



OAKVILLE TRIANGLE / ROUTE 1 CORRIDOR PLAN
ADVISORY GROUP COMMUNITY MEETING
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2015
FEEDBACK PROVIDED BY MEETING ATTENDEES ON WORKSHEETS

***Oakville Triangle/Route 1 Plan Area Land Use Concept:** Predominantly residential uses on upper floors with some hotel and office uses at transit locations; predominantly retail/commercial on ground floors. Ground floor areas character: Swann: Eat-Shop-Experience Retail, Calvert: Neighborhood Goods & Services, Route 1 frontage of Oakville Triangle site: Regional Goods & Services, Rest of Route 1: Working-Making-Fixing.*

1 Provide comments on the proposed plan area land uses concept:

- I would like to see some working-making-fixing on Calvert too.
- Want to confirm that you will not connect to Stewart or Raymond Avenue.
- I think it's fine.
- 90' building height near Glebe – incompatible/lack of transition to nearby neighborhood (Lynhaven in particular). ATTN: to minimizing grid water drain off (requiring permeable surfacing immediately)
- Representation of green space shows roof top decks of private homes. Very misleading.
- I appreciate the mix of uses is a positive. I am concerned about the types of businesses allowed – especially after the City approved a 7-11 like store. That isn't really the type of convenience store needed – something more like Slater's Market would have been better.
- For the “fixing” concept – Do we really need auto-repair oriented businesses? That seems really incompatible for the density and character near the future metro. Imagine putting car repair on King St. in Old Town – doesn't make sense. On-street parking absolutely doesn't make sense.
- Putting light industrial back on Route 1 will create parking issues. Repaired cars in a brand new development? parking below grade- very expensive

2 Do you agree that allowing 'maker' uses and greater flexibility for 1st floor Route 1 commercial spaces is an appropriate way to address the recommendations of the industrial study, and the loss of warehouse space within the plan area? Provide comments.

- Yes. Need to keep access to those services and not have very tall buildings
- Maker is fine if building heights are reduced – they are too high.
- Yes
- You are forgetting about loading zones.
- Yes, definitely – esp. consider the future of local manufacturing like the Crystal City Tech Shop, i.e. 30 Printing. Consider Regis-type flexible office and maker spaces to attract Silicon-Valley type tech startups. Also, Brewery, Bakery, M.E. Swings.
- No

Oakville Triangle/Route 1 Plan Area Open Space and Heights Concepts: Highest heights at Transit Stops (Swann and Glebe on Route 1) 90-100 feet with appropriate transitions; Required height transitions 30-45 feet adjacent to existing neighborhoods; Appropriate setbacks and landscape buffers adjacent to existing neighborhoods; Required onsite ground level open space for each block; Expansion and enhancement of Mount Jefferson Park and Ruby Tucker Park

3 Do you agree with the proposed plan area open space concept?

- Yes
- The open space proposed on Glebe and Route 1 does not appear accessible to the public. The surrounding existing buildings are private property. Is the space accessible through the proposed buildings? It seems like there wouldn't be much use for such a space.
- Seems catch as catch can. No planned park – just an assortment of oddly shaped green spaces.
- “Roof top” open space is offensive. By definition you can't have open space on top of a building.
- I'm concerned about light pollution into surrounding neighborhood when it comes to roof top green/open spaces. Also, in the 65ft and taller buildings, you have security lighting or office lights on at night shining into houses and blinding the residential 'outdoor' experience.
- The idea of the setbacks and landscape buffers seem reasonable. I am concerned that open space does not equal green space and green use is critical for house an open space feels for example. I don't think anyone is going to spend time in a square concrete 'ark' other than skate boarders. There are also environmental concerns about water absorption. I would want to see requirements around green landscaping using native plants.
- Looks good. Good project.
- Appropriate transitions, setbacks and buffer distances should be the same throughout the planning area. There should absolutely not be a historic townhome with a shadow cast on its property from an adjacent building twice the height.
- Yes
- Allowing roof decks and similar uses for rooftop open space adds light, use and noise – effectively making the height taller. This should not be added in the step down area toward the low-rise residential land.

4 Do you agree with the proposed plan area height ranges?

- Tall building at Glebe (both sides) is far too tall. It creates a canyon effect like something in Crystal City – not at all like a residential area. Very jarring in contrasts with neighborhood.
- Yes
- No – 90' max (2 at Glebe) is still too high and close together, being next to residential! Proposed building on Route 1/Lynhaven are still too much of height contrasts to neighborhood. 3 / 65 between Wesmond/Lynhaven. Favor maker/repair space minimizing 15' height revision.
- Object to the 90' Glebe – Route 1 heights because it feels like a wall causes a canyon feel, shadow. Already the Giant cuts out a sky view. (React similarly to the woman who said developers focusing on Route 1 experience)
- No. 90' is far too high – 70' Max!!!
- No. >/ 75' is too tall for the neighborhood. These heights do no align with the neighborhood and existing buildings. They will tower over existing homes, block sunrise, and will be taller than the figure stated (e.g., 75, 90, 100) due to elevator shafts, penthouses, etc. The neighborhood charm will be adversely affected.
- I think 45' should be maximum at edges closest to residential (Wesmond, Montrose, Evans, etc.). Even the heights along Mt. Jeff Park are 45' (and its setback is much greater). And 90' is so high even compared to the East side for that North corner of Glebe.

- The height between Glebe and Wesmond is of concern. Should probably be revised.
- I would like to see less drastic height ranges, more of the “wedding cake’ concept, i.e., not put a 20ft building adjacent to a 90ft building. This would be true especially right on Route 1.
- District 3 needs work. It needs the same step down or variance as District 2 with regard to buffer and transition. If the space doesn’t exist, the max height should not go up to 90. The biggest concern is between Glebe and Montrose.
- Yes, along Jefferson Davis, but may need to reduce Glebe Road. For residential – what is allowed – elevator – mechanical rooms – stair enclosures
- 90’ heights at Glebe and Route 1, even with setbacks is too tall. Should be no higher than 70’ to match the height of the ‘Giant’ building across Route 1.

Oakville Triangle Site – Heights: Highest heights at Swann/Route 1 intersection (Transit Stop)90-100 feet; Height transitions achieved through townhouses adjacent to Mount Jefferson Park and through building step-downs on Calvert.

5 Are the proposed Oakville Triangle site heights consistent with the previous direction of the Advisory Group and has the plan implemented the concept appropriately?

- No. No one approved 3 90ft. buildings. That is very different than one on Route 1, not adjoining the neighborhood.
- No. They grew taller. Started at 90ft as the tallest, now it’s 100ft, which will be taller than 100ft due to items not counted in height (penthouses, elevator shafts, etc.). The buildings can achieve/offer similar uses at lower (i.e., 50) feet.
- Unknown

Oakville Triangle Site – Building Character: “Loft” style with industrial origins; High quality building materials; Variation in height and façade; Active retail / pedestrian streetscape

6 Is the building character presented for the Oakville Triangle site headed in the right direction?

- Where is the parking for retail? Buildings too tall.
- Yes
- Love the front porches! They keep/create ‘community’. We aren’t Old Town. Let’s keep it that way.
- Yes – I definitely like the expansion of Ruby Tucker Park. Any chance of adding Rock Park at the other end of Lynhaven to the redevelopment to engender goodwill with the neighborhood?

7 Other thoughts?

- We know that developers typically sell their developments quickly. They are not in this for the long haul, as the residents are. Already they are pushing for more density, higher buildings. Please hold the line. Too much accommodation got us the Potomac Yard development. We do not need another site like that.
- There’s very little time for community input.
- What about design standards that include green building? I did not hear that in the discussion – green roofs, solar, etc.
- It would be interesting to see renderings of impacts to light. How much shadow will be cast by these tall buildings on the existing historic residential? Also, consider impacts to existing residential street parking. Are you recommending a zoned parking system?