



SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

**1555 Wilson Boulevard (SP #445)
SPRC Meeting #4
January 9, 2016**

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Erik Gutshall, Jane Siegel, Stephen Hughes, James Schroll, Stephen Sockwell, Elizabeth Gearin

MEETING AGENDA

The SPRC Chair began the meeting with an overview and introductions. The Applicant provided a presentation to the committee that was a response to comments and questions raised over the course of the previous three SPRC meetings. The SPRC then engaged in discussion and additional questions and answers on the material that had been presented before concluding with information provided on sustainability and phasing.

SPRC COMMENTS

Land Use and Zoning

- The Applicant explained how they were able to accommodate more three bedroom units in the west building.
- A question was asked about how the 10.0 FAR was derived or is provided for in the Development Agreement. Staff provided an explanation.

Urban Design and Building Architecture

- It was commented that the fire station should have a vestibule. It was confirmed that it is designed to have one. It was further noted the fire station design was too homogenous and that it does not stand out.

West Building

- Clarification was requested and provided on stepbacks for the West Building. Concern was expressed about the effect of the building on the school and the relationship between the two buildings. Additional questions followed and were answered about the proposed design of the building having an adverse impact on the proposed design of the school roof terrace plantings. In consideration of the fact that reducing the mass and providing stepbacks on the west building would reduce the amount of open space provided, some expressed that the amount of open space was preferred to reducing the mass by providing stepbacks on the West Building. A question was raised as to whether

or not density could be shifted from the west building to the east building to provide more sculpting to which the applicant replied not based on the current design and program with the fire station and other uses provided for based on the WRAP. It was also noted that massing changes on the West Building would adversely impact the basketball court and so changes were not preferred.

Transportation

- There was continued discussion with regard to the design of the loading dock for the east building with questions about whether or not it was envisioned that larger trucks would need to be accommodated and if there are larger trucks for move ins, where would they go. The Applicant noted that based on their retail program and the residential proposed, a longer, deeper bay was not needed but could be provided if needed in the future. There was additional discussion about the management and operation of loading docks in the R-B corridor and issues with enforcement – double parking, driveways being blocked, etc. There was a question about the availability of data on enforcement and how it is being captured. Specifically, how the County manages issues with loading dock enforcement.
- There was a question about any impacts of the loading on 18th street to school buses and whether or not parking is proposed on 18th street. It was noted that there should not be spaces on 18th Street because of potential impacts with respect to the truck turning radius. Additional explanation was provided by staff and the applicant as to how truck turning movements would occur on 18th street.
- A question was asked about whether or not N. Pierce Street could be a curbless street. The Applicant and staff responded that it could not.

Open Space

- Concerns were expressed with the design of the open space.
- A question was raised about the location of dog walking areas in the park and the Applicant's plan to accommodate this in their project. It was noted that there is no County policy or condition requirement to require an Applicant to provide areas for pets with site plans. The Applicant noted that they would continue to study this but that it is not currently part of their program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

- It was noted that the materials and façade fenestration on the East Building should vary.
- Comments were made with respect to vehicle trips, provision of a multimodal impact analysis; impacts on infrastructure, and number of students who will use the open spaces.

WRAP UP COMMENTS

- Area for dogs is needed in the project;
- N. Pierce Street needs more character; Something other than asphalt to make it more special. Consider making it curbless.

- A distinctive landscape plan is needed for the east side of the West Building.
- Loading design should accommodate large trucks.
- Pedestrian access during construction should be coordinated for each WRAP site plan (site plan conditions) including lighting.
- Fire Station 10 design needs something more.
- Consideration should be given to the effect on the school of the West Building and to ensure that the school roof gardens don't fail.

NEXT STEPS

- This was the final SPRC meeting for the project. It is anticipated that the site plan will be heard by the Advisory Commissions and County Board at their public meetings in February 2017.