

**MCLEAN PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monthly Meeting, August 15, 2018**  
6645 Chain Bridge Road, McLean. Balducci's shopping center

7:00 PM

**Call to Order**

**Winnie Pizzano**

Approval of minutes – deferred to next meeting

Ruthanne Smith

**Treasurer's Report**

**Francesca Gutowski**

\$947.37 = balance from bank, problems getting statement to po box

\$4000 CD matures on Jan 19, 2019

**Supervisor's Report** – set forth later in these minutes as part of 6707 Old Dominion report  
**Ben Wiles**

MRC Report – deferred to next meeting

Roshan Carter

**Old Business**

**Website**

**Winnie**

Website is coming along. Do people want their pictures on the website? No one appeared to want a picture.

**6707 Old Dominion Project Subcommittee**

**Maya Huber**

Maya: there is a misconception I need to clear up. Bassing is not only complying w design standards, he is doing better than design standards because of location of sidewalks and trees. Winnie has update from ben. Bassing has figured out how to offset on the first, he will offset, go back and make it up on the office building side, looking at that as a potential idea. Undergrounding is the big issue. Staff is not happy w. undergrounding not being solved. Bassing suggested they defer to next stage, with summer recess, and other stuff that is how we ended up in October. No one intended that, it just happened that way. Bassing will end up with 4 poles instead of 2 if he does the undergrounding.

Ben's report:

What Bassing has put on table is increase in proposed contribution to under-grounding. Bassing has increased his potential contribution to \$450,000. He will underground utility along frontage or contribute that money for undergrounding to be used on another project. We are evaluating

either him to his work or extend undergrounding across from Shell or Beverly and Elm. We are waiting to hear from Dominion on cost estimate.

Bassing's latest offering of \$450k includes significant money to relocate some items on his property, grease traps. He is estimating \$100k for that, Ffx will evaluate what that means.

From the MPC: If you look on a per unit basis, \$450k is more than what JBG offered. Maybe twice as much.

Ben: That is true. But we don't negotiate proffers in a silo. Jbg gave a lot on the sidewalks.

## **Subarea Subcommittee**

## **Maya Huber**

Subcommittee report. Maya. We ran with it. Brian produced a lengthy memo, we reduced to bullets. Incorporated into these minutes is the one-page, bullet points, memo produced by the subcommittee dated August 15, 2018, entitled Discussion of McLean CBC Subarea Map – Outlined [sic] of Recommended Changes (referred to herein as "Subarea Outline"). *References in these minutes to subsections, such as 2, 3, 3a, 3b, etc. shall mean the subsections listed on the Subarea Outline drafted by the Subarea subcommittee.*

Summary of the subcommittee's findings and work (Maya):

Let's take it one piece at a time. It's basically the same thing we were talking at our last mtg. suggest putting up a new framework w 2 major areas.

1, Buffer area goes all the way around business district except Dolley Madison which itself is a buffer.

2, Core.

We don't spell out the rules. Height should be approx. same as residential 35-40 at mid point. Height limit for low rise office in business is 40.

Transition would happen in buffer zone. Then rest of bus. District could become a core much simplified where each property is worth as much as other. Except for high density core which is mclean house and ashby. Bonus core would need to be earned. Should have a commensurate offering for getting bonus density is public open space. In every development the thing that matters most is public open space have we been given. Palladium is case in point. We have a little plaza thanks to palladium. In return for that they could have height density and FAR up to 3.

**1<sup>st</sup> resolution** (from Nicole): Move that we suggest to Spr Foust and planning staff and task force any ideas that this group has.

Craig seconds.

Discussion. None desired.

All in favor aye. No one opposed. **Unanimous approval** of 1<sup>st</sup> resolution/motion.

**2<sup>nd</sup> resolution.** By the way this is all subject to transportation study. Move that we retain designation buffer zone consists of modified set of properties outlined on this map (subcom's map) and a transition yard or similar area be required for comm'l developmt required for mixed use

Seconded.

Discussion

Question whether we want to have a height number. 35-40 feet in buffer.

Reason: we don't want res'd around the business district to fray. It's the buffer zone. We should have more flexibility in buffer.

“stepping down to a business or stepping up to a business district” as Maya said is better wording than putting height.

Proposed amendment to Subarea Outline: Section 2b be changed to state that Building heights in buffer zones must transition down to adjacent residential buildings lying outside the buffer area.

Ken: Edges vary. Right now some houses are 25.

Francesca makes a motion to accept Nicole's wording. **Friendly amendment. Accepted by the subcom.**

**Motion:** adopt the friendly amendment as the only change to part 2.

Nicole seconded.

Vote: Majority of those present approved. One opposed (Rich). Part 2 as amended to remove specific height suggestions has been approved. **Measure passes.**

**Friendly amendment: Section 2b be changed to state that Building heights in buffer zones must transition down to adjacent residential buildings lying outside the buffer area.**

Medical bldg. on chain br road that is set back 40 feet is zoned FAR 1 so that building could double. The land area is large. That is one case where you might want greater height in front and step back in back.

2c transitional yard. Today the transitional yard is 25 feet.

Ken: Question about process. We vote on this, we take it to County, task force. Eventually the comprehensive plan will incorporate this. The objective of this exercise is to provide input to the people writing the plan. We will throw this on the table for everyone involved.

Ken: how do we participate in the debate?

(We all wonder that)

Ben: the way the process typically works, you have the task force, the County will put together a draft that will be shared w. task force, there'll be opportunities for public to comment; ultimately the task force will submit their comments. Staff will do same thing. planning Staff's report may be similar, different, from the task force. Planning commission will review that, public hearing will discuss, debate.

Prior to that, MPC can say whatever we want.

Ken: I expect someone will argue over height again; the task force that has been working on this may need to say 'this is our thought process of why we did this'

Ed: a few of are on the task force, then it's our roles to make sure we carry that on the task force. I'm on the task force because I'm on MPC.

Rich – I have no intention of doing that.

Winnie; there is plenty of opportunity for input, we need to be vigilant, and speak up. It would be surprising if they get to the detail of buffer zones or not.

Maya: this is a suggestion of the framework on which you can hang other stuff. We think it would facilitate development in business district if two adjacent properties have different requirements.

### Part 3 Core Area

Ken, Ed, Nicole: the use should be designated mixed use. Needs to be clear. Otherwise people are still trapped into having to in a three step process.

Maya: this is only about dissolving artificial barriers in the plan now. It is a framework. Not a full plan, doesn't need to be a plan. Does not purport to be anything more than this is an idea. This is how the whole thing should be framed up.

Ken: but fundamental is that it should be mixed use.

Maya: yes it should be mixed use.

Rich: the term mixed use has no meaning. Are you saying you can't build an apartment building or office building.

Ken: the reason landowners now have to get a comprehensive plan amendment and take 2 years is because their use is not aligned with the comprehensive plan use designation.

We let the market decide.

Ed: There's lots of mixed use zones in ffx where in mixed use, I can develop a residential only building or retail only, or a combo in mixed use area.

Making it mixed use would encourage development by removing an unnecessary step. Saying mixed use does not obviate a developer having to get a zoning amendment.

Francesca: The core area comprise mixed use development, including but not limited to res'l, apartment, business, retail, office, commercial. There is a land use designation of "mixed use" already. This document already has in the document the land use objectives. We are saying our land use objectives is mixed use.

Core area's land use expectations is mixed use.

Ed: I question whether we want to identify heights.

Palladium is 90ft, so is Bassing's project.

Ashby is about 130ft. 12 stories.

If someone bought total wine etc. And they built to 90 feet. Then someone else may never be able to build to 90 feet. The core building heights will be driven by market.

The goal of this task is to build a set of principles, making suggestions.

But you have re-defined buffer as a transitional zone. If I were looking at this, I would say to county staff why are you telling me I must have a transitional height

There should be a complete buffer along both sides of Ingleside. To give someone the potential right to build 90 foot building across the street.

This isn't a rule, this is ideas.

Friendly amendment suggested: adding mixed use as a description of Core area intended use.

"The land use objective of the core should be mixed use. The mixed use concept applies to all properties." Maya accepts the friendly amendment.

**Friendly amendment: 3a is amended to now state that The land use objective of the core should be mixed use. The mixed use concept applies to all properties.**

3d. Are we going to speak to a certain height or not. You need to give developers more flexibility than just open space being the way to bonus. Public benefits over the amount that is required, for example work force. Open space is very difficult to achieve. Can't put parking below grade (too expensive). Need a menu of items. Leed certification, for ex.

Rich: but the point is we need something to make the aesthetics.

- If you don't try to get public space you don't get it. Even the little pocket space is good.
- There is already open space requirement for developers.
- this is going to be a long negotiation on those topics. I am ok with making it more flexible and expansive, I do think the priority of open space is good.
- if you limit to open space no one will take the bonus space.
- 3c That the density be variable, but conditional upon the amount of public open space and/or other public benefits each development offers to provide.
- 3f That the receipt of bonus height be conditioned on greater public open space and/or other public benefits being provided by the owner/developer. Friendly amendment.

**Friendly amendment: 3f is amended to now state that the receipt of bonus height be conditioned on greater public open space and/or other public benefits being provided by the owner/developer.**

FAR and height are inextricably intertwined.

3e we talk about FAR being 3.0 but nowhere else.

What is the FAR in core area not in bonus?

- Do we put a range in. when you load up the land with FAR, then traffic is going to affect things. Shouldn't be less than 2.0 says Ken. Ed thinks should be at least 2.5.
- Subcomm purposely did not define FAR for the non-bonus area.
- Maybe we should try. Consider having a steering committee study FAR at a range of \_\_\_ and \_\_\_.
- Developer is looking for more definitive guidance.

**Motion** (Rich): Move we amend 3c to say density be variable but conditioned on the amount of open space and/or public benefits each development offers to provide with a maximum cap of FAR 2.0.

Maya seconds.

Discussion: Baseline cap should be 2.0, with the bonus round you can go up to 3.0.

Vote: 3 in favor, 6 opposed, the **measure does not pass**.

Ann: moves that core FAR should be 2.5.

Ken suggests range of 2.0 – 2.5 with the outcome dependent on the comprehensive plan process.

**Motion** from the floor (Francesca): Move that in 3c the maximum cap of FAR should be 2.5.

Ken seconds

Vote: 8 in favor, 2 opposed. **Measure passes**.

3c is amended to now state that **The density in the Core area may be variable, but conditional upon the amount of public open space and/or other public benefits, each development offers to provide with a maximum cap of FAR 2.0-2.5 in Core, non-Bonus areas with outcome depending on citizen committee process.**

**Motion** from the floor (Ed): Move to pass 4.

Ken seconds.

Vote: Unanimous approval. **Measure passes**.

**Motion** from the floor (Nicole): Move to add language to 4 or add a new section 5 stating designations describing north area and south area be dropped.

It's a one block radius, confusing, might as well add it to reduce confusion which is the purpose of the exercise.

Molly seconds.

Vote: Unanimous approval. Measure passes.

**Motion approved: Resolution adds language to 4 stating designations describing north area and south area be dropped.**

Rich: Points for the record. I think the core area is way too big. I don't think it was good public policy on the part of the group to take a position on this tonight without giving us to let our constituent groups a chance to weigh in on this.

Winnie: I have talked to my group about it. I have talked to Dale at MCA. We're looking at the land owners. Chamber had a separate meeting. This is the second meeting we've had on the subject. We've been transparent, I have talked to more than one group.

Rich: devil is in the details, the language we got yesterday and discussed today is substantive.

Ken: but this is ideas. We are starting the conversation. We don't think these subareas worked, these 4 different categories. We have suggestions along those lines. I don't think the county will feel in any way committed to this. We have a responsibility to have a position about this, the position we have taken is not very strong.

Ed: is MCA talking a position on this?

Rich: MCA will take a position on something that is put before them

Francesca: planning and zoning is aware.

Maya: I will not be at next p&z mtgs. There won't be a p&z mtg in August.

New business. None.

9:00 adjourn

**Directors:**

Present:

Winnie, Nicole, Ed, Maya, Ann, Kathleen, Molly, Craig, Marshal, Francesca, Rich, Ken

**MCA**

Maya Huber  
Francesca Gutowski  
Rich Salopek  
Debbie Matz

**SCA**

Andrew Serafin  
Winnie Pizzano  
Craig Bennett  
Charlie Bunn

**GMCC**

Nicole Morrill  
Ruthann Smith  
Ann Seaman  
Ken Wiseman

**CLA**

Ed Murn  
Mark McFadden

**Alternates**

---

Roshan Carter

Mari Pierce

Molly Peacock

Connie Fan

Hanlan Pasquier  
Kathleen Wysocki  
Brian Berry

Marshal Hyman  
Alan Edward  
Emily Oveissi