after the traffic analysis was completed so it was not included. The City has no regulatory authority over NVCC but is working with them to discuss issues.

- f) Rebecca Hierholzer – Says staff, Duke, moving in right direction. Said PTA concerned about Parallel Road, read email from Vice Mayor Donley about directive. Gave open invite for anyone to visit neighboring houses to see existing conditions.

Vice Mayor Donley's email:

“As I recall at the Public Hearing I requested that the matter of the road adjacent to your neighborhood be studied by staff and the BRAG. I believe your appeals to the BRAG had not been heard since the committee did not feel it had been part of its charge to the committee from the Council. My intent was to make it part of their charge. Additionally I mentioned possible options in my opinion were to relocate the road, enlarge and landscape a buffer between the roadway and your neighborhood, and to examine other possible locations for traffic circulation, although I did not prescribe a solution but felt staff and the BRAG should consider possibilities.

“Given where we are in the development of the plan, I feel possible solutions are out there and can be appropriately considered now at this early stage in the plan's development.”

Cathy Puskar responded to thank the citizen group for going to Council to ask for the Advisory Group's charge to be expanded rather than continuing to bring the issue to a group which had no power to review the situation. Reminded group that the development will not occur for another 10-15 years and that there were many people that were aware of the small area planning process. Comments should be taken into consideration during the CDD conditions process but community should understand that Duke is not prepared to develop for some time and that lots of things can change before then.

Ken Wire, attorney for Duke Properties, responded that concerns of the neighbors are valid and appropriate. Need to consider traffic flow, connectivity. The plan represents a series of choices made by the community. Believes that neighbors were not directly contacted, as it is not standard practice to give notice for small area plans but happy to hear that the neighbors are involved now.

- g) Bill McCulla – Asked what happens to Corridor C transitway, where does it end and what happens in Arlington, Southern Towers to King Street. How will sewer utilities service the area?

Staff response: Ends of route depend on what is built, transit will go through NVCC campus, not connecting to Columbia Pike because it is too expensive. Offsite improvements will be done earlier than the transportation improvement phasing. For example, when King-Beauregard intersection improvements begin, the existing sewer will be upgraded, even though the capacity isn't needed yet. Planning Commission work session in January is on Sewer Master Plan.

Topic Area Review

Topic Area 6: Transportation

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added:

8B, 8.8, 8.12, 8.15

Items with further discussion:

8.14 moved from CDD to Other, checkmark not needed.

Topic 6 review completed.

Proposed Upcoming Meeting Dates

Staff proposed next meeting dates: January 26, 2013; February 11, 2013; February 28, 2013.

Cathy Puskar asked for the record to show that these meeting dates were discussed and that notice will be given through the usual channels.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm.