

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)

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	
Marilee Pierce	Charlie Bunn	Ken Wiseman	
<u>Alternate</u>			

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