

**Crystal City Planning Process
Task Force Meeting Summary
05-06-08**

Task Force Discussion on Draft Policies

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

General Comments:

- Need further clarification between concept plan and policies – do they supplement each other or not?
- Need to provide flexibility within the Plan and Policies. Developers and Owners are asking for flexibility to potentially change park locations, orientations, etc. in order to make their developments more feasible, even though they possibly may be contrary to what the Concept Plan, Policies, Heights Diagram, and/or Park and Street Locations Diagrams may dictate.
- Seems that Staff has altered certain Policies and Plan Diagrams contrary to what the Task Force has said, requested, or known about, based on the illustrative plan.
- It seems that county staff and the developer representatives have conflicting views on several matters.
- Plan needs to allow for and promote future development to meet the overarching goals of the Concept Plan. There is a fear that without a strong economic understanding or implementation concept, the plan may not be fully or even partially realized.
- It seems the plan has not moved forward with proposed ideas by the Task Force. Even though it has been 1.5 years now, what have we achieved?

Policy P-1:

- How were the open space designations “Preferred” and “Required” developed? How are they defined? These need to be clearly defined.
- Are there dimensions to the “Required” and/or “Preferred” Parks?
- If the Policy does not require dimensions then Vornado may be more in favor of the Policy. Suggested change to qualify “Required” spaces as requiring approx. size/location on block to meet overall intent of design. In any case enough flexibility is needed to allow for working through final design in the future.
- What is the thinking behind the plaza at Crystal Dr and 23rd St? Has this been shown in the past?
- Open spaces (Parks, Plazas) do not make great retail destinations or places.
- Need to define what the difference is between a Park and Plaza.
- Does a Plaza include landscape and trees?
- Further reductions in open space are not welcome.
- Will “Preferred” open spaces really survive the process? They should be expected as open spaces to be achieved.
- Too much flexibility will diminish the plan. There is a fear that by adding flexibility the cumulative effect may be a dramatic reduction in open space.

- Would like to see more Parks and Open Spaces at mid-block points between Eads and Route 1, north of 23rd Street, and also along Fern St if possible.
- Existing open space within Crystal Park development east of Crystal Drive should remain.
- What is the difference in area between existing open space, the vision plan open space, and the policy diagram open space.
- Open spaces # 3, 6, and 7 are all problematic, as TF has said before.
- What is the anticipated use of open space #13?
- Parks and Plazas are likely locations for Transitway or transit stops, and need to be designed to accommodate them appropriately. This is especially true for open space #6.
- Water Park is an example of a Park that has substantial paved surfaces and works well.
- Retail Plazas do not work.
- Retail plazas do work, and become great neighborhood centers.
- There is both support for and positions against the Center Park #7.
- Staff needs to find and present a formula that pays for the parks (such as Center Park) and other amenities in the plan. There needs to be a balance.
- How does this plan relate to the County's Urban Forest Master Plan? Would like to see a tree canopy analysis.
- Reductions in the size of #2 is not welcome.

Policy P-2:

- Can the word "Immediate" be removed from this Policy? Again, some flexibility is needed to accommodate phasing over time.

Policy P-3:

- No specific comments.

Policy S-1:

-Certified "Silver Rating" Certified is a classification as is Silver in LEED. Should remove the word Certified.
- There is general concern that different institutional standards often change over time and could become obsolete. Even though LEED is the primary standard today, it might not be in 10 years. The Policies need to be more general and possibly connected to County Guidelines on Sustainability rather than a specific institution's.
- Maybe we say "Highest and Best Environmental Standards" rather than tying it to a specific program.
- If Silver Rating is not a County Standard or Goal, then why would it be required in Crystal City?
- Need to be general.
- How will sustainability standards apply to renovations?
- Economics of higher Sustainability standards needs to be factored into this Concept Plan and implementation process. RCLCo did not factor higher LEED ratings into their analysis.

- We need a better understanding of the requirements of LEED-ND.

Policy S-2:

- “Certification” should be “Certified.”
- Same comments as above
- Vornado has also submitted portions of their portfolio in Crystal City for LEED Core and Shell. These efforts should be reviewed and might be coordinated in the future(?).
- Do we need another policy in this area that speaks to desire for Energy Efficiency in building design?

Policy AH-1:

- Should create a Policy that requires a mix of unit sizes to promote more family units rather than just efficiencies and 1 bedroom units.
- Is the 20% level a county goal, or is it only for Crystal City? How does it compare with what is being planned/achieved in the R-B Corridor?
- Why create this Policy in Crystal City when it is not required in the rest of the County?
- How will you define the qualifying standards for Low Income vs. Moderate Income?
- How was the 20% figure derived?
- High-rise construction is the most expensive, and therefore the most difficult for affordability standards.
- Even the existing res. buildings have high (opportunity) costs associated with them.
- Economics of this Policy need to be factored into the implementation equation of the Concept Plan. RCLCo did not factor a 20% into their analysis. Vornado’s draft analysis of 20% requirement indicates the cost would be roughly twice current cost to meet the ADU Ordinance.