Realizing Rosslyn: a new era of opportunity

Rosslyn Process Panel Meeting #23
Air Rights and Subcommittee Series review

February 2, 2015
AGENDA

1. Welcome/Meeting Overview 10 min.

2. Air rights feasibility study findings and Realize Rosslyn 45 min.
   • Background & assumptions
   • Analysis, recommendations & conclusions
   • Discussion

3. Subcommittee Meeting series status report 100 min
   • Transportation
   • Parks and Open Space
   • Building Height and Form (and Land Use)
   • Discussion

4. Outstanding issues/topics for Board direction 10 min.

5. Updated schedule/next steps 10 min.
2. Air-Rights feasibility study findings

- Background & assumptions
- Analysis, recommendations & conclusions
- Discussion
2. Air-rights study

Background

In fall 2012, Arlington County initiated Realize Rosslyn effort to update Rosslyn Sector Plan.

In summer 2013, Virginia’s Office of Public Private Partnerships released Request for Information (RFI) for air rights development over I-66 in Rosslyn (and East Falls Church).

In 2014, Arlington initiated its own feasibility study on air rights development to:

- Better understand potential economic feasibility of air rights development in Rosslyn
- Explore general levels of development that could be accommodated on air rights sites
- Further consider key planning goals that could be achieved through air rights above I-66, and key planning challenges to overcome; and ultimately

  - Determine whether, and to what degree, the Rosslyn Sector Plan Update should address air rights development
2. Air-rights study

Study Area
2. Air-rights study

Key Assumptions

- Building height limits per MWAA-preferred elevations

- “C-O Rosslyn” parking standards

- Air rights development to support cost of access to air rights (to VA) and community benefits (to County)

- Included Site 3 (Gateway Park) in study, yet Plan Framework envisions revitalized park space

- Reinforcing existing deck is half the cost of a new deck

Figure 2: The four potential sites (labeled with red numbers) with presumed maximum building height limits above mean sea level, or AMSL, (labeled in white) as provided by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. View looks to south from above Key Bridge. Site information provided by VDOT.
2. Air-rights study

Additional Assumptions

- 20’ minimum clearance above Interstate 66 travel lanes
- 4’ platform structure thickness as supporting deck Horizontal structural spans allow support columns to align with highway edges and center median
- 13’ office, 11’ residential floor-to-floor height
- 20’ rooftop mechanical penthouse height
- 100’-120’ wide office buildings and 60’ wide residential buildings
- 1,100 sq. ft. per residential unit
## 2. Air-rights study

### Building Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3 Office</th>
<th>Site 4 Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sq Ft</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>812,500</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Sq Ft Office</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>566,500</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Sq Ft Residential</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Sq Ft Retail</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building massing schemes modeled for each site

- Building massing schemes modeled for each site
- Sample pro forma created for each site to study economic feasibility of development

Source: W-ZHA
2. Air-rights study

Site 1 potential air rights development scenario

- 460,000sf office
- 220,000sf residential
- 10,000sf retail

Platform area

Potential parking access
2. Air-rights study

Site 2 potential air rights development scenario

- 566,500sf office
- 246,000sf residential
2. Air-rights study

Sites 3-4 potential air rights development scenario

- **Site 3**: 200,000sf office or 183,600sf residential; 16,000sf retail
- **Site 4**: 260,000-309,000sf office; 4,000-8,000sf retail
2. Air-rights study

Summary of economics findings

- 9% target return on investment assumed necessary for feasibility
- Target rate higher than usual (as low as 6.25%) due to perceived project risk and potential for increased financing costs over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Return achieved</th>
<th>Rent increase needed to achieve target return</th>
<th>Potential timeframe needed for rent increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3 alone</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4 alone</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 3 &amp; 4 office</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 3 &amp; 4 residential/ office</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Air-rights study

Key transportation and parks considerations

Transportation

- Parking needed to support development would likely increase traffic volumes on key streets
- Location, magnitude, timing of peak hour trips from new development key
- Potential to leverage proximity/access to transit
- Vehicular access is generally challenging/presents conflicts on all sites

Parks and Open Space

- Air rights may provide opportunities for open spaces above parking decks, but likely to be several stories above street level
- Site 3&4 scenario could provide potential to help implement Gateway Park improvements, with building on portion of park area
2. Air-rights study

Conclusion 1: Economics are challenging

Air rights development in Rosslyn is very likely to be a very long term proposition, based an economics (and likely the market as well)

- Except for site 3, likely at least 20 years before a project is economically feasible
- Rents need to increase or costs need to decrease by 13-15% (net inflation)
- Today, already 4,000,000 SF of net new development in RCRD pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosslyn MSA (Includes RCRD), Development Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2014 Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Under Construction (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Projects (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Under County Review (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development in Pipeline (NET)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as percent increase over 2014 Base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPHD, Planning Division
2. Air-rights study

Conclusion 2: Focus on the core, first

Even if feasible, **County must consider potential of air rights to divert investment from the core to fringe**

- If same market, could shift private interest from core to new edge sites

- Could thwart County’s efforts to revitalize and reinvest in central Rosslyn, first

- Air rights could be seen as growth boundary, to be expanded into in the future – should keep options open
2. Air-rights study

Conclusion 3: But, don’t say no - not at all

However, the County should not reject outright the concept of air rights

• Remain open to future proposals, should the Commonwealth pursue it

• If submitted, County to determine process to guide community review and evaluation of proposal, before County Board action

• Air rights could be seen as growth boundary, to expand into in the future – should keep options open
2. Air-rights study

Conclusion 4: But, yes only for very special project

Any air rights proposal should offer real and significant place-making benefits

• Potential to focus on Site 3, as way to address Gateway Park improvements, Rosslyn Circle and Key Bridge Gateway in integrated way

• At same time, if Site 3 pursued, need to discuss how decrease in Gateway Park open space to be addressed

• Any proposal should be validated by opportunity to achieve important park/public realm improvements sooner than otherwise feasible
2. Air-rights study

Wrap-Up: Rosslyn Sector Plan Update

Staff recommends Sector Plan Update only briefly address air rights development as item for future consideration

Plan text could:

- Reinforce County interest in focusing on revitalizing the core first, expanding into the edges with air rights later

- Identify broad planning goals and challenges County would like to see addressed if air rights development in this area is in fact pursued.

- Convey County commitment to define special planning process for County review and consideration of air rights project, if submitted
3. Subcommittee meeting status report

Major outcomes and updates from committee discussions on:
- Transportation
- Parks and Open Space
- Building Height and Form; Land Use
- Discussion
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Transportation Topics Addressed

• Future Street Network
• Street Cross-Sections (select)
• MTP Designations
• Lee Hwy/Lynn St./Trails intersection
• Mode Share Targets
• Parking and Curb Space
• 2-Way Conversion for Lynn/Fort Myer
• Sidewalk widths
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Future street/travel lane changes

- **Lynn and Fort Myer:** two-way travel
  - At least two lanes each direction at peak
  - One lane in off-peak direction at other times
  - New options for bus stops and routes
- **Kent south of 18th:** two-way travel
### 3. Subcommittees: transportation

**Two-way traffic offers compelling benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Auto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transform Ft. Myer and Lynn into two-way streets</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Moderate net impact on traffic flow
- Easier wayfinding, more direct routing to Rosslyn destinations
- Keeps traffic speeds moderate
  - Safer pedestrian crossings
  - Safer, easier biking
- Opens new options for bus stop locations on Lynn & Ft. Myer
  - Added capacity
  - Convenient to Metro station
  - Less pressure on Moore
  - More efficient bus routing; repurpose Central Place bus alley
- More flexibility for street closures for festivals/events
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Plan to recommended implementation of two-way

Plan will identify critical steps and sequence to proceed:

- Complete study of implementation details (signaling, turns etc.)
- Coordinate changes with adjacent properties
- Prepare to monitor any impacts on other streets in the greater Rosslyn area
- Pilot-test two-way traffic on Ft. Myer prior to removal of tunnel at Wilson
- Expand two-way operations to Lynn
- Remove Ft. Myer tunnel
3. Subcommittees: transportation

A continued transportation culture shift is needed

- Reducing drive-alone (SOV) commute share:
  - Will support economic and community growth
  - Can enhance walkability and transportation choice

- Targets influenced/supported by broader trends, including:
  - Future of office market
  - More balanced use mix
  - Relatively less parking with new site plans
  - Enhancing non-auto modes

---

**Rosslyn Worker Commute Share: RMTS Proposed Shift**

- **COMMUTER RAIL**: 0% change in share, 0% growth or loss per mode.
- **TELEWORK/OTHER**: +2% change in share, +200% growth.
- **WALK**: +2% change in share, +67% growth.
- **BICYCLE**: +2% change in share, +200% growth.
- **CARPOOL/VANPOOL**: +2% change in share, +20% growth.
- **BUS**: +4% change in share, +57% growth.
- **METRORAIL**: +3% change in share, +11% growth.
- **DRIVE ALONE**: -15% change in share, -31% growth.

*Source: Arlington County Commercial Building Survey, 2008*
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Mode split goals must work with policy/regulations

- Provision of off-street parking (and other transportation infrastructure or service) must align with goals pertaining to modal splits
- Experience shows that TDM strategies/measures most effective when a large surplus of off-street parking is not provided

### Potential Development/Parking Characteristics,
Realize Rosslyn Sites Assumed to Redevelop by 2040*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near-term Redevelopment Sites (presumed)</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Estimated 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>1,760,918</td>
<td>2,319,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Units</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Commercial Uses</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>2,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Residential Uses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Hotel Uses</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,045</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis does not include Rosslyn Plaza or 1401 Wilson Blvd site plans
### Other places have achieved similar targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute mode</th>
<th>Columbia Heights resident workers</th>
<th>Longwood District, Boston workers</th>
<th>Cambridge workers</th>
<th>Rosslyn goal workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving (SOV)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/vanpool</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk &amp; Bike</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>+36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommute, other</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>+86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workers</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>+50%</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Priority enhancement of Arlington’s proven TDM strategies

- Support **teleworking** and **compressed work scheduling** by providing services needed to help employers/employees.

- Increase attention to **ride-sharing** and **matching**.

- Implement physical improvements and awareness promotions to encourage greater number of "**slugging**" carpools.

- Consider forming a Rosslyn Transportation Demand Management (**TDM**) District.

- **Commuter Store** near the Rosslyn Metro station entrance (**now open**).

- Consider refining County policies to further incent or require **Transit Fare Media** with future site plan development approvals
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Heavy walking, biking and vehicular traffic conflict

- Two crossings over I-66 are possible, where one would be selected and built.
- Need for improvements integrated with Freedom Park Intersection treatment to reduce bike/vehicle conflict.

**Legend:**
- Multi-use trail
- Cycle track
- Marked route (bike lanes and sharrows)
- Signed route
  
  *(All routes two-way unless noted one-way)*
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Near-term improvements

**Ongoing:** Maximize separation of pedestrians/bicycles from turning vehicles:
- Investigate No-Turn-On-Red sign at N. Lynn Street for those exiting I-66.
- Increase leading interval time for bicycles/pedestrians crossing N. Lynn
- More enforcement/education by AC Police Department

**Next 1-2 years:** Lynn Street Esplanade/Custis Trail Improvements project
- Extend corner curbs to minimize crossing distance, add bike lane to N. Lynn Street bridge over I-66, widen sidewalks and improve lighting
- Replace a Lee Highway westbound lane (west of Fort Myer Dr.) with widened Custis Trail (from 10 feet wide to 16 feet wide).
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Longer-term solutions

Draft Sector Plan Recommendation:

- Study the feasibility of various long-term infrastructure options for further reducing or eliminating conflicts at Lee/Lynn

- Include study of a tunnel under Lynn (to be shown in vision sketch of Gateway park area)

- Develop a preferred alternative, with an implementation and capital funding plan.

Longer-term: Tunnel below Lynn?
3. Subcommittees: transportation

Transportation

Discussion
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Parks and Open Space Topics Addressed

• New Park Typologies
• Proposed Park Network
• Trail System
• Rosslyn’s Major Parks
• Detail and Elaboration on “Game Changer” Parks
• Rosslyn Plaza Park
• Small On-Site Spaces
• Priorities for Implementation
• Corridor of Light
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

What types of public spaces do we need?

**Destination Spaces**
- Unique features, attracting visitors from the community, region and beyond (e.g. vista, monument, programmed events)
- Typically larger in size, can be multi-use in function

**Revitalizing Spaces**
- Opportunity for respite, socializing, transition, reflection
- Form/amenity may vary: hardscape or soft-scape; small urban plazas, nature preserves, intimate spaces in larger parks. Seating, picnic tables, gardens, walking trails, public art

**Recreation Spaces**
- Used for active recreation and leisure activities. Amenities can include playgrounds, sport facilities, dog parks, trails
- Depending on scale, can serve the neighborhood, the community, even the region

**Linking Spaces**
- Connect other open spaces in an integrated, accessible network
- Often linear in form (e.g. trails, greenways, streets, linear plazas)
- Amenities include greenery and vegetation, seating, lighting, ecological corridors
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Overview: Rosslyn’s major parks

Existing parks with new access, facilities, and other improvements

• Gateway Park
• Freedom Park
• Dark Star Park

New park spaces adding exciting new experiences to Rosslyn

• The Esplanade
• Rosslyn Plaza Park
• 18th Street Corridor
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: initial scenarios felt unsuccessful…

Main strategies:

- Design and program as active destination
- Create significant visual and access connections to The Esplanade, Wilson, 17th, 18th, 19th Streets
- Thoroughly integrate design and use with adjacent development

Layout alternatives:

- Locate major space to connect the Esplanade with Kent Street
- Locate major space along the Esplanade
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

...further study led to an 18th St orientation

New location/configuration celebrates frontage on 18th St, Ridge Rd, and Esplanade
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

View from northeast

New location/configuration celebrates frontage on 18th St, Ridge Rd, and Esplanade
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Applying program options: “Dynamic urban plaza”

- Active retail
- The Square
- The Lawn
- The Gardens
- The Bridge

PLUS

- Retail pavilion
- Stepped seating lawn and theater
- Multipurpose gardens
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics

ACTIVITIES
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics

GARDENS
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Rosslyn Plaza Park: defining characteristics

CAFÉ PLAZAS ON 18TH ST
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

The Esplanade

Main strategies:
- Linear promenade/multiuse path
- Destination experience
- Part of regional and neighborhood networks
- Connecting element
- Separated from streets, but sometimes runs along them

Episodic overlaps with larger parks
- Gateway Park
- Rosslyn Plaza
- Freedom Park via Rosslyn Plaza
- Iwo Jima
- Also future boathouse
- Also GW Memorial Pkwy and the Potomac landscape

Two crossings over I-66 are possible options, where one would be selected and built.
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Esplanade Segments

A: Gateway Park
B: Waterview/Potomac Tower
C: Rosslyn Plaza
D: River Place/Iwo Jima

Two crossings over I-66 are possible options, where one would be selected and built.
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

A: Gateway Park Proposed Esplanade Section

Proposed section

- Wide sidewalks flanking Lee Hwy bring experience of Gateway Park to both sides of street
- Street tree selection and planting beds coordinated with Gateway Park design

![Diagram of Gateway Park Proposed Esplanade Section]
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

B: Waterview/Potomac Tower Esplanade Section

Proposed section

- 20’ multi-use path along Waterview Place and Potomac Tower
- Navigate approx. 12’ grade change from N Lynn to 19th St/ Arlington Ridge Rd
- Consider providing vertical access to public plaza
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

C: Rosslyn Plaza Proposed Esplanade Section at park

Proposed section
- 12’ multi-use trail east of Arlington Ridge Rd
- Bicycles share use of Arlington Ridge Rd
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

C: Rosslyn Plaza Proposed Esplanade Section to river

Proposed section
- 12’ multi-use trail east of Arlington Ridge Rd
- Bicycles share use of Arlington Ridge Rd

Looking north
Proposed section
• 20’ multi-use trail west of Wilson Blvd
3. Subcommittees: parks and open space

Parks and Open Space

Discussion
Building Height and Form Topics Addressed

- Goals/Performance Criteria
- Economics of “C-O Rosslyn” Redevelopment
- Initial modeling/analysis of 3 scenarios
- Development of refined, proposed scenario
- Draft Building Height and Form Management Framework
### 3. Subcommittees: building height and form

**How should modeling alternatives be evaluated?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground level view corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation deck priority views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good views from all buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good daylight access to buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive edge transitions (neighborhood, park, river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun/shade opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied building heights / skyline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great open space and additional circulation opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable sites, multiple-use options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How should we manage and design future building forms to create the best possible Rosslyn (to maximize framework goals)**?
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Scenarios: peaks and tapers

SCENARIO A (average FAR 9.5)

• Least height variation
• 470’ ASL peaks wherever public view corridors allow
• On 2-tower sites, lower tower limited to 75% height of taller tower

What we heard:

• Perpetuates undesirable current trends
• Concern that density close to FAR 10 should not be assumed as typical condition; must be earned through project’s merits
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Scenarios: peaks and tapers

**SCENARIO B (average FAR 9.5)**
- Moderate height variation
- 470’ ASL peaks in selected areas
- Other sites limited to 85% of (470’-grade)

What we heard:
- Some building form & orientation advantages over Scenario A (except at Holiday Inn)
- Concern that density close to FAR 10 should not be assumed as typical condition; must be earned through project’s merits
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Scenarios: peaks and tapers

SCENARIO C (average FAR 8.8)
- Most height variation
- 470’ ASL peaks in selected areas
- Other sites limited to 70% of (470’-grade)

What we heard:
- Building forms typically preferred over A & B
- Still doesn’t achieve compelling skyline, but its variety is better
- Concern for infeasibility of development, and inconsistent constraints among sites
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario: peaks and tapers

PROPOSED SCENARIO (average FAR 9.2)

• Significant height variation
• 470’ ASL peaks permitted in selected areas (where not blocking observation deck view corridors)
• Other sites generally limited to 70-80% of nearby towers for height variation (may be taller to achieve 8FAR min)
• On multiple-tower sites, min. 40’ height differences among towers sought
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – aerial view to northeast
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

How are the “valleys” defined?

- Located to create contrast with peaks, and preserve priority view corridors
- Also to assist with edge transitions
- Height limits are a balance of:
  - Contrast with surrounding building heights as measured from the ground
  - Contrast with surrounding building heights as seen in the skyline
  - Ensuring FAR of at least 8, and preferably 9 or greater where possible, in the modeled scenario
- Resulting height differences from peaks are generally at least 40’
  - Reduced to 30’ in certain cases like Commonwealth and Hyatt buildings (to achieve FAR 8)
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – skyline view
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – skyline view
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – skyline view
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – skyline view
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed scenario – select views from building tops

1400 Wilson Blvd

View from 391’ amsl (top floor)

1500 Wilson Blvd

View from 443’ amsl (top floor)

1101 Wilson Blvd

View from 296’ amsl (top floor)

1515 Wilson Blvd

View from 433’ amsl (top floor)
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Proposed approach does not directly limit FAR

Retains potential for up to FAR 10 within height limits and design guidelines

Number of properties in FAR ranges listed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average FAR:</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>8.8</th>
<th>9.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAR range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0-8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0-9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8-10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario: G1, A, B, C, proposed

[A Current Policy Scenario]
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

**Proposed building height & form policy**

With refinements since 12/15/14 subcommittee presentation

**BUILDING FORM POLICY MEASURES**

**SEE DETAIL ON FOLLOWING PAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Buildable areas and edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Ground level building area design and use along street and public space edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Service and parking access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Parking location and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Grade transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Streetscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING TOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1. Building height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2. Tower orientation, dimensions, spacing and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3. Street and neighborhood scale transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4. Architectural composition of towers and caps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKING DRAFT-subject to change**
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Block and street network

- Proposed curb line
- Proposed built-to line
- General location of new ped/bike or ped-only connection
- General location of new complete street
- General location of new service street/alley
- Park or plaza

WORKING DRAFT-subject to change
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Ground floor use and design

- Primary and secondary active use edges must be built to accommodate retail
- Map would serve as guideline for retail occupancy, not requirement
- Classifications and map to be updated and converted to use County Retail Plan typologies

**WORKING DRAFT - subject to change**
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Ground floor use and design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING EDGE TYPE</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS AND OTHER ELEMENTS AS INDICATED</th>
<th>TRANSPARENCY BETWEEN TWO AND TEN FEET ABOVE GRADE</th>
<th>ENTRANCES</th>
<th>FACADE SHADOW LINES</th>
<th>LAND USE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary active use</td>
<td>ACRP retail and urban design principles for inside and outside*</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>At least every 60 feet</td>
<td>Vertical divisions: the ground story facade should be divided with vertical shadow lines a minimum of 60 feet on center. ACRP standards for “Shopping and Dining Street” and/or “Hybrid Street.” Active uses should occupy at least 75% of frontage length, including street corners where present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary active use</td>
<td>ACRP retail and urban design principles for inside and outside*</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>At least every 60 feet</td>
<td>Horizontal divisions: the ground story should be separated from upper stories with a shadow line along a minimum of 75 percent of the facade. ACRP standards for a “Shopping and Dining Street,” “Hybrid Street” and/or “Personal, Business and Retail Equivalent Street.” Active uses should occupy at least 65% of frontage length, including street corners where present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible use</td>
<td>Minimum clear ceiling height 15 feet</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>At least every 100 feet. In multifamily buildings, ground floor units should have individual entrances from the sidewalk, with associated stoops and/or compact front gardens. Shadow lines include a recess or protrusion a minimum of 2 inches in depth and 8 inches in width.</td>
<td>Active ground floor uses are encouraged but not required. Any uses appropriate for a “Secondary Active Use” edge are permitted. Any other uses permitted by zoning may also occupy ground floor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/hotel use</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>At least every 60 feet. In multifamily buildings, ground floor units should have individual entrances from the sidewalk, with associated stoops and/or compact front gardens.</td>
<td>Any uses appropriate for a “Secondary Active Use” edge are permitted. Housing and hotel uses permitted by zoning may also occupy ground floor space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* WORKING DRAFT—subject to change
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Recommended service and parking access

Service and parking access

Park space

New corridors

WORKING DRAFT—subject to change

Service and parking access may occur anywhere along the lower service level of Arlington Ridge Rd, if provided.

Service and parking access may occur in a corridor below Freedom Park.
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Building heights

Potential flexibility to exceed listed height maximums:

- Floors above noted height limits occupied by housing only
- Building volume above noted heights ≤ reduction in maximum building volume below height limit
- Building incorporates cogeneration plant and stack

WORKING DRAFT—subject to change
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Building heights flexibility

- Building volume above noted heights may be considered if less than or equal to the reduction in maximum building volume below height limit
- Yellow volume at far right is slightly less than yellow volume at near right

Additional height may be considered per condition

Height limit per diagram

WORKING DRAFT—subject to change

More slender base
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Recommended tower orientation – with flexibility

WORKING DRAFT-subject to change
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Wilson Blvd. step-backs expand view opportunities

Without step-backs, limited views

With step-backs, more opportunities

WORKING DRAFT-subject to change
3. Subcommittees: building height and form

Tower and cap architectural guidelines
3. Subcommittees: building height and form: Land Use

The role of housing in the RCRD

There is little housing in the core today

- Just four residential buildings in the RCRD today
- Limited population, few compelling retail or park destinations, limited walkability = little neighborhood activity beyond business hours
- RCRD office concentration imposes significant peak traffic/transit demands

Could adding housing...

- …expand shopping and dining choices? Increase neighborhood activity evenings and weekends?
- …balance transportation network demands better?
- …offer other benefits, e.g. income diversity, sustainability, building form and character?

Potential policies to increase housing’s presence

- Height and/or density incentives?
- Building dimension restrictions favoring housing vs. office?
- Parking regulations favoring sharing parking among uses?
- Do nothing … current market conditions attract housing and office in tandem?
3. Subcommittees: building height and form: Land Use

Housing share could grow x4; count could grow x10

### Existing
- Approx. 450 units
- 7 units/ac

### Existing + approved
- Approx. 1375 units
  - (925 net new)
  - 21 units/ac

### Existing + approved + long term potential
- Approx. 3,600-4,500 units
  - (2,950-3,850 net new)
  - 55-69 units/ac

#### Land use
- Office: 81%
- Hotel: 7%
- Housing: 6%
- Retail: 5%
- Other: 1%

- Office: 76%
  - Hotel: 13%
  - Housing: 6%
  - Retail: 4%
  - Other: 1%

- Office: 64%
  - Hotel: 28%
  - Housing: 4%
  - Retail: 3%
  - Other: 1%
3. Subcommittees: building height and form: Land Use

Land Use Target Recommendations

**Land Use Goals**

- Add 3,000 – 4,000 new residential units to RCRD by full buildout
- Strive for 30% of future developed space as housing

**Land Use Strategies**

- For any site with two or more towers, at least one should be residential (guideline)
- Per building form provisions, potential for increases in height for residential floors only (incentive)
3. Subcommittees: building height and form: Land Use

Proposed – sample land use mix, FAR, heights

Example land use per building footprint (share of new development)

- **Office** (64%)
- **Housing** (32%)
- **Hotel** (4%)

No change anticipated

Average FAR 9.2

Uses depicted here are illustrative only – do not reflect site-specific recommendations.
4. Draft List of Items for tentative County Board work session consideration

1. Building Height and Massing / Peaks and Valleys

2. 18th Street Corridor Details

3. Approach to Potential Air Rights Development

4. Rosslyn Plaza Area Elements
   - Rosslyn Plaza Park
   - Esplanade
   - Street Network (Connectivity among Arlington Ridge Road; 17th Street, 18th Street)
5. Updated schedule and next steps
## 5. Updated Schedule

### Target Process Timeline (draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| February| • Rosslyn Process Panel (2/2)  
  • County Board Work Session (2/17 - tentative) |                                                  |
| March   | • Rosslyn Process Panel (TBD)  
  • Civic Associations (TBD)  
  • Community Open House (TBD)  
  • LRPC (TBD)               | 1<sup>st</sup> Draft Plan for Public Review     |
| April   | • Advisory Commissions (TBD)  
  • LRPC (TBD)               | RTA Draft Plan issued                           |
| May     | • Planning Commission (RTA)  
  • County Board (RTA)       | Rosslyn Sector Plan Update Adoption             |
| June    | • Planning Commission  
  • County Board (Action)   |                                                 |
DISCUSSION