

**MCLEAN PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA**  
**Monthly Meeting, March 20, 2019**  
**7:00 PM**  
**McLean Community Center**

**Call to Order**

Winnie Pizzano

**Approval of minutes**  
Minutes Approved.

Ruthanne Smith

**Treasurer's Report**

CD at 2.55% - matures January, 2020 4,062.24  
Checking account 907.42

Francesca Gutowski

**Supervisor's Report**

Ben Wiles

**MRC Report**

Collected \$25K from Mars

Roshan Carter

**New Business**

**Update on Medical Office Building on Chain Bridge Road**

- Connie Fan has a conflict of interest; she won't be voting
- David Schneider presented: concept is to develop a Sunrise Senior Living center at the current location of the Medical Building Property 1515 Chain Bridge Road
- CBC says: All identified needs should be accommodated in the CBC and the CBC doesn't have assisted living right now
- Proposed center is designed to meet McLean guidelines and includes the following elements:
- **Streetscape / Street Design:**
  - Providing preferred streetscape
  - Proposing to add a bus shelter in guidelines to the site
  - Adding a bike lane
  - Building is 25' from curb
  - Garbage pickup is interior to building so it won't be visible
- **Building:**
  - 3 story masonry brick with sloped roof
    - Majority is 40' high with a few points that are 45' for interest
  - Entrance designed with a balcony on the top
  - Articulated the building to reflect townhome
  - 2 story bay windows that will be attractive feature

- Looked to recently approved material to get the design aesthetic as well as the garden types that are common
- Porch transitions and pushes the building back
  - Design guidelines encourage front porches; 1 story porch that is 12' deep
- **Parking:**
  - Underground parking opens up open space
- **Open Space:**
  - 1 acre of open space – 45% of property and that does not include the streetscape
  - Including some space that will be open space – public urban park
  - there is a trail that connects to the church playground
  - the visual currently included in the concept is a placeholder so they can work with the community on what the space will look like – about 2/10 of an acre

### **MPC Member Discussion and Q&A**

- Where is the loading?
  - Loading is interior to the building – so it's not visible from Chain Bridge
- What about the curb cut?
  - The two cuts were studied and VDOT thinks the proposed cut is the best solution given the existing scenario
- What about the mature trees that are on the property?
  - We're studying what needs to be done to protect the trees
  - The design of the drive aisle will be large enough to accommodate the old growth trees
- Do you need approval from MPC?
  - Staff is in conformance with comp plan
  - The need for assisted living is established
  - We need an entitlement and approval from the Board of Supervisors to approve
  - Have submitted the special exception

### **Presentations of nominations to the CBC plan: Evan Pritchard (land use attorney at Venable) - MCBC 6 – Old Dominion, Ingleside and Beverly: Mr. Pritchard**

- Client just purchased these in the past year or two
- Since McLean is planning, told client he should be involved
- Everything is very conceptual
- Presented to the McLean CBC Task Force
  - In light of feedback, this is a revised version of the plan we submitted in November
  - which was based on a guesstimate – given that the StreetSense study wasn't complete yet
- Proposed site plan includes residential and retail
- Would try to break up block with a center access street
  - Reduces curb cuts
  - Move the traffic more smoothly
  - Let people cut through the block
- Vision plan calls for 3-5 stories
  - we are proposing 7 stories on Old Dominion and no more than 5 on Ingleside
  - Task Force (on Monday) said they would consider this
- The plan presented had 176-178 units

- what is shown on the current plan would be closer to 157
- Want to be respectful of the nearby homeowners
- More walkable block, open space, retail, street trees – and try to achieve the broader vision

### **MPC Member Discussion and Q&A**

- MPC Suggestion: tie the building in – so at least a 6’ sidewalk on Old Dominion
  - Answer: Yes- We agree
- MPC – What’s the temp impact of the sun hitting the all glass buildings? In NY it is adding heat to the building.
  - Answer: that is news to me – we’d have to meet the county LEED expectations. We’d do what we have to do
- MPC: Are you proposing the existing parking deck continue to be a parking deck or add some open space?
  - Yes – we are suggesting open space
- MPC: For FAR, are you only measuring on the current corner or combining parcels?
  - We are measuring the residential building on the land that it stands on
  - We are calculating the FAR for the zoning
  - Both parcels – 89790 sq. feet – just the Old Dominion site
  - So this is a 2.8 FAR where the triangular parcel is
- MPC: When you’re thinking about applying for a special exception – are you moving forward with development or just trying to get vested rights for many years?
  - In conversation with “John” (current owner) he said if there’s support in the community, he’d be interested in moving forward relatively quickly with these
- Height: MPC: For anyone who has been to the task force – I have a lot of concern about the height of the buildings – looking at Google street view, I take issue with the characterization of the height of the buildings
  - I’d be surprised if the houses were more than 25’
  - It’s more like 70 versus 25 not 60 versus 40 – height comparison.
  - Anything higher than 3 stories should not be allowed along Ingleside – continue to advocate to keep Ingleside a residential versus commercial street
  - MPC: What is the elevation difference – how does the site slope?
    - Answer: see page 3 – the building sits roughly level if not lower than the houses along that side
  - MPC – As far as height, walk up to the townhouses that are already there – the buildings are already blocked by the white building that is already there – not saying for or against the 5 stories – but go see it.
- MPC: I’d like to see some greenspace at Ingleside and Old Dominion – I think you have to take care – this is an edge zone (loosely) and have to be aware of the people who live there
- MPC: I looked at the last picture where the Signet is – I wonder how many people would think this building design is not in alignment – someone should have gotten another design – understanding this is conceptual
  - We were invited by staff to submit the nomination – if we were coming before you with an actual proposal – this would be different
- MPC: Suggest to the owner he join the MPC

- MPC: Is there a typology architecturally for McLean? The design may not be suited to McLean preferences
  - MPC: Are there any guidelines that we can give people so they can come back with some certainty that McLean would like
  - MPC: The design may be good. Signet is good because it has varied massing and steps back – could be contemporary and looks like just as good

### **Task Force Update: Rich Salopek et al**

- We've had two task force meetings since we last met (past Monday and two weeks prior)
- The Task Force is trying to narrow down the edges – center, edge
- Trying to set a table for FAR calculations
- Traffic Study:
  - As we understand it, we only get one traffic study from the Task Force – and it has to be modeled on a certain development scenario
  - On Monday, we approved the scenario that would be approved for the study but the plan that we approved for the study might not be the plan at the end of the day
  - County said it would be better to start higher because it's easier to manipulate traffic estimate downward
  - So, we are using relatively high level of density for the purposes of the study
  - For purposes of understanding the scale discussed in this scenario – these are estimates:
    - This sets the residential, retail, office, hotel FAR on each parcel to estimate future density
    - Would run about 8.5 million of density versus the 4.3 million sq. ft. we have today – (potential for development is 5.9M sq. feet)
    - 1279 residential units today and the scenario 3,900-4,300 residential units in the scenario
  - The analysis is 25 year and the market need analysis is 10 years; so comparing apples to oranges

### **Form of Zoning**

- County is discussing/proposing a form of zoning that is unclear
  - Versus specific numbers – sounds like you set performance criteria based on various development goals –
  - Sounded like zoning becomes a negotiating process versus a prescriptive process – you can't look at your property and tell what the zoning is
- Developer problem is that this is uncertain - and so how does this work – leaves developers wondering why they would try to develop here
- Have this approach in other areas in Fairfax County and nothing works. Gets too complicated
  - Rich requested Katrina and Kim – if they could provide an example of a development in Fairfax County that was approved
  - We need the zoning branch chief present at the Task Force Meetings or at an MPC Meeting
  - The planning staff who were present chose not to answer the question
- There is no agreement on definitions of zones; can't provide characteristics of each zone. The county hasn't defined them

- There is a bonus density area within the center zone –
  - Generally speaking max height is 7 – you get a bump up if you build a 2/3 acre green space – the idea is if you create a substantial green space – you can build higher
  - Once someone is “awarded” the bonus density, it’s gone. You can’t have 2, 6 acre developments – you can only have one
  - Problem is for a modeling perspective for traffic – have to limit the zone – County proposed a 6 acre limit to confine the bonus density area (we think)

### **Gaining Clarity on the Planning Process and Decision-Making including Zoning**

- MPC would like to get some clarity on the overall Task Force process including:
  - how the zoning will work
  - how voting works; questions were raised but not addressed
  - how the Task Force feedback will be acknowledged and incorporated
- While the McLean Commercial Landowners Association were at the latest meeting; it was the first meeting they attended
  - Not clear whether they were aware or not that the planning was taking place
  - 12 landowners came to the task force – those 12 – they should have had 4 people on the task force from the beginning – should have been personally invited –
- Task Force meetings happen off sequence with MPC meetings – we’re always a month behind – we don’t get a chance to digest what has happened in order to present to the MPC
  - Could move meetings around but is it worth it? Since we don’t know what the meetings will be about – can’t plan
  - Issue is that the chamber made a presentation and then we had no discussion about it – we just went on

**Motion:** MPC requests Branch Chief to speak to the MPC about form based versus prescriptive zoning and to provide information about how they would see the form-based zoning implemented within McLean. MPC meets with the Chief prior to their attendance at an MPC meeting to structure the conversation prior to the meeting.

- All in favor. Motion passed.
- **Action:** Winnie will call Ben and convey our request

### **Privately Owned Open Space**

**Maya Huber**

Small proposal that came from Huntingdon

- wherever you have publicly accessible but privately owned open space that there should be a marker – that shows people have access to it – so that people know they can use the area
- Maya will say okay conceptually but as small and inconspicuous as possible – even in pavement

### **Hotels By-Right in Office Buildings**

**Maya Huber**

- Redoing the zoning ordinance – called zmod – under it:
  - the new hotel and R&D uses would be allowed by right in office buildings
  - by right adult book stores as retail anywhere

- Comment period – can’t change adult book stores because they are retail and can be treated as such
- What we’re told – is that they are reorganizing versus a rewrite
  - Putting existing uses into a chart – so grouping common things – so it’s easier to follow what can be done
- To some extent these groupings might require substantive changes to zoning to make the categories work.
  - then they have to consolidate uses and make new categories
  - whatever has special exception or permission – there is a public hearing
  - have public scrutiny with a public hearing – they are responsive
- If they take a use that’s a little questionable and make it “by right” it will prevent citizens from being able to weigh in
- Too much empty office space in the county, so they’re looking around for a new use for the empty office space. Office versus hotel is a different thing. Even if in a commercial district

**Motion:** That the committee provide feedback that a hotel is not always a good substitute or alternative for an office building.

All agreed. Motion passed.

**Bylaws**

**Ann Seaman**

- Include business owners and commercial real estate agents as members (a group) to become members of the MPC
- Winnie has asked multiple people to participate but we are having a hard time getting people to come
- They would have four alternates and four Directors – would not change the composition
- Would have to give them a new designation – not CLA but something more inclusive
- McLean Commercial Owners (Land or Business)

**Motion:** Redefine the CLA as the McLean Commercial Owners – defined as landowners or business owners within the CBC.

All agreed. Motion Approved.

**Adjournment**

**Directors: (Bold= In Attendance)**

<b>MCA</b>	<b>SCA</b>	<b>GMCC</b>	<b>CLA</b>
<b>Maya Huber</b>	<b>Andrew Serafin</b>	<b>Nicole Morrill</b>	Ed Murn
<b>Francesca Gutowski</b>	<b>Winnie Pizzano</b>	<b>Ruthanne Smith</b>	Mark McFadden
<b>Rich Salopek</b>	Craig Bennett	<b>Ann Seaman</b>	
<b>Marilee Pierce</b>	<b>Charlie Bunn</b>	Ken Wiseman	
<b><u>Alternate</u></b>			

---

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