

**Arlington Planning Commission Long Range Planning Committee**  
**Review of the Draft Rosslyn Sector Plan**  
**Expanded Discussion Outline**  
**May 20, 21 and 27 (if needed)**

A. **Welcome/Introductions** – Steve Cole

B. **Rosslyn Process Panel Report** – Brian Harner

C. **Overview of the Draft Sector Plan** – Anthony Fusarelli

D. **Urban Design, Building Heights, and Form**

- The draft plan proposes the current “tent-pole” heights policy be replaced with a “peaks and valleys” approach that seeks to ensure better views from more places on and above the ground in Rosslyn. (p 146) Is there support for this approach? Changes needed to it? Does it provide for adequate transitions to neighborhoods around Rosslyn? (p 164-5)
- Are proposed heights acceptable? (Map 3.16 and p 162) Are there places where changes would make sense? Should there be any flexibility with respect to heights above those shown on the heights map? (p 163) If so, is the proposed approach to flexibility sensible? (p 162) Are there other bases for flexibility? Or other requirements? Are transitions to neighborhoods or streets appropriate? (p 164)
- For some time, the high quality views from the observation deck have been a goal. Is this still desirable and, if so, does this plan adequately protect these views? Should the plan establish standards for rooftop design within priority view corridors? What about views from other buildings in Rosslyn? Views from the Ground? (p 51, 164-5) Are they of sufficiently high quality?
- The draft plan calls for retaining the 10.0 FAR cap, but provides for densities above this under limited circumstances. (p 147) Should this approach be incorporated into the final plan?
- Does the plan get ground level design right? (p 152) Are proposed podium heights sensible? Are ground floor building design and use standards right? (Map 3.2 and p. 154) What about streetscape standards? (p 170)
- Does the plan get the guidelines for tower and caps right? (p 168) Should all buildings have architecturally distinctive tops or just some? Is the way the draft addresses architectural design sufficient to generate improved building and site design? (p 168)

- What about the other architectural guidelines? Is the proposed building/tower separation sufficient/excessive? (p 166)? Is the approach to parking location and design appropriate for Rosslyn? (p 158)
- The plan notes the Commonwealth's interest in air rights development above I-66. (p 82-4). The plan does not include specific goals or timing for pursuing this possibility. Should it be more specific on air rights development?

## E. Land Use

- Does the plan strike the right balance between public spaces and the built environment? (p 69)
- Does the plan strike the right balance between office, residential, hotel and retail use? (p 75)
- If the goal for residential share is correct, should there be a policy/guideline related to the rate at which the goal should be achieved? Note: In the Crystal City Sector Plan, the goal is supposed to be achieved linearly (gradually/steadily over time).
- Are the tools for achieving the new balance the right ones? Are there others that should be considered? (p 76 & 162)
- Are ground floor uses as presented in Map 3.2 sensible? (p 79)

## F. Transportation

- Streets
  - Is the proposed street/block layout correct? (pp 88-9)
  - Are the MTP classifications appropriate? (p 92-93)
  - What about the new 18<sup>th</sup> St. corridor? (88) Are the proposed street types the right ones? The street cross-section including the proposed setbacks? (p 98)
  - There are several new street connections (Rosslyn Plaza, between Clarendon Blvd. and 18<sup>th</sup> St., Nash St. from 17<sup>th</sup> St. to Fairfax Dr.). Are these sensible additions? (P 91, A-D)
  - Lynn St., Ft. Myer Dr. and Kent St. are proposed to become two-way streets? Is this a good idea? (p 90-1)
  - Should the Ft. Myer Dr. Tunnel be removed? If it should be removed, should it also be narrowed? (p 90-1)
  - Any comments on the street cross-sections? (p 94-101)
  - Other streets issues?
- Parking
  - Should parking space requirements be altered from current policy? (p 158)
  - What should the policy be with respect to above grade parking garages? (p 158)
  - Is curbside parking adequately provided for?
- Transit
  - Metro (p 102) - Are the proposed improvements to the existing Metro station desirable? Are there adequate tools to achieve the redesign? Does the plan provide sufficient for a second Rosslyn Metro station as proposed in WMATA's Momentum Plan? Should the plan provide for a new Metro station entrance on the Waterview property?

- Bus (p 104) – Should bus service to/from the Rosslyn Metro station be expanded? Should bus stops on N. Moore St. be reduced/moved and should new stops be planned elsewhere in Rosslyn? Should a new central off-street bus center or layover/staging area be planned?
- Pedestrian
  - There are numerous proposed new pedestrian connections (18<sup>th</sup> Street, the Esplanade, to the river, etc.) Are there any that are not needed? Others that should be added? (p 106)
  - The draft calls for replacing the remaining Skywalk segments with high-quality ground-level paths. Is this sufficient or desirable? (p 106)
  - What about the sidewalk/streetscape design guidelines? Are there any changes/additions or deletions recommended? (p 170, p 107))
- Bicycle
  - New cycle tracks are proposed. Are these necessary? Sensible?
  - Improvements to the intersection of N. Lynn St. and the Rosslyn Circle are suggested. Are these sufficient to address the problems with the intersection? Are there other ideas worth considering?
  - Several new bicycle trail connections are proposed (to Mt. Vernon Trail, Martha Custis trail, to the Roosevelt Bridge, to the south). Are these needed? Sufficient?
  - Should the draft plan provide for a central bicycle parking facility?

## **G. Parks and Open Space**

- Is the proposed park and open space network sufficient to meet the needs of the Rosslyn community? Is the variety of park types and the distribution among them the appropriate goal at full build out? Are there additions that should be made? (p 122-3)
- Gateway Park, Freedom Park and Dark Star Park are planned for redesign. Is this needed and is the proposed vision appropriate? (p 126-131)
- A new park is planned for Rosslyn Plaza. Are the standards for this park appropriate? Two alternative locations are provided. Would LRPC prefer one location over the other? (p 144)
- A new major feature for Rosslyn is the creation of an esplanade along the eastern edge of Rosslyn Plaza. Is this still a good idea? Is the proposed design sensible/desirable? (p 132-5)
- What about the 18<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor? Does it effectively link park spaces and become a horizontal park itself? (p 137-37)
- How important is a new boathouse on the Potomac River? How important are efficient connections (easy access by foot, bike and car) from the core of Rosslyn to the boathouse?

- The draft plan does not encourage the development of new small plazas on redevelopment sites. Is this a sensible policy?

#### H. Sustainability (p70-3)

- Should green building standards for Rosslyn be the same as the rest of Arlington? What about standards for energy efficiency?
- How actively should district energy be pursued?
- Are the proposed tree canopy initiatives sufficient? Stormwater treatment?
- Are there other policies that should be added?

#### I. Community Benefits (p 178-80)

- Many of the public realm improvements proposed in the plan are supported through community benefit contributions. In addition, inclusion of others is expected as the biannual Capital Improvement Program is updated. Is this approach to funding likely to speed or delay redevelopment of Rosslyn and implementation of the plan?
- The plan calls for 30 percent of community benefits to go to affordable housing. Is this a sensible target?
- Other issues with community benefits or funding public realm improvements?

#### H. Other Issues

- Rebuttable Presumption – Long-range plans have been characterized as part of the compact between the County Board and its constituents; between the community and elected representatives. As such, there has been an expectation that development and redevelopment would largely follow the vision, policies and guidelines included in the County’s long-range plans. These plans are not, however, seen as rigid. Rather, an underlying principle has been that they are flexible; that they provide ample opportunity for developers/land owners to make proposals that are inconsistent with a particular plan; that they needlessly constrain the County Board from approving proposed changes or making changes on its own. At the same time, there has been the expectation that plans are not simply changed for the sake of convenience or to benefit one party over another. Rather, changes to plans or proposals to develop property that departs from a long-term plans vision can and should occur for good reason.

The draft Rosslyn plan suggests a degree of flexibility, especially as it relates to land use, building heights form, and open space that generally goes somewhat beyond what has been typical of other plans. The question is whether the expectation the community has for this plan, for development proposals submitted under this plan, and for the County Board’s consideration of these proposals is the

same as prior plans or the community should have the expectation that developers have greater flexibility and discretion under this plan.

- Other

## **I. Wrap Up**