Meeting Agenda

I. Review and Approval of Draft June 20, 2012 Meeting Minutes

II. Review and recommendation for Landbay G Block D (IDA)

III. Review for Landbay J Multifamily Building

IV. Review for Landbay H and Partial I Multifamily Building

V. Review for Landbay G Block H (Giant)

VI. Potential Date/Time for Next Meeting:
   September 12 at 7:00 p.m. location to be determined
The Potomac Yard Design Advisory Committee (PYDAC)
June 20, 2012
7:00pm to 9:00pm
The Station at Potomac Yard Community Room

Committee Members in Attendance:
Russell Kopp - Chair
Shawn Glerum
Mike Grinnell
Jason Rascoe
Jason Albers
Chris Bellanca
Quynn Nguyen

Absent:
Anthony Dale
Jennifer Taylor

City Staff:
Gwen Wright, Division Chief, P&Z
Dirk Geratz, Principal Planner, P&Z
Colleen Willger, Urban Planner, P&Z
Jessica McVary, Urban Planner, P&Z
Beth Carton, Park Planner, RP&CA

Applicant Representatives:
Brian O’Looney, Torti Gallas and Partners
Cathy Puskar, Walsh Colucci Lubeley Emrich & Walsh
Amie Evans, Land Planning, and Design Associates
Duncan Blair, Land Carroll and Blair
Joseph J. Plumpe, Studio 39
Ken Wire, McGuire Woods
Chet Humberd, IDA
Manoj Dalaya, KGD Architecture
Estrella Amador, KGD Architecture
Rafael Muniz, JBG
Fred Rothmeijer, MRP Realty

Community:
David Fromm, Del Ray Citizens Association
Joe Bondi, Lynhaven Citizens Association
Marcy Giannunzio, Citizen/Alexandria Beautification Commission

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Approval of PYDAC Meeting Minutes from May 9, 2012
2. Review and Recommendation for Landbay K Amendment for North Pond

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting began at 7:00 p.m. A quorum for the meeting was established.

DISCUSSION

- Mr. Grinnell requested that the May 9, 2012 meeting minutes be amended to capture the discussion regarding the use of social media in community outreach efforts.
- With the aforementioned amendment, Mr. Grinnell motioned to accept the May 9, 2012 meeting minutes and the minutes were approved.

Review and Recommendation for Landbay K Amendment for North Pond (Pond 2)

- Ms. Willger provided a brief overview of the amendments proposed to the North Pond of Landbay K.
- Mr. Kopp inquired if the ramp at the pond is publicly accessible. Staff noted that the pond is not publicly accessible, but rather, is for the use of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities staff to complete operations and maintenance.
- Ms. Carton indicated that the new design incorporates all the elements of the previous pond, with the exception of the pier. She clarified that there is a terminus feature proposed which provides a view of the promenade and creates a visual connection.
- Ms. Evans with Land Planning and Design Associates (LPDA) identified the primary differences between the approved and proposed design. In the previous design, there was an overlook area angled toward the National Mall, which has been relocated in this proposal. Also, at the end of the promenade, there are now planter walls and a grade transition.
- Mr. Grinnell inquired if there are still views of the National Mall. Ms. Evans responded that there are views to the Mall and tables, seating and gathering areas have been provided which are oriented toward the Mall.
- Mr. Kopp inquired if there is an additional pond north of the proposed pond. Ms. Willger clarified that there will be two ponds.
- Mr. Rascoe inquired if the ponds could be merged in the future. Ms. Wright responded that it is technically possible, but unlikely.
- Mr. Rascoe inquired about the purpose of the pier. Ms. Willger responded that the pier was envisioned as a way to get out into the water.
- Mr. Rascoe inquired about whether the pier was removed. Ms. Evans, Ms. Willger and Ms. Carton responded that the original pier would have extended the length of the pond, but the proposed pier provides a terminus and enables interaction with the water.
- Mr. Glerum asked how outflow is being handled. Ms. Evans responded that everything will outfall on the east side of the pond into a structure which runs under the Parkway and then releases.
• Mr. Kopp inquired if an aquatic bench is proposed. Ms. Evans responded that there will be aquatic benches on the north and east.
• Mr. Bellanca and Mr. Kopp asked if lighting is proposed. Ms. Evans responded that there will be lighting along the promenade and Potomac Avenue, in the same locations as previously approved.
• Ms. Nguyen asked if there will be a park connection to North Potomac Yard. Ms. Carton responded that the Linear Park will provide a connection and added there will also be a connection to Four Mile Run.
• PYDAC members discussed that the proposed design appears more active than the approved design, which might result in a destination for skateboards. Ms. Evans clarified that there are skateboard deterrents proposed.
• Mr. Kopp inquired if the bands are seat height and how the ramp provides accessibility to the promenade. Ms. Evans responded that the seating is 18 inches in height and was designed to ensure ADA accessibility.
• Mr. Kopp motioned to recommend approval of the proposed amendment and Mr. Grinnell seconded the motion.

Review for Landbay G Amendments

• Ms. Puskar provided an overview of the amendments proposed for the Potomac Yard Coordinated Development District and Landbay G. To accommodate an office tenant in Landbay G, Block D (the Institute for Defense Analysis – IDA) the applicant proposes to reallocate uses and square footages in the Landbay G blocks. She noted that the applicant is requesting flexibility in blocks E2 and G to provide either a hotel or residential units, with ground floor retail proposed in both blocks. Overall, the applicant proposes to increase the office, retail and residential square footage but reduce the hotel square footage.
• Ms. Puskar then provided an overview of the amendment proposed for Landbay G, Block H. She noted that in Block H, the applicant requests approval to construct a Giant grocery store with residential units above the store.
• Ms. Puskar noted that the retail area on East Glebe Road will primarily be transparent glass, whereas Main Line Boulevard will likely have 4-foot groceries cases with transparent glass above the cases. Seaton Avenue will serve as the “back of house” and accommodates the loading area. Route 1 will have a combination of grocery cases with transparent glass above, spandrel glass and areas of transparent glass.
• Ms. Nguyen inquired if the below-grade garage is for residents and patrons of the grocery store. Ms. Puskar answered that the first level is for grocery patrons while the second two levels are reserved for residents.
• Mr. Rascoe noted that the larger retail tenant appears to deactivate Route 1, whereas the approved plan includes several smaller tenants which help to activate the frontages.
• Mr. Grinnell noted that an eatery might be successful, similar to Whole Foods on Duke Street.
• Ms. Nguyen inquired if there will be outdoor seating. Mr. O’Looney answered yes, at Main Line and East Glebe.
Mr. Kopp inquired if the louvers at the corner of Seaton and Route 1 are garage exhaust? Mr. O’Looney responded that the louvers are the garage exhaust but that the applicant recognizes that they cannot exhaust onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Glerum inquired how the garage access on Main Line and the loading area on Seaton were consistent with the Design Guidelines. Ms. Puskar stated that the proposed configuration is consistent with the approved Landbay G plan.

Mr. Grinnell offered that the Giant on O Street NW in Washington, D.C. and the Whole Foods on Duke Street might provide examples of the opaque glass below and transparent glass above concept.

Mr. Kopp asked if the vertical exhaust goes through the residential units to the roof. Mr. O’Looney responded yes.

Mr. Fromm inquired if something could be done to provide visual interest to the loading dock doors on Seaton Avenue.

Mr. Rascoe noted that the Seaton Avenue elevation could use refinement. Mr. O’Looney noted that the applicant is trying to remain consistent with the previous approval.

Mr. Grinnell noted that an improvement on the Seaton Avenue elevation was the introduction of vertical columns at the loading dock doors.

Mr. Wire provided an overview of the amendment proposed to accommodate IDA on Landbay G, Block D. Mr. Wire explained that the building has to be secure due to the nature of the business operations and thus no publicly accessible retail is feasible.

Mr. Wire discussed the building location, which is immediately adjacent to the northern property line shared with Landbay F. Mr. Wire stated that they are working with the Landbay F property owners to gain access for loading docks and construction.

Mr. Dalaya presented an overview of the proposed IDA building and how the project meets the applicable design guidelines. Mr. Dalaya described the project as being an eight story building, approximately 110 feet tall and including 600 parking spaces. The applicant will likely apply for an exception to the building height, as there is a screenwall that hides rooftop mechanical equipment. Mr. Dalaya explained that given the close proximity to the northern property line, the loading dock may need to be located on Main Line Boulevard. From an urban design perspective, this alternative location is not ideal. The project will be using the USGBC’s green building rating system and aiming to achieve LEED Gold Certification.

Ms. Wright notified the Committee that they will see the project again in September and the proposal is tentatively slated for the October Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

Ms. Nguyen stated that she thought the cafeteria location was positive and would activate the street and pedestrian areas.

Mr. Rascoe asked if having retail in this location was no longer possible. Mr. Humberd answered that IDA can not have people in the building who aren’t associated with the company. Several members of the Committee inquired whether the building could be wrapped with retail uses and provided examples of other similar conditions in the region. Mr. Humberd responded that IDA would be concerned about terrorist attacks through the retail. Mr. Wire also stated that IDA would not consider locating to Potomac Yard if retail was required.

Mr. Rascoe expressed concern that the office workers will be driving to the building and eating at the cafeteria; not generating any activity outside or frequenting surrounding
businesses. Mr. Humberd and Mr. Dalaya stated that employees will use retail on the side streets. They believe office workers will still go outside for lunch. Mr. Wire stated that IDA’s existing space is too isolated and although some employees will remain inside, the hope is that others will go outside. Mr. Rothmeijer stated that the success of the retail does not rely on IDA to support it.

- Mr. Rascoe commented that there were two flagship hotels with a large amount of activity planned and now the area will have the equivalent of the FBI building in DC – albeit far superior architecturally – but the activity level is much reduced. Mr. Rothmeijer stated that given the economic downturn, two hotels or one hotel with 400 keys are no longer a reality. He commented that MRP would love for IDA to come to Landbay G to help with attaining the metro and other tenants, similar to an anchor. MRP believes the spillover would affect the remaining hotel and help the town center overall become a reality. Mr. Humberd stated that between the Hilton and Marriott hotels in the Mark Center area where IDA is currently located, IDA can account for drawing 3,000 hotel night stays based on their business.

- Mr. Rascoe reiterated his belief that the plan would be going from one extreme to another. Mr. Rothmeijer stressed his belief that the uses will work and keep retail on the town green. He also believes that not having retail in the building will not impact the overall success of the town center.

- Mr. Dalaya raised the possibility of having the cafeteria accessible to patrons not working for IDA. Mr. Dalaya explained that the security checkpoint is programmed to be located deep within the building, providing an opportunity for entrances to the cafeteria in front of the security area.

- The Committee raised the issue of the loading dock location on the northernmost portion of the building, next to an adjacent property currently without access to the site. They stated that Main Line is the main street and the loading, exhaust, etc. is along that frontage and not ideal. The Committee suggested that if access is unattainable on the north, place the loading on the northernmost corner but on the west side. Mr. Dalaya answered that they can explore the potential relocation of the loading area.

- Ms. Nguyen asked if there are two buildings but one entrance, would it be possible that one of the buildings rent to retailers. Mr. Humberd answered that there is a possibility that IDA could, in the long-term, lease space and close off the IDA portion to secure their business operations and allow for retail.

- Mr. Kopp inquired as to whether any other administrative support services could be moved to the perimeter of the building to activate the façade. He suggested flipping the corridor with the shipping/receiving area. Ms. Wright commented that similar situations have occurred in the city and office workers tend to close their blinds, however the condition was worth exploring. Mr. Humberd also suggested that the locate human resources or finance operations there because they don’t have to be in the secure area.

- Mr. Fromm commented that the building design was interesting and he looked forward to the next iteration. He asked if the parking needed to be secure and expressed concern about excessive queuing and traffic problems due to security checks. Mr. Humbered assured Mr. Fromm that each car will have a transponder and no stopping and checking of badges will be necessary.
• Mr. Fromm asked if there would be a library or fitness center and if so, suggested that those uses be placed on the ground floor to activate the street. Mr. Dalaya answered that there will be a fitness center.
• Mr. Fromm inquired as to whether there would be a shared parking philosophy distributed throughout the landbay. Mr. Rothmeijer stated that other uses on the block will work well with the parking numbers.
• Mr. Kopp asked if the rooftop will be occupied space and expressed concern that if so, then there may be less activity in the pedestrian plaza. Ms. Wright responded that rooftop area will remain open.
• Ms. Wright commented that the building is being treated as a sculptural form, or vista, at the pedestrian through-block connection. The retail uses are great but empty retail is not. IDA is not depending on retail to activate the street but using other uses instead.
• Mr. Kopp inquired about the above ground parking and why it wasn’t below grade. Mr. Humberd answered that the location was cost driven.

**NEXT STEPS**

• The next meeting will be held in July.
• Meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm.
DATE: June 13, 2012

TO: Potomac Yard Design Advisory Committee

FROM: Planning Staff

SUBJECT: Landbay G Amendments

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The applicants, the JBG Companies and the Institute for Defense Analysis, are requesting several amendments to the Potomac Yard / Potomac Greens approvals. These amendments include:

- A Master Plan Amendment to increase the office square footage, retail square footage and residential units within Coordinated Development District #10, and to increase the maximum building height within Landbay G, Block D;
- A Text Amendment to increase the office square footage, retail square footage and residential units within Coordinated Development District #10;
- A Coordinated Development District Concept (CDD) Plan Amendment to increase the office square footage, retail square footage and residential units with Landbay G; and
- Amendments to Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) #2007-0022, as amended in DSUP#2011-0026, to permit office development instead of hotel in Landbay G, Block D and to increase the retail square footage permitted in Landbay G, Block H. Architectural modifications are also requested for both blocks.

In addition to the amendments requested to convert uses, the applicants have also requested a Master Plan Amendment to increase the building height in Landbay G, Block D. Currently, the maximum building height is 110 feet, as measured from the average finished grade to the roof line, per the November 2010 Potomac Yard Amendments. The approved development special use permit (DSUP) for Landbay G (DSUP #2007-0022) indicated that the building height for Block D, when measured from the average finished grade to the roof line was within the height limit. However, City Council granted approval of a special use permit to increase the height of the mechanical penthouse, from 110 feet to 117.4 feet. Therefore, the main roof line must remain within the 110 foot limit, unless a Master Plan Amendment is requested. The applicant is requesting a maximum height of 117.4 feet.
It is important to note that these amendments are requested to accommodate two specific tenants within Landbay G. The Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) proposes to relocate from Mark Center to Block D and Giant Foods proposes to develop a flagship location on Block H. Although PYDAC is not required to make a formal recommendation on the Master Plan Amendment, Text Amendment and CDD Amendment, these amendments would result in changes to an approved Development Special Use Permit, which requires action by the Committee.

BACKGROUND

The development special use permit (DSUP) for Landbay G, considered the “town center” of Potomac Yard, was approved by City Council in January 2009. The initial approval proposed nine buildings on eight blocks with a variety of uses, including office, retail, hotel and residential. As discussed in greater detail in the Landbay G DSUP staff report, provided as a separate attachment, the following densities were approved:

- 697,085 square feet of office;
- 182,915 square feet of retail;
- 623 hotel rooms (622,831 square feet);
- 14,009 square feet of hotel amenities; and
- 414 residential units (446,124 square feet).

Subsequent to the approval of the Landbay G DSUP, the North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan was approved. The adoption of the North Potomac Yard Plan, and associated rezoning, resulted in the desire to reallocate uses and densities within the southern portion of Potomac Yard.

In November 2010, City Council approved amendments to the Potomac Yard / Potomac Greens Small Area Plan and Coordinated Development District (CDD). The amendments, requested to ensure coordination between uses in North Potomac Yard (CDD #19) and Potomac Yard (CDD #10), reprogrammed retail density to be used for commercial or residential uses and increased density in Landbay G by an additional 32,000 square feet. The resulting density could be used for either 120,000 square feet of additional commercial uses or 120 additional residential units on Block F, and enabled the construction of a building of a height and mass consistent with the adjoining buildings in the Landbay.

The CDD Concept Plan was amended to include two scenarios, Alternate A and Alternate B. The following densities were identified for each alternative:

**Alternate A**
- 712,000 square feet of office;
- 80,000 square feet of retail;
- 625 hotel rooms; and
- 534 multi-family units.
Alternate B

- 832,000 square feet of office;
- 80,000 square feet of retail;
- 625 hotel rooms; and,
- 414 multi-family units.

In March 2012, the applicants elected to pursue Alternate A, with the approval of an amendment to the Landbay G development special use permit (DSUP2011-0026). MRP received approval to convert the two-story retail building previously approved for Block F to a five-story multi-family residential building with 112 units. With this request, the applicant elected to pursue residential units on Block F, rather than the office square footage permitted under the November 2010 amendments and implemented Alternate A within the CDD Concept Plan.

AMENDMENTS TO LANDBAY G DENSITIES

As noted in the summary, the applicants propose to decrease the previously approved hotel square footage and increase the office square footage, retail square footage and residential units within Landbay G to accommodate the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) and Giant Foods. The following densities are proposed:

- 956,102 square feet of office;
- 104,431 square feet of retail;
- 200 hotel rooms; and
- 624 multi-family units.

BLOCK D - DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT

Background and Summary

Block D is approximately 1.88 acres and is located at the northern portion of Landbay G. It is bordered by North Potomac Yard to the north, Dogue Street to the east, East Glebe Road to the south and Main Line Boulevard to the west. The initial Landbay G approval proposed a 399-room hotel with ground-floor retail and an above-grade collector garage to serve the hotel, visitors to the Town Center Green and other retail within the Landbay. The building was designed to accommodate two different hotel operators and was envisioned as the “grand hotel” on the Town Center Green.

As previously described, the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) proposes to convert Block D from hotel to office square footage. IDA requests approval of an amendment to the Landbay G DSUP to construct approximately 400,000 square feet of office within two multi-story buildings. The proposal is currently being reviewed by staff to determine its consistency with the Potomac Yard / Potomac Greens Small Area Plan, CDD #10 and the Potomac Yard Urban Design Guidelines.
Site Design

The overall site design remains consistent with the CDD Concept Plan, as it maintains the block size and street grid previously approved. The site design is also largely consistent with the approved development special use permit, although the porte cochere initially approved on East Glebe Road has been eliminated with the proposed amendment, a significant improvement to the streetscape. Some of the primary site design issues that staff is currently reviewing include:

- **Location of garage entrances and loading:** In the first concept submission, the applicant proposed a garage entrance and loading dock on Main Line Boulevard and a second garage entrance and loading dock on Dogue Street. The applicant has worked with staff to relocate the garage entrance and loading dock from Main Line Boulevard to Wesmond Drive on the northern portion of the site. The North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan identified Wesmond Drive as a “C” street, defined as a street which provides “a means of access and service entries to alleys as tertiary streets for the neighborhoods.” Due to this designation, Wesmond Drive is a logical location for the placement of the garage entrance and loading dock. However, access easements and written agreements have not been developed to date, which would enable access from the North Potomac Yard property to Block D.

- **The extent of the garage entrances and loading dock on Dogue Street:** The applicant proposes two curb cuts on Dogue Street to accommodate the loading dock, trash enclosure, a garage entrance for visitors and a garage entrance for employees. The first curb cut, which accommodates the loading dock, trash enclosure and visitor entrance, is approximately 54 feet in length, while the second curb cut, which accommodates the employee entrance, is 22 feet in length. To improve pedestrian safety and enhance the streetscape, staff recommends combining the employee and visitor entrances and providing controlled access within the garage.

- **Staff has expressed concerns that the southeast building corner (East Glebe Road and Dogue Street) is eroded. To address this concern, staff has recommended that the applicant explore landscape designs to create a pedestrian-friendly plaza at this location or, alternatively, provide a streetwall at this corner.**

- **Staff requested additional information about how the small plaza areas along East Glebe and at the southeast corner will be designed including details on hardscape and landscaping treatments.**

Building Design

In the initial Landbay G approval, Block D was conceived as a grand hotel on the park and was designed using a more traditional vocabulary and materials palette. With this proposal, the applicant proposes a more contemporary design, consisting primarily of precast panels and glass. Some of the primary building design issues that staff is currently reviewing include:
• Exploring additional options to extend the building expression to the ground, particularly along Wesmond Drive and at the northwest corner of the building along Main Line Boulevard to further conceal the above grade parking structure.
• Increasing the contrast between the two office buildings by introducing a vertical expression on one building and a horizontal expression on the second building.
• Refining the glass element along East Glebe Road to wrap around the southeast and southwest corners, to enable the element to read as an embedded form.
• Identifying areas on the building façade where opaque, tinted or reflective glass are proposed, as the design guidelines restrict the use of reflective or darkly tinted glass on medium-sized office buildings.
• Staff is continuing to work with the applicant to ensure that facades longer than 200 feet, such as the northern façade, are articulated with vertical recesses or projections to break down the scale of the façade.
• Studying ways to tie the building to Alexandria’s building fabric by using some brick or other material strategies.
• The projected entry element along East Glebe Road seems to conflict with the strong diagonal of the main façade of the building. Staff has recommended that the applicant explore other ways to assure that the front of the building meets the street appropriately and in a pedestrian-friendly way. Likewise, staff has recommended that the applicant continue to work with staff to ensure that the main entrance on East Glebe Road appears as a significant public entrance, pursuant to the Potomac Yard Design Guidelines for medium-sized office buildings.

Parking

As briefly referenced, parking is proposed within one-level of below-grade parking and four levels of above-grade parking, accessed from Wesmond Drive and Dogue Street. While above-grade parking is typically discouraged, it is important to note that four levels of above-grade parking were approved on Block D in the Landbay G development special use permit, to serve as the collector garage for the Landbay.

With this application, the collector garage is eliminated and approximately 600 spaces are proposed to accommodate the office employees and visitors. Staff anticipates that the applicant will request approval to amend the office parking ratio approved within the Landbay G DSUP, which was 2.03 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

The applicant has screened the garage on the East Glebe, Main Line Boulevard and a portion of the Dogue Street elevations, and proposes a façade treatment at the northeast corner of the building. Staff is continuing to work with the applicant to refine the exposed garage on the Wesmond Drive elevation.

Open Space

As previously noted, there is also a small open space area along East Glebe Road and at the southeastern portion of the site, which are sufficient due to the proximity of the Town
Center Green. Staff has requested that the applicant explore extending the streetwall at the southeast corner to anchor the space. Alternatively, staff has requested additional information to clarify how these small plaza areas will be designed, including details on hardscape and landscaping treatments.

**Preferred Retail Location**

The East Glebe Road frontage of Block D was identified as a preferred retail location in the Coordinated Development District Amendments approved in November, 2010 due to the site’s proximity to the Town Center Green. In this case, retail is contrary to the applicant’s security procedures, and therefore will not be provided with this application. However, they have agreed to provide active uses along the ground level, including the cafeteria, building lobby and meeting spaces, which will provide a level of activity similar to retail uses along the street.

**Urban Design Guidelines**

The site layout, building design and uses proposed are generally consistent with the Design Guidelines and staff continues to work with the applicant to refine site and building features. Staff anticipates that a formal application, which includes a greater level of detail, will be submitted in the next week. The formal application will be reviewed for compliance with the guidelines and presented to PYDAC during the July meeting for review.

**Conclusion**

The applicant is tentatively scheduled to submit a formal application for staff review in the next week. Block D is scheduled for the October Planning Commission and City Council hearings. During the September PYDAC meeting, the Committee will be asked to provide a recommendation.

**BLOCK H - DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT**

**Background and Summary**

Block H is approximately 1.87 acres and is located at the northern portion of Landbay G. It is bordered by East Glebe Road to the north, Main Line Boulevard to the east, Seaton Avenue (and the Fire Station) to the south and Route 1 to the west. The initial Landbay G approval proposed approximately 51,000 square feet of ground-level retail space and 206 residential units. Approximately 19,000 square feet of the retail was proposed for a grocery store use, with the remaining square footage designed to accommodate a variety of retail tenants.

As previously described, the applicant requests approval of an amendment to the Landbay G DSUP to increase the retail square footage within Block H to approximately 60,000 net square feet to accommodate Giant Foods. In addition, the applicant requests
approval to increase the number of residential units on Block H from 206 to 211. The proposal is currently being reviewed by staff to determine its consistency with the Potomac Yard / Potomac Greens Small Area Plan, CDD #10 and the Potomac Yard Urban Design Guidelines.

Site Design

The overall site design remains consistent with the CDD Concept Plan, as it maintains the block size and street grid as previously approved. Also, as discussed during the May 9th PYDAC meeting, very few changes from the approved site design are proposed. The primary site design changes that staff is currently reviewing include:

- The number of loading spaces has increased from four to five, thereby extending the size of the curb cut on Seaton Avenue. Staff has recommended that the applicant explore options to reduce the number of loading spaces and reduce the size of the curb cut on Seaton Avenue. Giant Foods has indicated that five loading spaces are necessary to accommodate operations and has agreed that if five loading spaces are provided within the building, on-street loading will not occur.
- Due to the “back of house” nature of the Seaton Avenue façade, staff has requested additional information to confirm that the delivery trucks can fit entirely within the loading spaces when the door is closed. To accommodate this request, the applicant is examining whether the building wall can be pulled toward the property line or if the length of the loading space can be increased within the building.

Building Design

As also discussed during the May 9th PYDAC meeting, the building design remains largely consistent with the design approved in the Landbay G DSUP. The primary building design elements that staff is currently reviewing include:

- The curved building façade on the northeast corner of the building has been slightly altered in the current proposal. Staff has recommended that the applicant explore increasing the radius of the curve at this location to ensure that it is clearly perceived as a curved façade.
- As one large retailer is proposed, rather than several smaller retail tenants, there will be “back of house” interior functions which will be screened from the public right-of-way. Staff has requested that the applicant coordinate with Giant Foods to maximize the amount of transparent glass at the ground floor with functional visibility into the retail areas and clarify the locations where clear glass, transparent glass with backer, spandrel glass or louvers are proposed.

Parking
Parking is proposed within two-levels of below-grade parking, accessed from Main Line Boulevard. The applicant proposes 471 spaces within the garage, 183 spaces to accommodate retail patrons and 317 spaces to accommodate residents and residential visitors. Similar to Block D, staff anticipates that the applicant will request approval to amend the retail parking ratio approved within the Landbay G DSUP, which were 2.58 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Open Space

As previously noted, the primary open space within Landbay G is provided in the Town Center Green. With this application, there are three open space areas; a small area at the corner of East Glebe Road and Route 1, a plaza area at the corner of East Glebe Road and Main Line Boulevard, and a private residential courtyard located in the center of the building. Additional details on the design and function of each open space area is anticipated in future submissions.

Urban Design Guidelines

The site layout, building design and uses proposed are generally consistent with the Design Guidelines and staff continues to work with the applicant to refine site and building features. A formal application was submitted, and staff is currently reviewing the application for compliance with the guidelines.

Conclusion

The applicant has submitted a formal application for staff review and is scheduled for the September Planning Commission and City Council hearings. During the July PYDAC meeting, the Committee will be asked to provide a recommendation.
1 East - Main Line Blvd Elevation

2 South - Seaton Ave Elevation

MATERIAL LEGEND BLOCK "H"
- TAN BRICK
- SMOKY BRICK
- RED BRICK
- DARK RED BRICK
- ARCHITECTURAL BLOCK
- METAL LAMINATE
- METAL LOUVERS
- PAINTED BRICK
- ANTIQUE BRICK

SIGNAGE LEGEND
- Building Identification - 10-A
- Building Mounted Development Identity - 10-B
- Exterior Signage - 10-C
- Window Signage - 10-D
- Parking Signage - 10-E
- Office Entry Signage - 10-F
- Interior Signage - 10-G

STOREFRONT DESIGNATIONS
- Storefront A - Transparent glass and display case from floor to 8'-6" or store.
- Storefront B - Transparent glass and display case from floor to 9'-6" or store.
- Storefront C - Metal frame glass and display case from floor to 8'-6" or store.
- Storefront D - Wood frame glass and display case from floor to 8'-6" or store.
- Storefront E - Metal frame glass and display case from floor to 8'-6" or store.
- Storefront F - Metal frame glass and display case from floor to 8'-6" or store.

All storefronts have awnings between 8'-6" and top of masonry opening, covered by awnings as allowed by local code.

East Main St. and south/west of Main St.

Signage:
- Building Identification - 10-A
- Building Mounted Development Identity - 10-B
- Exterior Signage - 10-C
- Window Signage - 10-D
- Parking Signage - 10-E
- Office Entry Signage - 10-F
- Interior Signage - 10-G
DATE: July 20, 2012

TO: Potomac Yard Design Advisory Committee

FROM: Planning Staff

SUBJECT: DSUP#2012-0012: Development Special Use Permit for a proposed multifamily building on Landbay J

________________________________________

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The applicant, Wood Partners (same applicant as Landbay L multifamily development reviewed in Fall 2011), has submitted a concept plan to construct a 5-story residential building at 1800 Main Line Boulevard, which is the southwestern portion of Landbay J (the southernmost landbay east of Route 1). This property is 1.5 acres and is bounded by Route 1 to the west, Potomac Avenue to the south, Main Line Boulevard to the east, and an alley and proposed townhomes to the north. The applicant has proposed a 183 unit building with 2,436 sf of retail space. There will be one level of underground parking and one level at grade which will be completely wrapped by the residential units and retail space. A courtyard with amenities for the residents will be provided above the garage in the center of the building, which can be accessed from the second floor.

The CDD Concept plan calls for 150 multifamily units on Landbay J. In order to create a viable project the applicant will request additional density through the affordable housing density bonus provisions in the Zoning Ordinance (Section 7-700). This allows them to add an additional 20% of density, or 30 units. Ten of these units will be made affordable units. Since the current proposal is for 183 units, the applicant will need to eliminate 3 units to stay within the permitted density. There will be a mix of one and two bedroom units, with roughly two thirds of the units as one bedroom and the remaining third as two bedroom units. Approximately 10 units will include a loft level.

BACKGROUND

The applicant introduced this project to PYDAC at the April 11th meeting earlier this year. The Committee discussed the importance of the south and west elevations since they will be very visible from Route 1 and the development will be the first building one sees heading north across the Route 1 bridge. The treatment of the corner element will be very important to this design and the Committee suggested it could take a less traditional approach. The Committee also discussed
the location of the retail since at the time it was presented a block off of Route 1 at the corner of Main Line Boulevard and Potomac Avenue.

SITE DESIGN

The overall site layout is generally consistent with the approved CDD Concept Plan and design guidelines. Two significant changes have been made since the previous review by the Committee. First, the retail space has been relocated from the corner of Main Line Boulevard and Potomac Avenue to the corner of Potomac Avenue and Route 1. This provides greater visibility for the future retail tenant since it will front Route 1 at a prominent location at the bottom of the bridge. Also, there will be a future BRT stop at this intersection, which provides additional patrons for the retail use. The main residential lobby has been relocated to the previous retail location, which will provide a more compatible use for the townhouses across Main Line Boulevard.

The second change is the location of the garage entrance. The previous concept plan had the garage entrance and loading space off Main Line Boulevard in the center of the block. In response to staff comments, the applicant has relocated the garage entrance to the alley along the north property line. This is consistent with the Design Guidelines goals for Main Line Boulevard to have as few curb cuts as possible and to locate garage entrances to the side or rear of buildings. The loading space will remain in the same location, but will include a door to minimize visibility. The sidewalk will continue flush across this driveway to create a continuous sidewalk along Main Line Boulevard.

BUILDING DESIGN

The building, which occupies almost all of the block, is approximately 300 feet long (north-south) and 200 feet wide (east-west). To minimize the perceived length of the building along Route 1 and Main Line Boulevard there is a building break provided by a change in materials, color, and patterns. The building materials are predominately brick, with metal used at the corner towers, and fiber cement panel used along portions of the upper stories. There are fewer units on the top floor due to density limitations which creates some change in height at the roof level. The applicant has arranged the units on this level so that the full fifth floor and taller portion of the building is at the south and west sides of the building. This gives more height to Route 1 and reduces the height along the north and east which is more compatible with the proposed townhouses. In response to Committee and staff comments, stoops have been added along Route 1, Main Line Boulevard, and the alley.

Staff is generally comfortable with the direction of the architecture, but recommends that the applicant consider the following refinements:

- Minimize the number of towers for the building by eliminating or minimizing the two northern towers. This retains towers at the retail and residential lobby and provides further distinction between the two “buildings”.
- Create a taller, more prominent tower at the retail corner (Route 1 and Potomac Avenue). The applicant should incorporate modern elements into the design, such as more glass, a modern interpretation of brackets, etc.
• Propose an alternate solution to the shingle roof along Main Line Boulevard and the alley. Since this is where the loft units are, the applicant could incorporate more glass to these upper levels.
• Minimize the number of balconies on the Potomac Avenue elevation and/or consider using a glass balcony railing or making these enclosed sunrooms.
• Provide more distinction between the two “buildings” through more glass in the southern portion, alternative masonry materials and colors, and different bay treatments.
• Use colored vinyl windows to match the surrounding material colors and provide further variation between the two “buildings”.

NEXT STEPS

Staff believes that the submission is in general conformance with the Potomac Yard Design Guidelines and anticipates that, pending resolution of the above concerns, the application will proceed to public hearing in November or December. The Committee should have another opportunity to review the project at the September or October meeting.
DATE: July 20, 2012

TO: Potomac Yard Design Advisory Committee

FROM: Planning Staff

SUBJECT: Landbay H/I Multi-Family Building (DSUP#2011-0021)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The applicants, MGL Partners and Bozzuto Development Company, have submitted a third concept plan for review. In the second concept plan, submitted last fall, the applicant proposed to construct 249 dwelling units, two internal courtyards, approximately 4,000 square feet of ground floor retail, two levels of below-grade parking, and a limited number of surface parking spaces embedded within the block to serve the retail. A through-block pedestrian connection, consistent with the recommendations of the Potomac Yard Design Guidelines, was proposed to extend from Main Line Boulevard to Route 1.

With this submission, the applicant proposes to provide 250 residential units and eliminate the retail square footage. Consistent with the previous submission, two levels of below-grade parking and a limited number of surface spaces accessed from an internal drive off of Main Line Boulevard are envisioned. The two internal courtyards, one at-grade and the second located above the surface parking spaces, remain consistent with the previous submission. The applicant has eliminated the through block pedestrian connection previously included.

BACKGROUND

During the November 9, 2011 PYDAC meeting, the second concept plan was introduced and discussed. The Committee discussed the importance of maintaining pedestrian safety in the through-block pedestrian connection and suggested lighting, including skylights, be considered. The Committee also discussed the accessibility of the surface parking to the retail. With regard to the building design, the Committee expressed concern with the building hyphen and suggested that the hyphen needed to be subtle in design, yet engage the street. Committee members also expressed concern with the proposed massing on the Bluemont Avenue elevation, which some believed was neither symmetrical, nor asymmetrical.
CURRENT PROPOSAL

The architecture, as in the second concept plan, still ranges from traditional to contemporary, but refinements to the building design have been completed. The revised elevations, dated June 27, 2012, are provided in a separate attachment for your review.

Though generally pleased with the revisions to the elevations, staff has recommended that the applicant consider the following refinements:

- Reduce the height of the base material on the Main Line Boulevard and Swann Avenue elevations by extending the glass to the floor line.
- Explore the use of color in the contemporary building and the hyphens. Consider, for example, accent colors on the bays, metalwork and the buff brick portion of the Swann Avenue elevation.
- Refine the metal course above the lobby area on Swann Avenue, which wraps the corner on Route 1. Consider replacing part of this course with a canopy at the lobby area.
- Introduce a darker color at the building hyphens, for both the metal panels and the mullions.

In addition to these refinements, staff strongly believes that the mid-block pedestrian connection should be reinstated and recommends the use of skylights and other lighting features to ensure a safe and visually appealing connection. Likewise, staff recommends that the applicant continue to refine the interior courtyards and the relationship to the pedestrian connection. Similarly, staff is evaluating the elimination of the ground-level retail, as this location is designated as a preferred retail location within the CDD Concept Plan, and is also near a future transit stop.

NEXT STEPS

Staff believes that the submission is in general conformance with the Potomac Yard Design Guidelines and anticipates that, pending resolution of the above concerns, the application will proceed to public hearing this autumn.