

Crystal City Vision Plan, Draft 1.1

Long Range Planning Committee, Meeting Summary

12-09-2009

Discussion/Remarks on Draft Chapter 4, Implementation

**Editorial text changes discussed in the meeting will be addressed directly in the revised draft chapter.*

Land Use and Zoning

- The Plan does not yet clearly identify how improvements will be funded, especially the public infrastructure components.
- There were varied opinions on how the tear-down credit should be applied. Some advocated for making clear tear-down credits would be used widely, while others noted that due to the unique economics of each building, it makes sense to do economic analyses on a case by case basis to determine if a tear down credit is warranted.
- More certainty is needed on expectations and incentives for projects, so that developers have enough confidence to pursue redevelopment.
- The recommendation for full-block, joint PDSP applications is problematic, particularly where ownership is highly fragmented; the County may need to be proactively involved in bringing owners together, and flexibility for less than full-block PDSPs is needed in certain instances.
- Regarding the GLUP open space triangle symbol, options should be considered for how to clearly convey that all open spaces in the Plan are equally important to achieve. Having just one triangle symbol on the GLUP without clarifying text may be inadequate.

Affordable Housing

- More information is needed on “affordability by design” and “accessibility guidelines.” Examples of how affordability by design could be achieved would be helpful.
- Consider caveat to this section, (and perhaps others) that says “Use the County’s most current practice. As of 2010, the standard is...”
- Economics of redevelopment in Crystal City are different from recent projects where 20% has been achieved as part of the bonus density and this needs to be recognized.
- Text should clarify that units may be provided off-site, as stated in the Policy Framework.
- Consider additional language to explain the tools listed in #9, and consider whether other tools may be added to this list.
- In the context of all of the Plan’s goals, we should reexamine the number of affordable units we actually believe can be achieved through the Plan.
- Should describe family units (of 2-3 bedrooms) and the mechanisms to realize them?

Transportation

- With regard to #18, flexibility should be considered for residential building parking ratio maximums when a project has many larger, family-sized units.
- Sharrows could be explored where one-way bicycle lane couplets are proposed.
- Uncertainty about the ability to redevelop a project that is dependent upon timing of infrastructure projects is a concern. There needs to be stronger language to provide more certainty.
- Connection to Four Mile Run trail should be added to the language in #17.

Public Open Space

- The Implementation actions do not include mention of tree canopy coverage.
- How is the County ensuring the construction of the 1st piece of Long Bridge Park (Esplanade) continues through to Crystal Drive?
- Language about improvements to parks should not pre-judge “larger scale” facilities.

- #21; should mention the Policy Framework linkage between open space at 2121 Crystal Dr and the Center Park.
- #23; regarding public accessibility to private building amenities, this should be re-framed as something to explore, rather than a stated preference or expectation.
- A more specific strategy is needed for how Center Park will be achieved.
- Reference to no net loss of open space at any point conflicts with what was discussed among the Task Force and built into the Policy Framework.

Community Building

- Section is missing mention of civic infrastructure, urgent care facilities, polling places, schools, and the commercial needs of Crystal City as a complete neighborhood.
- A new item should be considered that discusses monitoring school populations, developing baseline for number of students, and being proactive in planning for future needs.
- In the discussion of the BID, there is some ambiguity about what tasks are being envisioned for the BID (or other parties) to take on in the future; please clarify.

LRPC Participant Attendees

Terry Savela	Planning Commission
Charles Monfort	Planning Commission
Steve Cole	Planning Commission
Inta Malis	Planning Commission
Neal Sigmon	Park and Recreation Commission
Aaron Lien	E2C2
Larry Whithers	Housing Commission
Mitch Bonanno	Property/Land Owner
Mike Dowell	Aurora Highlands CA
Chick Walter	Arlington Ridge CA
Ted Saks	former Crystal City Task Force
Harmar Thompson	Property/Land Owner

(**Bold** = Planning Commissioner)