

DRAFT FOR REVIEW

MEETING SUMMARY

North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan Update Meeting #2

Monday, May 16, 2016 | 7:00-9:30PM | Charles Houston Recreation Center



1 Precedent Tour Debrief

7:00pm

Advisory Group (AG) members gave perspectives of the April 30 precedent tour. AG members discussed pros and cons of Shirlington, the Atlantic Plumbing site in Shaw, and Yards Park in Navy Yard. General topics included connectivity within/and to surrounding areas, sense of place, and building form and massing.

Comments from AG:

- *Shirlington had a constrained grid and was isolated/closed off from the adjacent area.*
- *The Shirlington development could be anywhere America – no unique sense of place.*
- *There was limited connectivity in Shirlington; felt sterile.*
- *Shaw/Atlantic plumbing had a different take on retail that seemed to work very well. The retail was carefully curated with merchants/unique shops.*

2 Brief Review

7:10pm

Richard Lawrence, Project Manager, gave a brief review of the advisory group's role in this planning process, describing the types of planning and regulatory processes, and explaining the AG's role in reviewing potential amendments for the current process. Jeff Farner, Deputy Director, provided a review of the key aspects of the 2010 Plan to provide a basis of comparison to the JBG concept plan presented next on the agenda.

3 JBG Presentation

7:30pm

- a. Market Conditions/Retail
- b. Concept Plan Presentation

The JBG developer team provided a presentation to the Advisory Group and community, beginning with the market research, economics analysis, and land/leasing constraints that preceded and formed the basis for the presented concept plan. The team then walked through their proposed concept plan and presented precedent images and case studies of projects of comparable scale. JBG provided responses to clarifying questions to this information prior to the AG discussion of the proposed concept.

4 Advisory Group Discussion of JBG Concept Plan

8:20pm

Staff suggested that advisory group members consider the following questions when providing their feedback on the JBG Concept Plan:

- *Framework/Connectivity: Does the proposed street network enable the type of place envisioned by the 2010 Plan?*
- *Open Spaces/Park Edge/Integration: Does the proposed open space enable the open space network envisioned by the 2010 Plan?*

- *Metro Integration: Discuss the pros and cons of the two options presented for parking at the Metro Station.*

Comments from Discussion of the JBG Proposed Concept:

- *Ensure that heights are not pushed to Route 1 in future phases since not building to height maximum in Phase 1.*
- *Ensure that commercial land uses are concentrated within .5 mile of Metro.*
- *In 2010 Plan, Metro entrance is open to an active plaza (metro square)*
- *In 2010 Plan, E. Reed Avenue was meant to be part of the retail core, show what implications this new plan will have on that concept.*
- *New plan results in the loss of the Metro Square Park, portion of Crescent Park, and the loss of the true 'public' nature of Potomac Yard Park.*
- *Realignment of Potomac Avenue to the east was intended to maintain the public character of the Potomac Yard Park.*
- *Key elements of the 2010 Plan were Metro Square and E. Reed Avenue. These elements are missing from the Phase I concept.*
- *Original framework was unique and exciting; particularly liked the off center Metro Square; the new proposal feels generic.*
- *The concept should ensure that the neighborhoods created don't feel sterile. The concept as proposed has no "soft corners" and is very rigid.*
- *As shown in the concept this would be a self-contained neighborhood. This should not impact future Phases and integration into the larger concept plan area.*
- *Like the 'boulevard' feel that was created by realignment of Potomac Avenue in the 2010 plan, and the separation that it created between the public and the private*
- *Don't want to lose the continuity of the public nature of Potomac Yard Park.*
- *Concerned about sterility of new concept. No curved street, loss of sense of place, loss of Metro Square, park doesn't feel integrated.*
- *Pedestrian connection from park north of block 4; How do we integrate it into the retail street?*
- *The residential bridge between blocks 14 and 18 obscures vista to the park.*
- *Vistas also blocked on E. Reed and Silver Meteor Avenues.*
- *The Advisory Group should be looking at the entire North Potomac Yard site, not just the theater location. The AG has responsibility to ensure that the proposed Phase 1 does not preclude the rest of the plan as originally envisioned.*

Additional information requested by the Advisory Group:

- *Show an overlay of proposed concept over North Potomac Yard 2010 Plan framework;*
- *Show how the Metroway would be accommodated;*
- *Provide a street section of Route 1;*
- *Demonstrate the transportation impacts of proposed concept (changes re re-alignment);*
- *When will construction begin/what is the timing of and what will be included in each phase?; and*
- *More info/context map showing Landbay K , Metro landings, and relationship to proposed concept plan*

Meeting Closed

9:25pm