

PYPAG Meeting Summary and Action Items

November 30, 2009

Sustainability (Chapter 2)

Comments:

- Emphasize neighborhood sustainability—think of sustainability through entire site, not just individual buildings
- Concern that term “carbon neutrality” not well defined, or difficult for future regulatory regimes to interpret or achieve
- Consider first bullet point on page 9 as neighborhood LEED instead of carbon neutrality

Action Items:

1. Update text to reflect support for aspirational, neighborhood-wide environmental sustainability initiatives
2. Title Chapter 2 “Environmental Sustainability”

Dedicated Transit Route and Street and Building Orientation Around Metro (Chapters 3, 4 and 6)

Comments:

- Staff’s plan provides an urban condition with buildings on both sides of Potomac Avenue and transportation modes integrated in to design, with bus and taxi service and parallel parking provided in front of Metro station, and the BRT station within a block of the Metro station entrance
- Developer expressed the following concerns about staff’s plan: walking distance from BRT station to Metro, perceived safety crossing pedestrian bridge, transferability/connectivity among modes, and the low height of buildings at the Metro station, and proposes an alternate plan
- General acknowledgement that maximum connectivity and transferability among different modes is important; desire to have BRT route serve residents west of Route 1; Transportation Master Plan considered transit route parallel service that did not need to connect at PY Metro
- Concern about precedence of bridge structure crossing a city right-of-way—not historically supported in City

Action Items:

1. Explore compromise between applicant and developer plans that provides ease of transferability between BRT and Metro, maximizing BRT access to residents west of Route 1, and ensures safe crossing to Metro station

Internal Pedestrian Street (Block 21) (Chapters 3 and 4)

Comments:

- Many like opportunity for pedestrian-only block
- Some concerns about loss of vehicular street connectivity between F and G along Water Street

PYPAG Meeting Summary and Action Items

November 30, 2009

- Concern that providing ground-level, pedestrian-only space in Block 21 would make it prohibitively expensive to build, and that it would not be compatible with the adjacent planned building in Landbay G

Action Items:

1. Consider flexibility to allow details for street connection for Block 21 as part of DSUP
2. Explore provision of pedestrian-only areas elsewhere in either the Metro Square or Market Neighborhood
3. Explore vehicular connection of Water Street to Landbay G

Height (Chapter 4)

Comments:

- Staff's plan proposes 50' buildings at Metro to comply with current height restriction in BAR district
- Desire to increase height for buildings adjacent to Metro (up to FAA height restriction)
- Concern about 90' height along Route 1; consider tiered buildings along Route 1
- Maintain variety of height

Action Items:

1. Propose change to height district as part of Small Area Plan
2. Explore options for tiering buildings along Route 1
3. Add recommendation which specifically notes provision for variety of heights

Athletic Fields (Chapter 4)

Comments:

- Concern that multi-use athletic fields not proposed to be located in Landbay F
- Concern about providing athletic fields in Landbay F as it would be one of the most urban areas of the City
- Landbay L could provide opportunity for future athletic field(s)

Action Items:

1. Maintain recommendation for provision of athletic field off-site
2. Enhance language in Plan regarding general need for fields

Affordable Housing (Chapter 4)

Comments:

- Should a % of affordable housing units be required/specified in Small Area Plan?

Action items:

1. Confirm maintaining existing Plan text regarding affordable housing

PYPAG Meeting Summary and Action Items

November 30, 2009

Prioritization of Amenities and Community-Benefits

Comments:

- Desire to prioritize amenities in Plan, with Metro station as highest priority, then including others, such as open space, affordable housing, etc

Action Items:

1. Consider opportunity to prioritize amenities and community benefits as part of Small Area Plan
2. Provide more information on Implementation

Parking (Chapter 4)

Comments:

- Concern that maximum of 1 space/unit not enough in the near term
- Residential high-rise typically have very low parking requirements
- Maximize shared parking

Action Items:

1. Research parking ratios for comparable residential developments
2. Maintain proposed parking ratios in Plan

School (Chapter 5)

Comments:

- Schools prefers to strike off-site urban option from Plan (Recommendation 6.1); do not want off-site possibility, want on-site guarantee
- Developer concerned about cost of on-site school

Action Items:

1. Staff work with Schools and developer on language

Public Comment

- Do not like specific terms like “carbon neutrality,” but specific goals important
- Consider compromise between staff and developer plans around Metro station, or putting both in Small Area Plan
- Confirm what Transportation Master Plan says about transit hubs, connectivity and coordination
- Depth of retail important; shallower depths needed to provide smaller spaces that are more affordable to accommodate a variety of tenants
- Consider examining views of development from farther away, such as across the Potomac River
- Explore connections from Old Town Greens to Metro and Landbay F
- Ensure bus stops are close to Metro station