

MCLEAN PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
Monthly Meeting, January 16, 2019
McLean Community Center
7:00 PM

Call to Order

Winnie Pizzano

Approval of minutes

Ruthanne Smith

Minutes approved

Treasurer's Report

Francesca Gutowski

Submitted in writing by Treasurer in her absence

Current Balance: \$771.42

- Beginning balance \$947.37
- Expenses 1/8/19: US Postal Service for Box 6007. -\$139.00
- Expense 1/8/19: Reimbursement to Francesca Gutowski for IRS 990N Filing. - \$39.95

CD 12 Month Term

- Maturity Date 1/9/19: Value \$4,062.24
- Renewed at 2.55% interest for 12 month term

Supervisor's Report

Ben Wiles

Nothing to report

MRC Report

Roshan Carter

- Looking for money for pedestrian improvements
 - Mars has promised \$25K
 - MRC looking for other sources
- Undergrounding is coming back
 - There is under \$1M for undergrounding
 - Hoping we can find some poles that can be done with that amount

New Business: Presentations of nominations to the CBC plan

Individuals representing property owners presented the changes they proposed be included in the Comprehensive Plan that is currently being updated. The county requested this be done.

These presentations were not requests for approval; just information sharing. No votes were taken.

Assisted Living facility – Nomination 1

David Schneider

Develop an Assisted Living Facility on the site of the McLean Medical Building at 1515 Chain Bridge Road

See submission text in Appendix

Discussion

- Change from medical office to medical care facility/ assisted living
- Want to add use; preserving height and open space
- Believe that this is plan compliant and rezoning is not necessary
- In the C3, a medical facility is an approved use
- Assisted living half the height of what is currently allowed and use only 40% of the open space
- The Health Care Advisory Board found need at the Kirby/Westmoreland site but there wasn't a question about the need

Exxon/7-11 proposal – Nomination 5, Different Use for the Exxon/7-11 at the Corner of Old Dominion and Chain Bridge, a 1.28 acre parcel

Michelle Rosati

See submission text in Appendix

Discussion

- While we aren't sure exactly how the final plan will wind up, we want this site to be included in the Center Zone
 - Wherever the “bulls eye” or epicenter of new development winds up, this intersection is very prominent
 - If this area is included in the Center Zone (currently it's not), it would offer the best opportunity to see this space developed
 - We submitted a density consistent with what's near it, the applicant said this density would be subject to the provision of 30% open space consolidated to that corner
- Vision Plan included green squares for open space
 - At this intersection, owner would develop an open space more like a plaza, not just grass
- We want to continue to talk this through

Q&A from MPC Members

- MPC Question - What kind of F.A.R.?
 - 3.0 subject to the 30% consolidated open space
- MPC Question – Would you agree to a height restriction?
 - Yes
- MPC Question - Any discussion with McLean Butcher, the properties on the same block as the gas station, about what they might want to do?
 - Owners have reached out to them, don't know if there are any real substantive discussions
 - Some people said might make sense to treat as a block, all the same
 - Others say this could be a transition area
- Discussion around open space language in the Vision Plan and how it would apply to this situation

- Issue is that StreetSense wanted up to 10 stories in center zone with 30% open space BUT you must deliver a 2/3 acre public space
- The bonus isn't linked to open space percentage but rather is 2/3 acre
- According to the current Vision Plan guidelines, the Exxon/7-11 owners would not be eligible for the bonus area because they don't have the public space - 2/3 acre of public space
- Argument linking the height to the open space isn't related to the language of the Vision Plan
- Members raised that MPC already voted against this idea
 - After the discussion above, some members said they would be for it
 - Discussion that MPC can reconsider and change its position

New Business: Task Force Update

Rich Salopek

Discussion of the Planning Process

- Task Force is yet to work with staff to finalize the Vision Plan
- According to the Vision Plan process document, then this plan is what will be reviewed on the 28th
 - The Task Force will present 1-3 nominations and discussion
 - Various organizations will present ideas (including MPC)
- No more public meetings at this point; feedback has to come through MPC
- Should MPC provide feedback to the county through the Task Force?
 - Yes. Task force members appointed to represent various constituents should report to their group
 - Coordination between task force and respective community organizations is responsibility of task force member

Discussion of StreetSense Vision as compared plan to MPC resolution

Resolution titled, "*RESOLUTION BY THE MCLEAN PLANNING COMMITTEE, November 14, 2018, REGARDING THE FRAMEWORK & VISION PLANS FOR THE MCLEAN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT PRESENTED AT THE NOV. 8, 2018 COMMUNITY MEETING*"

- Note that StreetSense did not disposition MPC feedback
 - If recommendations in the MPC resolution are not included in the StreetSense plan we do not know why
- MPC representatives are to convey thoughts and wishes of constituent organizations to the Task Force
- **MOTION:** MPC recommends that the county put comprehensive plan amendments on hold for six months after the Vision Plan is expected to be finalized
 - Aye/For: 3
 - Opposed: 8
 - Motion doesn't pass

Vision Comments/Motions

1A. Propose that the Vision Plan be changed to include the Exxon in the Center Zone but not in the Bonus Zone.

- Aye/For: 7
- Opposed: 4

2B. Propose that the Vision Plan be updated to reflect trees along Chain Bridge Road.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

3C. Propose to keep open space location and size flexible for ease of implementation. Open space will be in the CBC and there is a strong preference for it to be in the Bonus Zone.

- Aye/For: 7
- Opposed: 4

4D. Propose that the area around Landinis at Lowell and Old Chain Bridge be included in the Center Zone.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

5E. Propose that the Center Zone include the Ashby and the McLean House.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

6F. Propose that J. Gilberts and McDonald's be included in the General versus the Edge Zone.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

7G. Propose that MPC supports the concept of networked streets but recommends that the idea be reflected in the Vision Plan in a conceptual versus prescriptive fashion.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

8H. Propose that the Vision Plan be updated to connect Edge Zone areas to the Center Zone via pedestrian walkways.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

9I. Propose that the Vision Plan provide more information about the enhanced pedestrian facility related to connecting Elm St over Dolley Madison Boulevard.

- Aye/For: All
- Opposed: None

10J. Propose that the Vision Plan describe how previously adopted plans for multi-modal transportation such as bike trails will be impacted by the Vision Plan.

- Aye/For: All

- Opposed: None

11K: Propose the 11A from the original MPC resolution be removed. (11A language: We recommend changing the Baptist Church property, the parcels located between Chain Bridge Rd and Franklin Sherman ES (FSES), and the parcels to the south of FSES (between Old Dominion and Corner Ln) from General Zone to Edge Zone.)

- For/Aye: 7
- Opposed: 4

12J: Propose that MPC maintain the following aspects of the November 14, 2018 resolution: numbers 1, 2, 5A, 5B, 6, and 10.

- For/Aye: All
- Opposed: None

13K: Propose that MPC affirms the three designations, Edge, General and Center and that it agrees in principal with the bonus area.

- For/Aye: All
- Opposed: None

Other Note to the Vision Plan

Drafting mistake: The Vision Plan is not consistent in the transportation plan visual. The enhanced pedestrian facility is missing and should be added back at #8.

MPC raised that somebody briefed at a Franklin Sherman meeting that the Vision Plan is part of a larger effort to shut down Franklin Sherman the school and move it outside the CBC. County affirmed that this has never been part of the discussion.

Adjournment

Directors:

MCA	SCA	GMCC	CLA
Maya Huber	Andrew Serafin	Nicole Morrill	Ed Murn
Francesca Gutowski	Winnie Pizzano	Ruthanne Smith	Mark McFadden
Rich Salopek	Craig Bennett	Ann Seaman	
Merilee Pierce	Charlie Bunn	Ken Wiseman	

Alternates:

Roshan Carter	Mari Pierce	Molly Peacock
Connie Fan	Hanlan Pasquier	Marshal Hyman
	Kathleen Wysocki	Alan Edward
	Brian Berry	Emily Oveissi

APPENDIX

David Schneider Talking Points: Presentation to MPC

- **Address:** 1515 Chain Bridge Road
- **Parcel Size:** 97,217 square feet (2.23 acres)
- **Surrounding Property:** Redeemer Church (West), McLean Professional Park (East **and** South), Chain Bridge Road (North)

- **Existing Zoning:** C-3 → permits 1.0 FAR; 90 foot height maximum; 15% open space requirement.
 - Property is unique
 - C-3 District is most intense by-right district in CBC
 - This parcel is the largest C-3 Parcel in CBC
 - Therefore, this property would yield most intense by-right development CBC
 - Property is not in center/core of CBC, but still important as it is part of the gateway along Chain Bridge Road

- **Existing Comprehensive Plan** – Located in Subarea 2
 - “For office use, retain transitional character” 40ft height recommendation / 30% open space recommendation
 - Exactly what we submitted
 - Assisted living is a transitional use
 - Commercial aspects, but residential in nature
 - We are retaining the 40ft height recommendation and 30% open space recommendation
 - For implementation the Comprehensive Plan states to look to zoning ordinance
 - Medical Care Facility (Assisted Living) is a permitted Special Exception use in the C-3 district
 - **Therefore, this use is plan compliant with the existing Comprehensive Plan.**
 - Comprehensive Plan Amendment is not necessary
 - Submitted this Suggestion to protect current ability to seek a Special Exception for Assisted Living and prevent re-planning the site in a way which would encourage by-right development.

- **Existing Building:** 3 stories tall with 33,000 square feet of Medical Office GFA
 - By-right allows 90 ft tall, 97,217 square feet of medical office GFA and only 15% open space

- **Transportation:** Using ITE
 - Assisted living at a 1.0 FAR would generate 1/4 the trips than the **existing** medical office, which is a fraction of the by-right potential (by-right building could be built to be 3x the existing building).

- Owner is looking to sell
 - There is a lot of interest in the property – including assisted living providers.
 - County consultant’s market analysis stated that the office need in CBC is the replacement the old medical office buildings
 - They are referencing this building
 - This building was built in early 1960’s
- Hopefully by-right development of this site can be avoided
 - Owners understand not the site for the 90ft buildings (by-right), but also want to sell their site at market value
- The for plan amendment suggestions asked if each suggestion: “Reflects implementation of Comp Plan guidance through Zoning approvals”
 - Assisted living requires a Special Exception, which is evaluated for being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan
 - We believe assisted living is one of the only uses to allow the site to develop to its market potential while providing:
 - ½ the by-right height
 - 2x the by-right open space
 - ¼ the existing traffic.
 - All while providing transition to center of the CBC

- Comp Plan defines CBC’s identity as “a community-serving business district”. We propose to change the Medical Office to a Medical Care Facility, which is how assisted living is classified. This property will therefore continue its multiple decade long history of providing care to McLean.

Michelle Rosati Talking Points: Presentation to MPC

Intersection of Chain Bridge Road and Old Dominion Drive

6720 and 6724 Old Dominion Drive 1.28 acres consolidated

Currently occupied with an Exxon gas station and a 7-11 convenience store

When the CBC process was initiated, the Owner really liked the concept of a revitalized McLean, and wanted to engage in that process.

This property is at a very visible, central location in downtown McLean

Community input led to the identification of possible locations for public space in the “Framework Plan” – they were clustered around the CBR/ODD intersection, and the portion of this property closest to the corner was identified.

So we asked the Owner – is this something that could potentially happen in a redevelopment scenario? What might that look like, and what would it take to make that work?

Fundamentally, as the Framework Plan had evolved to a “three tier” approach – it seemed to us that this property would most appropriately placed in the CENTER zone.

Whether you place the ‘center of the bullseye’ on this intersection, or (as the Streetsense concept places it, more like Elm and Beverly) – this property is still in the heart of McLean, both FUNCTIONALLY and VISIBLY.

This is a very visible corner, with a lot of automobile activity (and wide curb cuts).

If the objective is to create a more pedestrian-oriented streetscape, and to encourage the creation of signature public spaces, then redevelopment of this site would support those objectives.

Of course, the primary, and perhaps most powerful, incentive in redevelopment is the intensity you can achieve on the site.

We know that there will be ongoing discussions about what it means to be in the CENTER ZONE – from the standpoint of density, height, and the expectations that go along with that.

But MOST fundamentally, we submit to you that this property should be in it.

The “Final Vision Plan” Framework Plan presented by Streetsense shows three sides of the ODD/CBR intersection in the CENTER ZONE – but NOT this one –

Which, considering that this is a significant consolidated land holding, currently developed with auto-oriented uses, with an owner who wants to be part of the revisioning of McLean –

Is a little hard to understand...

It makes much more sense to support redevelopment of the entire intersection and MAXIMIZE the opportunity to reshape that focal point VISUALLY and FUNCTIONALLY

(Pedestrian realm as well as simplify/streamline FLOW at that intersection)

IN ADDITION – the concept of creating meaningful public open space is something that can be achieved through redevelopment

The Owner made a decision to open the discussion on that public open space NOW, at the CBC planning level

So when the submitted the proposal, we specifically proposed that the achievement of CENTER ZONE-level density would be SUBJECT TO the provision of a MINIMUM 30% PUBLIC OPEN SPACE – CONSOLIDATED TOWARD THE INTERSECTION.

As opposed to just saying “we think it should be planned for CENTER density” and leaving the open space question for rezoning – this proposal would SET that expectation IN THE PLAN

The proposal includes a sketch of how that would lay out on the site, and includes some ‘precedent images’ to show how that space could be designed (worth 1000 words)

Input in the process seemed to indicate that more of a “landscaped plaza” with hardscape elements vs a “park” was more desirable – but of course none of this is set in stone.

We really just wanted people to be able to envision it. This is all at a very conceptual level, but I think that’s appropriate at the Plan stage.

We submit to you that the inclusion of this property in the CENTER ZONE, with redevelopment up to 3.0 FAR SUBJECT TO the provision of 30% of the site area in consolidated, meaningful public open space achieves these OBJECTIVES

We understand that this is a process, and likely an extended process, but we are committed to working with you, the Task Force and the community on the vision for this site.