



Draft Guiding Principles v.1

~~September 8, 2014~~

With comments recorded at WG mtg #4 (9.9.14), #5 (10.7.14), & #6 (10.9.14)

The following draft Guiding Principles were developed by staff and are based on Working Group, community, and other responses to the recent WRAPS on-line survey. Staff built on survey respondent suggestions and sought to develop draft principles consistent with the County Board's charge for the study, existing Board-adopted County policies, and "good planning principles." This draft is intended as a starting point for the Working Group discussion.

This draft includes two different subsets of principles, those on which there is a high degree of consensus and those on which no clear consensus is apparent. Principles believed to reflect a general consensus, i.e., generally supported by numerous Working Group survey responses and/or consistent with County policy and/or the Working Group Charge, appear in regular typeface. Principles where there are differing views are presented in **bold typeface**. The plan is to devote most of our time in the development of a final draft set of principles discussing those in **bold typeface**. Our discussion of the draft principles will begin with an opportunity for any Working Group member to request that any draft principle be regrouped from the "general consensus" group to the "**differing views**" group or vice versa. Once we have satisfactorily placed each draft principle in its appropriate category, the Working Group conversation will focus almost exclusively on those draft principles where views differ with the goal of reaching a consensus. Please keep in mind that a consensus implies general not unanimous agreement within the group.

County Goals for the Study:

- A multi-story secondary school with up to 1,300 seats;
- Recreation and open space that is up to 60,000 square feet in size; which could include athletic field(s) and interior space within the school to be used jointly by the school and the community, and other open space that replaces the existing playground and basketball court located within Rosslyn Highlands Park or provides similar needed passive and active park and recreational amenities for use by the community;
- A new fire station;
- Affordable housing;
- Energy efficiency / sustainability;
- Economically viable, urban and vibrant development with a mix of uses, heights and densities that support achieving County goals; and
- Effective multi-modal transportation facilities and services.

Note 1.: The Guiding Principles are aspirational in nature and are to be used as a guide. Through the course of additional analysis and modeling, a range of alternative site designs will be evaluated which

may, to one degree or another, meet the Guiding Principles that will be established. At that point, through further discussion with the Working Group, the Guiding Principles may need to be revised.

Note 2.: Working Group comments from the 9.9.14, 10.7.14 and 10.9.14 meetings are shown in *red* below. Guiding Principles that were identified for further discussion with the Working Group are shown as **highlighted and bolded**.

Uses / Density / Affordable Housing Principles

- 1 Create a memorable urban “place” that:
 - accommodates a mix of private and public uses, ~~including a new fire station~~;
 - offers opportunities for learning, leisure and fitness, ~~and retail and commerce~~; and
 - includes a variety of indoor and outdoor public spaces for use by the community.

Meeting Comments:

- **Add: Retail activation along Wilson Blvd, as a bullet**
 - remove “and retail and commerce” (as shown above)
 - maximize synergy and strengthen it as major retail street; activating both sides of street
 - be clear that expectation is not for full frontage, continuous retail; it may be a challenge to achieve but should try to include at least connections on this side of the street; could be “some frontage”;
 - suggest: “extend retail to greatest extent possible on Wilson Blvd; and into site” (w/o setting specific amount)
 - Why single out fire station in 1st bullet? There are other facilities we are trying to achieve; should a new fire station be explicitly stated or struck; or list all other key elements that we need to fit on the site?
Consider striking :”including a new fire station”
 - Regarding the term “opportunities,” what are we really saying with regards to “learning”?
 - intent was to capture the type of uses/ elements that may be in study area and this captured the existing and future placement of a school in the study area.
 - Public safety should be mentioned in this first GP; in 2nd bullet
 - Delete second bullet and provide more clarity in other places to capture all the uses
 - Function that is missing is “community building”
- 2 Expand the availability of affordable housing in the study area that accommodates individuals and families with a mix of incomes.

Meeting Comments:

- What does mix of incomes mean? High/low; 40-80% AMI? Does this only relate to affordable housing? Yes, that is the intent
- 3 Leverage private developments in the study area to achieve a sustainable urban development that includes ~~a new fire station and other~~ public facilities.

Meeting Comments:

- What does this statement mean? Intent is to convey that development should contribute to the cost of building a new fire station.
- There is density and value in existing fire station/County land; the County has some value that can be leveraged.
- Key idea is that we need a collaborative effort; and Recognition that new fire station will come from contributions from devevelopment in this study area.
- Consider striking “new fire station” as shown above? Alternative option: to figure out how to prioritize and accommodate fire station as a priority of the Charge

- 4 Provide for a new secondary school and its associated facilities that are well integrated into the neighborhood.

Height / Building Form Principles

- 5 Concentrate taller buildings along the eastern portion of the study area and locate lower, varied building heights along the western edge to achieve compatibility with the scale of development on properties adjacent to the study area.

Meeting Comments:

- Suggesting this statement potentially contradicts with Charge (pg 2); school may have height up to 175' all they way to Quinn St edge.
- Charge is starting point; suggest that it remain as is for now and can explore different concepts
- WG shouldn't be limiting development or siting options at this phase; too early to set a GP with this type of limitation
 - Opposing position is that the GP will guide concept plans, and could pose limiting factors
- Compatibility isn't limited only to height;
- GP as written doesn't set edict on building heights at the edge of the site and suggest that it should remain as written
- Should consider expanding “compatibility” beyond “scale”
- Charge is to design site, not specific buildings; and reach common good; start with goal of compatibility and then wordsmithing as needed later;
- Open to exploring ways to be compatible; beyond height;
- A school is a civic building; and it should have distinction from private development; for innovation; special designs; etc–
- Also, this should maintain flexibility for affordable housing; define compatibility in alternative ways
- Retain compatibility as key idea; but evaluate during site design;
- Consider deleting the phrase “along the western edge”; mixed feedback; consider leaving it for now and having flexibility to revise later

- Compatibility for scale makes sense for now to guide us; but may be revisited
 - Change “to relate to...” instead of compatibility
6. Require the design of buildings, especially at lower levels to foster pedestrian comfort, while adding visual interest and architectural variety.
7. Encourage building heights and massing that allow for the achievement of the study’s open space, recreational, and public facility and affordable housing goals.

Meeting Comments:

- Should affordable housing goals also be mentioned here? Added, as shown above
- This works with GP #5
- Is this too open ended
- Use of verb “encourage” versus “consider” or “allow”?
- Acknowledge that this is a small site, competing goals, and need to allow building heights
- We don’t have to be limited and expect that all open space is located at grade; there could open areas at different levels of the building (i.e., ledges, terraces, roof areas); building and open space can be blended;
 - Possible, but maintaining public access, specifically perception of public access, is critical

Architecture / Historic Preservation Principles

8. Design public buildings to be architecturally notable and incorporate or reference touchstones from the past.

Meeting Comments:

- APAH comments – per prepared statement;
- APS – similar position as stated by APAH comments
- As written, it cuts back on Charge; expand on word “elements” in Charge;
- Consider preservation (façade) if NO school building occurs here (i.e. new building entrance for private building); we will continue to move forward with current Charge for new school in this location;
- Distribute APS document shared at last week’s meeting
- Prefer concept of ALL buildings, not exclusive to public or private
- Touchstones to the past – should reference which past, time frame?
- Change “touchstone” to “architectural elements of the 1910 Wilson School”; elements of QC
- “...elements of the WSB and QC in whatever structures replace them”

- Take a more holistic approach and evaluate more specific options/elements when more design ideas are generated
- Consider separating 2 principles: architecturally notable; reference/~~incorporate~~ arch elements of 1910 WSB in new structures
- Retain “references” from past rather than “incorporating”; and not per se relying on reconstruction of original elements
- - historic markers are possible to reference touchstones from past
- Support for retaining “public” in GP #8

Suggested revisions: split into two Principles:

[New 8a] Design public buildings to be architecturally notable.

[New 8b] Incorporate or reference architectural elements of the 1910 WSB and the QC buildings in any new buildings that succeed them.

- 9 Design ~~private~~ buildings to be inspiring; construct buildings with high-quality materials that complement the surrounding mix of buildings.

Meeting Comments:

- These statements should apply to “all” buildings; delete references to public/private
- Remove “private” in #9, as shown above

Public Realm / Streetscape / Urban Design Principles

- 10 Establish a street wall along Wilson Boulevard, with openings to draw people into and through the block to continue the urban streetscape experience between Rosslyn and Courthouse. Locate parks, plazas, and other green spaces for visibility, easy access and maximum use from 18th Street.

Meeting Comments:

- This GP is linked to GP #31
- Remove **‘to continue the urban streetscape experience between Rosslyn and Courthouse’**; there is a strong transition from study area to blocks to west
- May be a conflict with energy goals for school; but premature since analysis hasn’t been completed yet to state the location for school; “consider” rather than rigorous principle; civic presence may be achieved with different building placement; “Consider establishing...”, or “recognize the street wall in some way...”
- State another way: vibrancy; no dead spaces; etc; that can lead to ways to implement
- Concept of street wall, but isn’t specifically defined and leaves flex to explore ideas; use to compare against conceptual ideas/siting alternatives;
- Framing the street; street wall may be limiting at this point;

- Intent to keep WB urban; not suburban with life along it; bring buildings to the edge and encourage pedestrian circulation
- Larger setbacks (buffers) in front of school may compete with maximizing open spaces/contiguous open space elsewhere

Suggested revision:

- [New #10] Effectively frame [WB] the street either through a building face or otherwise in an effort to ensure an active and vibrant pedestrian experience. Locate parks, plazas, and other green spaces for visibility, easy access and maximum use.

- 11 Establish 18th Street as a neighborhood public way with enhanced sidewalks and landscaping.

Meeting Comments:

- Add: continue design requirements of 18th street from RR framework; and continuing them into this study area; just use “integrate ideas/concept from RR framework”

- 12 **Locate public facilities strategically and prominently to promote community confidence, safety/security, a civic presence, as well as to accommodate community usage.**

Meeting Comments:

- Safety of students, using all travel modes (bikes, drop off, walkers), should be incorporated; also review #29 to assess how idea can/should be accommodated

- 13 Link public areas and main building entrances with a network of safe, connected, tree-lined and well-lit streetscapes that facilitate easy pedestrian circulation.

- 14 Create smaller, walkable blocks by introducing new streets, alleys, and/or pedestrian walkways.

- 15 Establish an urban design scheme that complements changes to the surrounding area contemplated in the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update.

Open Space & Recreation Principles

- 16 Strategically locate and design beautiful open spaces to maximize the size of contiguous areas and ensure the flexibility of uses and activities and the visibility, safety, and comfort of all users.

- 17 Maximize the **amount and** flexibility of natural areas and active and passive open spaces given the need to balance competing demands for space.

Meeting Comments:

- GP should also include “maximize amount of open space” to emphasize importance of achieving exterior ground/green space
- Add: “amount of”, as shown above

18 **Maximize opportunities for programmed recreational activities and incorporate existing park elements into the site design to the extent possible.**

Meeting Comments:

- Does this imply that all existing facilities should be replaced? This needs more discussion
- Statement should imply that existing amenities could return to the site, but not necessarily in the same space and/or configuration.
- Playground/tot lot and basketball programs today; GP indicates these would be replaced in the study area
- These facilities are actively used;
- Would like to reference “park space” specifically;
- Raises questions with access/availability
- Change “site design” to “study area”; allow for reincorporation of existing program elements but more broadly and not limited to existing location

Suggested revisions: split into two Principles:

- Maximize opportunities for programmed recreational activities. (versus non-programmed spaces)
- Programmed spaces definition: spaces that are scheduled by DPR (i.e. league play) vs. spaces that allow drop in use/play; Originally, the wording was intended to imply that, in a design sense, open spaces would be designed in such a way that set aside land for specific uses (i.e. basketball court) rather than solely designing open spaces for multi-purpose, free style use.
- Is there a distinction between “League play standards” vs. “middle school play standards”? – APS would want to make fields/courts applicable to high school stds; APS anticipates space/field would be for practice only at this site and competition would occur at another school location
- Design the programs that would allow for organized active recreation
- **[new18a] Seek to ensure that park and school facilities would provide the opportunities for organized active recreation [specifically reference the larger field]**
- Community input – would like to make sure spaces allow for drop in use; not extensive league/reserved spaces
- A decision to “program” any spaces provided in the study area would require additional discussions with community stakeholders, separate from the master planning process, partly because no league play occurs here today
- **Incorporate existing park elements into the study area to the extent possible.**
- may be premature at this time; need to allow for greater flexibility for use of space;
- GP should possibly include/reference importance and commitment to undertake a public process for determining specific park details (all County public parks include a civic engagement process to develop master plans)
- Interest in “retaining childrens play” area since it is limited in Rosslyn;

- [new 18b] Serious consideration should be given to including existing activities somewhere in the study area
- [new 18c] Design the space for activities for people of all ages

19 Use building roofs and indoor spaces for recreational amenities where possible.

Meeting Comments:

- [new 19] Use bldg. roofs and indoor spaces [of public buildings] for recreational amenities to augment outdoor rec amenities where possible
- Would this apply to private buildings? Unlikely, due to security, management of public access areas/amenities in these buildings.
- Affordable housing project (i.e. APAH) would be open to public use of tot lot on ground; tot lot is a desirable use in their projects

Sustainability / Environment Principles
--

20 Maximize tree canopy and pervious surfaces to minimize the adverse impacts of development, including the “heat island effect” and stormwater runoff.

Meeting Comments:

- Suggestion to change “maximize” to “no decrease” in overall tree canopy coverage and pervious surfaces or “increase” tree canopy and pervious surfaces
- Maximizing may surpass “no decrease”
- **Keep GP as currently written**

21 [new 21] Encourage the use of green building techniques to minimize energy use, the use of renewable energy, and the reuse, salvage and/or recycling of building materials.

Meeting Comments:

- Add renewable energy, as shown above
- [new 21b] Strive for net zero energy for school building
- Natural methods for swm (hard to determine at this stage)
- [new 21c] Minimize water use

22 Link the study area buildings developments with district energy, if available, and design them to not preclude connection to any future district energy system.

Meeting Comments:

- Change “developments” to “buildings”; add “and design them to not preclude connection to any future district energy system”, as shown above.

- leave as written for now; return to the draft language later once more discussion of sustainability occurs on green building, district energy, and Community Energy Plan (CEP)

Shared / Joint Use Principles

- 23 Promote shared use of facilities where feasible to make efficient use of land and infrastructure.

Meeting Comments:

- Joint use can be complex and in addition to operational and layout constraints the sharing of facilities should be evaluated economically

- 24 Promote shared use of roof amenities wherever possible through visible and convenient access.

Circulation / Access / Loading / Parking Principles

- 25 Prioritize fire/emergency response time in siting a new fire station and other buildings.

Meeting Comments:

- [new 25] Strive to minimize emergency response time when siting a new fire station.

- 26 Increase pedestrian and bicycle access for all users to and through the site and minimize curb cuts and thus vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

Meeting Comments:

- [new 26a] Increase pedestrian and bicycle access to and through the site.
- [new 26b] Minimize curb cuts and thus vehicle/pedestrian/bicycle conflicts.

- 27 Incorporate wayfinding for parking, Metro, bus stops, and bike share stations into the site design.

- 28 Provide for a new Pierce Street through the site to enhance connectivity.

Meeting Comments:

- Increased connectivity of street grid to explore options rather than specific to PS
- Consider options for additional connectivity OR street grid network within the publicly owned portion of the study area to ensure adequate circulation for fire/emergency and school.

- 29 Design vehicular circulation to minimize conflicts between emergency responders, school traffic, parking and loading functions, and pedestrians.

Meeting Comments:

- Safety of students, using all travel modes (bikes, drop off, walkers), should be incorporated; also review #12 to assess how idea can/should be accommodated

30 Encourage shared, underground parking for all uses.

31 Locate vehicle parking access, loading, and service areas on secondary streets and/or alleys to minimize their visibility from public spaces.

Meeting Comments:

- This GP is linked to GP #10
- The purpose is beyond visibility; assists with traffic circulation; safety;
- Strike “visibility” phrase as noted
- Provide Vision for 18th Street from RR process online

Other Principles

32 Develop a site design that can be phased such that that fire/emergency response for the Rosslyn/Courthouse area remains uninterrupted and construction of a new school is completed within the timeframe identified by Arlington Public Schools.

Meeting Comments:

- Recognize there are four distinct projects: with their own construction timing/financing strategies
- Attempt to simplify GP, about co -location, deadlines, and finance

Other Guiding Principles to be added:

~~33 promote common good vs to benefit property owners; vision and values~~

Meeting Comments:

- Is sharable and beneficial for the greatest number of Arlington residents, recognizing the rights of private property owners on the site
- No new GP

34 creative swapping of space and uses when evaluating different siting options; affirms use of creative swap in order to meet goals; however, schools should be excluded

Meeting Comments

- Suggest adding “uses”, as shown above
- Suggestion that If school development is delayed past 2019, then school circumstances would be different and consideration of shifting school placement/development should occur;

- **[new] Consider proposals that would include land exchanges to the extent that they increase the ability to maximize achievement of goals included in the charge.**
- specifically state real property