

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
1	1.A.	Remove all references of “theme” from this item, as the term “theme” was not in County Board approved scope of work.	Staff concurs, but notes that ‘or theme’ had been added to help clarify intent of this item.	Delete all occurrences of word “theme” from description for 1.A.
2	1.A.	Remove “landmarks” from elements to be included in recommendations pertaining to urban design.	Staff believes “landmarks” should remain as a key element of urban design, and is consistent with County’s practice of addressing landmarks in long range plans.	No proposed changes.
3	1.B.	Clarify that “building heights” and “topography” existing conditions will be diagrammed in the technical analyses.	Staff concurs.	Include “building heights” (to replace “heights”) and “topography” in list of items to be diagrammed.
4	1.B.	Diagram where potential change/preservation in terms of where it is most “likely”, not most “appropriate”.	Staff concurs.	Delete both occurrences of “most appropriate” from technical analysis column.
5	1.B.	In technical analysis, diagramming the recommended framework should take into account topography.	Staff concurs.	Adds “Taking into consideration topography” at start of fourth bullet.
6	1.B.	Q: Who will determine the comparative analysis addressing a range of issues including cost, timing, degree of community benefit, and overall feasibility?	The project team will prepare the comparative analysis, for review/feedback of Process Panel and others.	N/A
7	1.B.	In the recommendations, ensure that diagrams depict topography as well.	Staff concurs.	Add “topography” as an item to be depicted along with street, sidewalks, and open space networks.
8	1.B.	The Illustrative Master Plan (IMP) should make clear the depicted building locations are “approximate”.	Staff concurs, and agrees the building locations shown in the IMP are intended to be approximate and illustrative.	Add “Approximate” before “building locations, configurations, and heights”.
9	1.B.	The recommended IMP should identify “potential” public spaces.	Staff concurs, but anticipates the IMP could depict both future public spaces that are strongly recommended and others that seen more as potential spaces.	Add “recommended” and “potential” before “public spaces (streets and parks/plazas).
10	1.B.	For transportation infrastructure recommendations, more detail is needed here to clarify whether it will mimic the RMTS, and if so to what degree.	In the context of the IMP, the anticipated major elements to be depicted would include adjusted/new public streets/corridors, general sidewalk widths, etc.	Revise 6 th sub-bullet under IMP to say: “Transportation infrastructure, depicting any proposed adjusted/new public streets/corridors, generally reflecting proposed sidewalk widths, and other features relevant to the IMP.”
11	1.B.	“Coordinated sequence of improvements...” should include “approved projects/projects in the 4.1 application process”.	Staff concurs.	Add “given approved projects and projects in the 4.1 application process” to subject bullet.
12	1.B.	Q: Will the recommendations on preferred land use mix/balance be in the form of a map or other graphic?	It’s currently anticipated that any recommendations for a land use mix/balance would be described through text; however, if the process informs that such a map could be useful, we would consider it.	N/A
13	1.C.	Q: How is “passive uses” for ground floor frontages to be defined?	Generally, this includes spaces that accommodate office or residential uses fronting the ground floor.	N/A
14	1.C.	In analysis of identifying where sidewalk space could be provided for outdoor uses such as sidewalk cafes, also consider items such as sidewalk fairs, kiosks, or bookstalls.	Staff concurs.	In 5 th analysis bullet, revised to add: “...street sections for items such as outdoor dining areas, sidewalk fairs, removable kiosks, bookstalls, etc.”;

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
15	1.C.	In analysis, also “consider opportunities for festival streets or walking streets using special bollards, pavers, or curbing to enhance the relationship between pedestrians and autos in particular zones”. (see also 1A)	Staff concurs.	Add new bullet: “Consider opportunities for festival streets or walking streets using special bollards, pavers, or curbing to enhance the relationship between pedestrians and autos in particular zones (see also 1A).”
16	1.C.	Inventory existing skywalk system and document use and condition.	Staff concurs, and scope will focus on identifying approximate extent of use based on stakeholder input and informal observation, RMTS counts, and field observation of the pedestrian environment, but will not include specific counts of pedestrian traffic, nor structural evaluation of skywalk infrastructure.	Add new bullet: “Inventory existing skywalk system and document use and condition.”
17	1.C.	Ensure that retail location plan also accounts for topography.	Staff concurs.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, add “topography” as an additional item to be addressed.
18	1.C.	Urban design guidelines should also address “preferred locations within RCRD for residential, office and hotel uses, including consideration of incentives for increasing the proportion of residential development within the mix”.	Staff concurs to the extent that the design guidelines will identify prominent street characters, but may not identify specific sites for specific land uses.	Add new bullet: “Preferred locations within RCRD for streets whose character are primarily residential, office or hotel, including consideration of incentives for increasing the proportion of residential development within the mix.”
19	1.C.	Remove reference to “preferred locations” for service, loading and garage access, and instead focus on strategies that utilize existing topography and concentrate access away from heavily used pedestrian corridors.	Staff concurs, as the intent is to determine appropriate strategies, not as much to specify exact locations for service/loading for future projects.	Remove “Preferred locations or...” from subject bullet.
20	1.C.	Recommendations should include preferred locations for festival streets.	Staff concurs.	Add new bullet: “Preferred locations for walking streets or festival streets (see also 1A).”
21	1.C.	Recommendations should include areas for retention or removal of pedestrian skywalk system.	Staff concurs, but would refine comment to include “portions of skywalk system”.	Add new bullet: “Recommend retention or elimination of portions of skywalk system.”
22	1.D.	Recommendations should focus on where ground floor retail should be prioritized (rather than “required”).	Staff concurs.	Revise first bullet to delete “required”.
23	1.D.	Areas appropriate for other activating (non-retail) uses should be addressed via recommendations (not guidelines).	Staff believes that recommendations for other activating uses/frontages could be made through recommendations and/or guidelines.	Revise start of 3 rd bullet: “Additional guidelines and/or recommendations for frontages...”
24	1.E.	To 2 nd bullet, add “Including consideration of their entitlement review process” to research how other places have achieved well proportioned architecture.	Staff concurs to the extent of gaining a high level understanding of the development and/or design review processes that influence what gets built.	Add “including acknowledgement of type of review processes involved in determining the final building design” to second bullet.
25	1.E.	Add new bullet to “Review the site plan review process and the impact of this process on design considerations.”	This task is the focus of a newly formed Planning Commission committee to look at the SPRC process, and is outside the scope of this study.	No proposed changes.

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
26	1.E.	In 1 st bullet in recommendations, urban design guidelines should consider leasibility and salability.	While perspectives on leasibility and salability are somewhat subjective and are likely to vary among various property owners, the guidelines will be viewed through the lens of general development feasibility.	Add end of first bullet, add: "...with consideration given to general development feasibility."
27	1.E.	In 2 nd bullet in recommendations, remove "for specific locations" when discussing identification of multiple districts or form/use requirements.	The term "specific locations" intends to recognize areas in the RCRD with distinctly different location characteristics (e.g. park edges, river edges, neighborhood edges, etc.), and the identification and treatment of these "areas" may be an important part of the building form/height strategies.	No proposed changes.
28	1.E.	Add "Recommendation on the scope of site plan review" as a new bullet to the Recommendations.	See response to ID #25.	No proposed changes.
29	1.E.	Q: Regarding last bullet in Recommendations, what regulation would fall into the category of specific regulations for uses that should be handled distinctly?	The general idea is that any proposed revised regulations resulting from the plan's building height and form recommendations may include certain provisions for certain uses. It could involve height, density, lot occupancy or a variety of other elements, but will need to be determined through the planning process.	N/A
30	1.F.	In the analysis column, add "Identification of LEED/Energy Considerations".	Staff concurs, in that recommendations will address opportunities consistent with the overall vision and plan to reduce energy use and achieve other sustainable design goals, such as meeting LEED standards. Identification of "LEED/Energy considerations" or "LEED implications" will be done at a qualitative level and will not include a full quantitative analysis of LEED-NC (for a typical new building) or LEED-ND potential (for the whole study area).	Add "Identify qualitative LEED/Energy Considerations" to list of analyses.
31	1.F.	In the analysis column, add "Identify façade types and compositions by use"	Staff concurs.	Add "Identify façade types and compositions by use" to list of analyses.
32	1.F.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, add "taking into account use type" to how to achieve interesting and dynamic facades.	Staff concurs.	Add "taking into account use type" to how to achieve interesting and dynamic facades.
33	1.F.	In recommendations, consider moving "How floor plates can respond adequately and flexibly to the program needs of market-driven uses" to 1.E.	Staff concurs.	Relocate this bullet to List of Recommendations in Item 1.E.
34	1.F.	In recommendations, add "LEED implications of the above".	See response to ID #30.	Add "General LEED implications of the above" as a new last bullet to Recommendations for 1.F.
35	2.A.	In Analysis, 1 st bullet, replace "existing and potential future	Staff concurs, as it will be important to identify view	In Analysis, 1 st bullet, replace "existing and potential

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
		views” with “view corridors”.	corridors (or cones) for potential protection, as opposed to the much broader range of views	future views” with “existing view corridors”.
36	2.A.	In Analysis, 2 nd bullet, replace “views” with “view corridors” from Central Place observation deck.	Staff concurs, as it will be important to identify view corridors (or cones) that will exist once the observation deck is built, for purposes of prioritization.	In Analysis, 2 nd bullet, replace “views” with “view corridors”.
37	2.A.	In Analysis, last bullet, include “photorealistic renderings” in list of tools to outline preliminary goals and test alternative approaches for building height and massing.	Per Process Panel meeting discussion on 5/13, project team will share alternative options for visualization techniques, for further discussion with the panel.	Add “appropriate visualization techniques” after “3D Model” in list of tools to outline goals and test alternatives.
38	2.A.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, not sure what “Identification of multiple districts or at least multiple form and use requirements for specific locations within the zoning district” means?	This addresses the idea that the plan could result in more specificity for building height and form (and use) provisions than currently exist in the “C-O Rosslyn” district. Also see response to ID #29.	N/A
39	2.A.	In recommendations, 4 th bullet, not sure what “Recommendations for specific regulations for those uses that should be handled distinctly” means?	See response to ID #29.	N/A
40	2.B.	In analysis, 1 st bullet, add “consider heights of less than 300 feet and/or limited building footprints as part of the approach within these transition areas”	Staff concurs.	Add “consider heights of less than 300 feet and/or limited building footprints as part of the approach within these transition areas”
41	2.B.	In analysis, 1 st bullet, add with consideration to topography.	Staff concurs.	Add “with consideration to topography.”
42	2.B.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, replace “considering” with “allowing” greater heights...	Staff concurs.	Replace “considering” with “allowing”.
43	2.B.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, delete reference to “sub-block level”, and add “recommendations will take into account site specific design criteria, challenges, opportunities, while balancing the other goals of this plan including, but not limited to, view corridors, adjacencies, open spaces, use types, ground plane.”	Staff concurs.	Remove “sub block level”, and add “recommendations will take into account site specific design criteria, challenges, opportunities, while balancing the other goals of this plan including, but not limited to, view corridors, adjacencies, open spaces, use types, ground plane.”
44	2.B.	In recommendations, 2 nd bullet, add “photorealistic rendering” to list of images depicting height zones.	See response to ID #37.	Add “and other appropriate visualization techniques” to list of tools to depict height zones.
45	2.C.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, add “enhanced view corridors and other goals of this plan” to the list of community benefit types potentially associated with development allowed to achieve heights greater than 300 feet.	After considering this comment, staff recommends that this statement speak to community benefits and other stated goals of this plan generically, without including specific examples, so as to not risk prejudging the public benefits or goals to be prioritized through this plan.	Revise end of 1 st bullet language to read: “...that pierce the 300’ height limit, that promote desired community benefits and other stated goals of this Plan.”
46	2.D.	In analysis, last bullet, add marketability and salability as considerations for different height and floor plate combinations.	While perspectives on marketability and salability are somewhat subjective and are likely to vary among individuals, the guidelines should be viewed through the	Add at end of last bullet: “...and overall development feasibility.”

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
			lens of development feasibility.	
47	2.D.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, delete reference to “sub-block level”, and add same language as added in Item #43.	Staff concurs.	Remove “sub block level”, and add same language as added in Item #43.
48	2.D.	In recommendations, add new bullet: “Recommending a mechanism for evaluating where flexibility is appropriate when viewed in light of other goals of this plan.”	Staff concurs.	Add as a new bullet: “Recommending a mechanism for evaluating where flexibility is appropriate when viewed in light of other goals of this plan”.
49	2.D.	In recommendations, last bullet, add “photorealistic rendering” to list of images depicting height zones.	See response to ID #37.	Add “and other appropriate visualization techniques” to list of tools to depict height zones.
50	2.E.	Q: Why is the TDR element under building height strategy?	TDRs were listed under building height and form in this section since the interest was to explore whether TDRs would be an acceptable tool to help achieve desired building height and form goals of the plan.	N/A
51	2.E.	In analysis and recommendations, 3 rd bullet, remove “Rosslyn” and have TDRs only considered for the RCRD.	Staff concurs.	Remove reference to “Rosslyn” in 3 rd bullet of analysis and recommendations.
52	3.B.	In analysis, 5 th bullet, add “include topography when analyzing application of RMTS recommendations.”	Staff concurs.	Add “Include topography when analyzing application of RMTS recommendations”.
53	3.B.	In recommendations, add new bullet: “Identify opportunities to add highway connections around Rosslyn that would alleviate volume of through traffic on local streets.”	Staff concurs, but would suggest “could alleviate” volume of through traffic, instead of “would”.	Will add new bullet: “Identify opportunities to add highway connections around Rosslyn that could alleviate volume of through traffic on local streets.”
54	3.B.	In recommendations, add new bullet: “Develop strategy for management of bus, taxi, courtesy van, and ride share (slug) traffic within RCRD (including parking and waiting locations) and in particular its relation to Metrorail, hotels, and tourism.	Staff concurs, in that the plan will recommend locations for these needs at curbside and/or other appropriate locations, and potentially identify opportunities to consolidate services; but may not include quantifying patterns of these uses or recommending specific approaches to managing consolidation of these services.	Will add new bullet: “Develop general strategies for management of bus, taxi, courtesy van, and ride share (slug) traffic within RCRD (including parking and waiting locations) and in particular its relation to Metrorail, hotels, and tourism.
55	3.C.	In the analysis column, insert “topography/grade” as an element to factor into the review of RMTS street sections.	Staff concurs.	Add “topography/grade” to the bullet, between “plantings” and “and adjacent buildings”.
56	3.E.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, add “new” before “Metrorail infrastructure”.	Staff concurs.	Add “new” before “Metrorail infrastructure”.
57	3.E.	In analysis, add new bullet: “Consider feasibility and possible siting of a bus transfer facility.”	Staff concurs.	Add as a new bullet: “Consider feasibility and possible siting of a bus transfer facility.”
58	3.F.	In analysis, add new bullet: “Inventory existing bus stop locations and determine locations for potential future stops”.	Staff concurs, but would defer “determine locations” to the recommendation column for this item. (See ID# 59).	Add as a new bullet: “Inventory existing bus stop locations”.
59	3.F.	In recommendations, add new bullet: “Recommendations on potential future bus stop locations.”	Staff concurs.	Add as new bullet: “Recommendations on potential future bus stop locations.”
60	4.A.	Relocate first two bullets in the Recommendations column to the Analysis column.	Staff concurs, since these items focus on addressing existing conditions.	Move first two bullets from Recommendations column to Analysis column.

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
61	4.A.	In analysis bullet that speaks to user surveys, insert “parks and” before “open space needs, preferences, etc.”	Staff concurs.	Revise text to read “Conduct user surveys of park and open space needs, preferences, etc.”
62	4.A	In analysis, add new bullet that states: “Coordinate outcomes of the level of service, benchmarking, and surveys with key stakeholders.”	Staff concurs, to the extent this task is aimed at ensuring key stakeholders have an opportunity to provide input on level of service, benchmarking and surveys.	Add new bullet: “Coordinate outcomes of the level of service, benchmarking, and surveys with key stakeholders.”
63	4.A.	In analysis, add new bullet: “Identify existing public spaces that can be used as models/illustrative examples, when engaging the community.”	Staff concurs.	Add new bullet: “Identify existing public spaces that can be used as models/illustrative examples, when engaging the community.”
64	4.A.	In recommendations, add new bullet: “Identify strategies to maintain level of service, benchmarks and user needs for parks and open space in future years.”	Staff concurs.	Add new bullet: “Identify strategies to maintain level of service, benchmarks and user needs for parks and open space in future years.”
65	4.A.	In recommendations, last bullet, insert “park and” between the words “public” and “open space”.	Staff concurs.	Revise last bullet to say: “Recommendations on priority locations for Rosslyn’s public park and open spaces.”
66	4.B.	Insert “park and” before “open space network” in the issue statement for this item.	Although it is generally the intent, for consistency staff proposes maintaining the language as generally depicted in the County Board approved scope of work document from June 2011.	No proposed changes.
67	4.B.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, add “acquisition strategies” as items to research.	Staff concurs, to the extent that the team will provide a representative (but not exhaustive) sample of public open space acquisition strategies relevant to the Rosslyn context, not necessarily to include cost information.	Revise bullet to read: “Research best-practice techniques, acquisition strategies and precedents for creating high-quality, cost-effective public open space enhancements in comparable contexts.”
68	4.B.	In recommendations, 2 nd bullet, modify text to add “parks” before “open space”, specify the 2005 PSMP, and replace LAPP with Parkland/Open Space Acquisition and Preservation Plan.	Staff concurs.	Revise 2 nd bullet to add “parks” before “open space”, specify the 2005 PSMP, and replace LAPP with Parkland/Open Space Acquisition and Preservation Plan.
69	4.C.	In Recommendations, 3 rd bullet, add “park and” before all instances of “open space”	Staff concurs.	In 3 rd bullet, add “park and” before all instances of “open space”.
70	4.C.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, 3 rd sub-bullet, add “and Route 50” before “deck concepts”.	Staff concurs.	Add “Route 50” between “1-66” and “deck concepts”
71	4.C.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, 4 th sub-bullet, add the following after “18 th Street extension concept”: “for pedestrians or vehicles for individual street sections by block”.	Staff concurs.	Add “for pedestrians or vehicles for individual street sections by block” after “18 th Street extension concept”.
72	4.C.	In analysis, add new bullet stating: “Evaluate urban tree species options to improve canopy”.	Staff concurs.	Add “Evaluate urban tree species options to improve canopy” as new bullet.
73	4.D.	Comment on SOW issue description: With Wilson School	Staff concurs, and the plan framework will visually clarify	No proposed changes.

COMMENT/RESPONSE MATRIX | Rosslyn Process Panel Comments on Draft Work Plan, with Staff Response and Resolutions

06-10-2013

ID	ITEM	PANEL MEMBER COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION
		playfield and Rosslyn Highlands Park (inter alia) missing from this description, we need to be clear what areas are being addressed]	what parks are being addressed, and the narrative descriptions/recommendations in the plan will reinforce that.	
74	4.D.	In recommendations, 2 nd bullet, insert "in the RCRD" to qualify this as the focus area for park opportunities.	Staff concurs.	Add "in the RCRD" just before "through follow up initiatives."
75	4.D.	In recommendations, 3 rd bullet, replace "building form" with "building ground plane".	Staff concurs.	Replace "building form" with "building ground plane".
76	4.E.	In analysis, 1 st bullet, insert "park and" before "open space needs".	Staff concurs.	Insert "park and" before "open space needs".
77	4.E.	In analysis, 2 nd bullet, replace "to" with "for".	Staff concurs.	Replace "to" with "for".
78	4.E.	In analysis, 3 rd bullet, insert "parks or" before "open spaces".	Staff concurs.	Insert "parks and" before "open spaces".
79	4.E.	In analysis, add new bullet: "Review urban parks and open spaces developed in Arlington through the site plan process. Evaluate their use and effectiveness for the broader community."	Staff concurs, to the extent that a qualitative review would be done of select parks and open spaces achieved through the site plan process in the County that are relevant examples when discussing Rosslyn.	Add new bullet: "Qualitatively review urban parks and open spaces developed in Arlington through the site plan process, and identify good precedents as examples that could inform planning efforts for future parks and open spaces in Rosslyn."
80	4.E.	In recommendations, 1 st bullet, insert "parks and" before "open space".	Staff concurs.	Insert "parks and" before "open space".
81	4.E.	In recommendations, 2 nd bullet, insert "or community benefits credit" before "for provisions of...".	Staff concurs.	Insert "or community benefits credit" before "for provisions of...".