

**Crystal City Planning Process
Task Force Meeting Summary
06-03-08**

Task Force Discussion on Draft Policies

The following are comments and questions from the members of the Task Force shared at this meeting:

Discussion of Recommended Transit Alignment:

- S. Del Giudice (DES) gave an overview of the transit sub-group process
- T. Savela provided a summary of the sub-groups considerations and preferences; with preference for alignment #3 (couplet) with assumption of dedicated ROW. It was noted that if shared ROW was employed, M. Bonanno prefers alignment #2 (Crystal Dr).
- There was agreement that if possible, the preference was for long-term alignment to travel down Clark/Bell to 26th Street, with the redevelopment of Block Q.
- Having an interim segment on 23rd Street would require added ROW that may not be needed once transitway shifts to 26th as the cross-connection.
- Q: Will this be discussed with the Transportation Commission?
- Are these recommendations tied to the road sections presented to the sub-group at May's meeting (*the cross-sections are under revision by staff*).
- At least one sub-group member's decision was based in part on the cross-sections and would like to know that they are not changing greatly.
- Agreement that the recommendation to the County Board would include just the alignment, not including the sections at this time.
- What consideration was given to serving Long Bridge Park with transitway (*no proposal for direct, extended service up to park was included*).
- Do we want to ask the County Board if dedicated ROW is a firm decision or not? (*The 2 min. headways were a reason for the dedicated ROW assumption*).
- How would 2-way traffic work on Crystal Dr?
- The one page assumptions for evaluation should be included in materials to the County Board.

Discussion of LRPC Meeting:

- Staff provided a big picture overview of the draft Policies to the LRPC, for discussion and feedback. Some of the questions related to land use policies and if they were sufficient or not.
- T. Savela provided a summary of the sub-groups considerations and preferences; with preference for alignment #3 (couplet) with assumption of dedicated ROW. It was noted that if shared ROW was employed, M. Bonanno prefers alignment #2 (Crystal Dr).

Policy LU-4:

- P. Benda suggests he work with staff to find a way to integrate OEM work on forced protection standards into guidelines for future development, as it relates to any potential need for secure buildings.

Policy P-1:

- There still appears to be a lack of additional parks on the west side; how is this to be achieved?
- The existing semi-pocket park at the corner of 22nd and Eads should be kept in the plan?

Policy P-2 and P-3:

- No comments

Policy S-0:

- The language seems like it belongs in the guiding principles, or it sounds similar to language we developed in the guiding principles. Perhaps we can add some specific examples or tasks to make this statement more of a policy.

Policy S-1:

- Why are renovations being included in this? Why would buildings in Crystal City be held to a higher standard than the rest of the county? *(The CC plan may be the first to identify such guidelines, but may not be the only place in the county where they are applied).*
- Four Mile Run project urban design guidelines have similar language, and are supportable.
- Renovations shouldn't be held to a higher standard. What comprises a "major" renovation? *(We should be striving for the best sustainable practices in all activity; it's consistent with county goals. If renovations are substantial enough to require site plan amendment/ County Board review, then sustainability standards should apply.)*
- It's very likely that ultimately what gets written into the CC Plan will apply to any site plan in the county.
- Why are renovations being included in this? Why would buildings in Crystal City be held to a higher standard than the rest of the county? *(The CC plan may be the first to identify such guidelines, but may not be the only place in the county where they are applied).*

Policy T-3:

- How is this different from what was in the guiding principles? We need to start adding meat to the bones.

Policy T-5:

- Too much "required retail" is shown around the center park and perhaps in some other areas as well.
- Some retail in areas around parks/plazas would be helpful and should be a goal.

- The goal is to help encourage activity around these parks at all times to make them active, attractive and safe.
- Maybe required retail can be removed from BNA frontage
- Perhaps a footnote could be added that speaks to the need for retail locations to be viable.
- Residential lobbies fronting parks can help to activate the parks/plazas.
- Staff will revisit the retail diagram to possibly incorporate some of these comments.
- More detail or greater requirements should be considered for treatment of the underground retail.

Policy T-8:

- How will the current increase in transit use, based on increased gas prices, impact the future plan for transit in Crystal City?

Policy T-10:

- Why are we starting to discuss parking minimums at this point; we haven't been talking about minimums in the past, have we? *(The county parking policy is evolving and this is in draft form. The community may not be ready yet to totally abandon parking minimums, so we've always been talking about a range in terms of minimum and maximum, it may just not have been explicitly stated.)*
- Are the minimums based or supported by the traffic studies? Can they be achieved in the plan?
- There is support from landowner interests to do away completely with parking minimums.
- Perhaps to provide flexibility for future changes, the policy can bracket this range but also note that current county parking plan should be adhered to as it evolves over time, particularly if it drops minimums at some future time.
- T-10 doesn't specify the amount of retail parking, is that correct?

Preparation for County Board Work Session:

- It was noted that the Board would benefit from specific opinions from each of the Task Force Members.
- We need to determine what questions we are asking the CB. Is it an endorsement of staff's proposal or direction for change?
- Some comment that we are not adequately explaining the question as drafted.
- There continues to be disagreement between staff and some landowners about the viability of the plan; yet there is an acknowledgment that some plan elements will need to be financed differently.