



Working Group Meeting #2: July 8, 2014 Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees

Working Group Members: Steve Cole, Chairman; Rolf Blank (*Alternate), Tom Ikeler, Dennis Gerrity, Erik Gutshall, Paul Holland, Stan Karson, Gerry Laporte, Carmen Romero, Paul Rothenberg, Alex Sanders, Jennifer Zeien, Denny Truesdale, Heather Obora, Kelly King, Andrew McIntyre (*Alternate). **Other participants:** Mark McLachlan, Stuart Stein, Gregory Lloyd, Abby Raphael, Stephen Powell, Katherine Elmore, Jon Kinney, Paul Mulligan, John Kusturiss, Anne Spiesman, Nancy Ianedes, Chris Gordon, Laura Hoyer, John Cledeek, Mike Aziz, James Gartner, and Kedrick Whitmore. **Staff:** Richard Tucker, Jennifer Smith, Leon Vignes, Sarah Pizzo, Rebeccah Ballo, Cynthia Licesse-Torres, Scott McPartlin, Andrew Wilson, Kelly Cornell, Chief Joseph Reshetar, Gizele Johnson, Bob Duffy, John Chadwick (APS), Scott Prisco (APS)

Summary

The second Western Rosslyn Area Planning Study (WRAPS) Working Group meeting was held July 8, 2014 with the purpose reviewing current policy guidance and site context information.

Richard Tucker made general remarks on the feedback obtained from the Working Group meeting #1. He also indicated that the Participant Survey results were posted on the project web page and that staff and the Chair were finalizing responses to questions raised after which time the information would be posted online. Several presentations were given including:

- A review of the Realize Rosslyn Plan Framework;
- A review of the 2005 Rosslyn-Courthouse Urban Design Study;
- A review of existing policy guidance on the WRAPS study area, including: land use policies; zoning; Master Transportation Plan and 2012 Rosslyn Multi-Modal Study policies; 2005 Public Spaces Master Plan recommendations; housing goals/targets; energy plan policies; Historic Preservation Master Plan recommendations; and Historic Resources Inventory information on the Wilson School and Queens Court properties); and
- An overview of the study process deliverables including “What is a Concept Plan”.

During an open discussion period following the presentations, Working Group members asked questions and provided comments on information that was presented. A summary of the comments and questions are attached to this summary. Staff will continue to evaluate the feedback and, where applicable, will provide responses to questions.

Attachments:

- Working Group discussion comments

WRAPS | Working Group Meeting #2 July 8, 2014: Working Group Discussion Comments

Transportation Policies

1. Does the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) take into account a possible school in this location?

Response: Not specifically; although the MTP identifies this area as a location for future change as a result of planning efforts.

Public Spaces Master Plan (PSMP)

2. Policy presentation does not mention PSMP recommendation regarding under-utilized sites, such as Wilson School. Provide information to the Working Group

Response: The PSMP indicates the following as part of the land acquisition recommendations: Priority 2, Recommendation 1.2 – Develop a Land Acquisition Policy (p. 42)

Address the need to expand green spaces in the urban corridors in order to provide parks large enough to accommodate active recreation. Look for opportunities to make better use of existing public sites, such as the Wilson School/Rosslyn Highlands Park/Fire Station #10 Site.

3. When mentioning that all spaces should address and evaluate “accessibility”, the term should be all inclusive and relate to all persons. For example, accessibility could address paving surfaces, lighting, clear sidewalk widths, and access for children.
4. A resident of the area noted that this area has only a few open spaces available in this area, and access is limited

Affordable Housing

5. It was noted that there is very little affordable housing in central Rosslyn. This is a challenge and a problem that should be addressed and improved as part of this study. Preservation of existing affordable housing is vital there should be no net loss

Historic Preservation

6. Is Queens Court distinctive and unique enough to be worth saving? The owner of Queens Court (APAH) noted that this property is their most valuable property and they would like to maximize their most valuable asset. Although they have pursued preservation on other properties, that is not the goal on this site.
7. Queens Court – The National Register is an honorary designation organized by the National Park Service. The Garden Apartments in Arlington County were written up as a group nomination. If a specific complex would like to pursue designation it is a shorter process.
8. How many Garden Apartments are there in the County? General estimate, at one point there were 200 complexes now approximately 150.
9. Are developers building Garden Apartments in this day and time? If Queens Court is preserved, is there room for anything else on the property? Buckingham is an example of preservation and

expansion. Preservation is not intended as an impediment to development. Pierce Queen is a good example of preservation and development.

10. What is the disposition of historic preservation nomination report for the Wilson School? The APS School Board voted not to pursue; designation was tabled. APS noted that goals for a new school and associated open space would be less feasible with preservation. Working Group members should have access to the report in order to better understand the building as it previously looked with historical elements (post online). Additional information could be conveyed about how schools have been preserved and included into other development.
11. Historic Preservation of buildings is not one of the goals stated in the charge from the County Board. The County Board Charge indicates that an assessment on the feasibility of preserving elements of the Wilson school would be undertaken. And, the Charge includes specific goals for achieving/increasing affordable housing.

Property Ownership

12. Can the Working Group consider shifting facilities around and moving across properties? The charge constrains the development, indicating that a new school would be built on the current school property. This constraint is specifically tied to meeting the APS desired timeframe to open a new school by 2019, and the complexity to phase and/or enter into development agreements if the school is built on another property.
13. Is it possible to build a new fire station in the historic Wilson School Building?
14. What is the status and/or possibilities with the 7/11 property? It is included in the study area. It is currently designated as Public on the General Land Use Plan. This group will make a recommendation on the outcome of that property.
15. A fourth dimension of the concept plan is time. The phasing of the fire station is critical. A new station would have to be constructed before demolishing the old one. The Working Group should evaluate ideas against time issues.

Charge

16. When would the Working Group evaluate any changes to the constraints established in the Charge? For now, the Working Group should work within the Charge goals and constraints. Staff and the Working Group Chair will have regular meetings and will have regular check-in meeting with the County Board, in which conflicts or impasses will be raised. It is within the County Board's purview to change the charge.

School

17. How do we generate a general school footprint and scale for a typical secondary school? APS will be hiring a consultant to help them through a process over the coming months to prepare hone future school needs, including building massing, orientation, placement, access, and other elements.
18. How do we do it without a specific program or quantity of students? We will use standard specs to reach a conceptual understanding.

19. APS School Board wants to keep option for a future school, “up to 1,300 seats,” in this location even if a decision is reached to place up to 1,300 seats for a secondary school in another/other locations as part of the current CIP process. APS has identified student population growth in next 40+ years, which makes this site important for future school needs.
20. Would APS entertain any shift on to adjacent parcels? APS may consider evaluation of the edges of its property.
21. APS evaluates school size on a case by case. How was the quantity of 1,300 seats decided? The maximum size for a secondary school is 1,300 seats; the maximum capacity for an elementary school is 700 seats.
22. Is multi-use or co-location part of what we will review? Yes, joint use of APS facilities by community.
23. Size of school – if a size constraint as written in the Charge (1,300 seats) was not a limit – what would APS consider as an optimal school size? This would be good to know so that the Working Group could evaluate whether something else is worth giving up for larger school in this location?
24. APS & County Board spent time on preparing charge; APS will still be short, up to 2,500 seats, even with the current needs included in the current CIP.