

Crystal City Vision Plan, Draft 1.1

Long Range Planning Committee, Meeting Summary

07-30-2009

Opening Remarks

Terry Savelle, Planning Commission member and chair of the meeting, made a few opening remarks on the background of these discussions and general objectives of this round of LRPC meetings to discuss the draft Crystal City Vision Plan.

Discussion/Remarks on LRPC Comment/Response Matrix

Staff walked through the staff responses to the comments from LRPC raised at the last meeting.

Discussion/Remarks on Draft 1.1

CHAPTER 3

Public Realm

- P.68 – The language in Section 3.7.2, paragraph 1, second to last sentence should be modified to delete the phrase “utilize tree boxes”, as this is unnecessarily specific. This issue needs to be clarified and used consistently throughout the plan.
- P. 69 - In the second bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, the language should clarify that new open space is to be provided within Crystal City.
- P.69 - In the second bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, the word “public” should be added before “open space” for purposes of clarity.
- P.69 - It would be useful to have a little more discussion (or new section) that highlights the distinctions between public and private open space.
- P.69 - The discussion on public open space should include reference to Policy P6 and the desire/need for mid-block pedestrian connections and east-west connectivity in particular. A graphic that illustrates where these connections are most desired would also have value.
- P.69 - In the third bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, what exactly is meant by “within the development” (regarding pools, gyms, rooftop facilities, etc.)?
- General - There are many local examples of public open spaces in Arlington that can be used for precedent photos, instead of using so many photos from abroad.
- P.72 – For the 15th Street Park, the proposal for a bike-path inside the park is concerning, and further reduces the usability of the proposed space.
- P.70 – Table 3.7.1, References that direct readers to section 3.3.7 to review open space concepts is incorrect.
- P.72-79: Consider including reference to rainwater harvesting systems for concepts for public open spaces uses (e.g. irrigation), as feasible.
- P.72-79: replace “catch basins” with “cisterns.” Consider consistent recommendations for permeable paving in open spaces throughout the concepts, where feasible.
- P.74 – Please clarify what is meant by “building wing to north should be more iconic...”
- P.74 - Reference to space potentially providing direct entrance to the underground means that underground would need to be extended to this location. Is this desirable and/or appropriate?
- P. 76 – Water Park - Graphics and narrative suggest a number of new elements to this park which may crowd or clutter the currently successful park. Rather than having a free-standing structure for bike rentals, perhaps it could be incorporated into the redevelopment structure along the park’s southern edge.

- General - It could be useful to have a statement about expectations or standards used to ensure sufficient soil depth and acceptable planting methods for plant quality.
- P.77 - How will the plans for the esplanade and for future park space at Gateway Park be coordinated with Long Bridge Park Esplanade? The Esplanade character should be carried until Crystal Drive for consistency in design; widths should be consistent.
- P.79 - What is the intended use and accessibility of the Crystal Park playground space as it relates to an existing child day care center facility? Is the playground envisioned as private, public, or one of each?
- General – What are the Plan’s proposals or recommendations on future community canine areas?
- P.80 - This section needs clarity on the goals for public art. The county has history of defining public art pretty broadly, not just referring to plop art. In actuality, county has shied away from targeting gateways as place for public art. A few specifics about particular public art initiatives in the area could make some sense. Clarify level of consistency with Public Art Master Plan.
- P.80 - Text could use cross-reference to “performing arts” narrative that occurs later on page 98.
- P.81 - Suggest adding note to ensure clear and frequent wayfinding signage throughout the underground.
- P.81 - Does the continuous underground network need to be fully underground, or can there be instances where street crossings occur at grade if space is short.
- P.81 - What tools will be used to ensure that the underground is open to the public, if not through easements?

Density and Built Form

- P.86 – sentence beginning “However, the massing...” needs clarification – what does this mean?
- P.86 - Is the 40’ guideline for podiums only or for breaks for garage or loading dock entrances into buildings as well?
- P.86 - Tools may be a little weak to ensure tapering in building forms, especially if there is no numerical cap on density. Thought needs to be given to how the code ensures the desired tapering.
- To be continued...

LRPC Participant Attendees

Terry Savela	Planning Commission
Nancy Hunt	Planning Commission
Rosemary Ciotti	Planning Commission
Brian Harner	Planning Commission
Brooks Rainwater	E2C2
Larry Whithers	Housing Commission
Christopher Mailander	Arlington Ridge CA
Mitch Bonanno	Property/Land Owner
Bruce Cameron	Aurora Highlands CA
Christer Ahl	Crystal City Resident

(Bold = Planning Commissioner)