

BEAUREGARD REZONING ADVISORY GROUP, MEETING #8
Polk Elementary School
Saturday, January 26, 2013

Members Present: David Baker, Chair, At-Large Representative; Don Buch, At-Large Representative; Dave Cavanaugh, At-Large Representative; Donna Fossum, Planning Commission Representative; Carolyn Griglione, At-Large Representative; Kevin Posey, Transportation Commission Representative; Catharine Puskar, Developer Representative.

Absent: Stephen Beggs, Parks and Recreation Commission Representative; Mike Caison, Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Representative; Hector Pineda, At-Large Representative; Josh Sawislak, Environmental Policy Commission Representative.

Substitute Present: Judy Noritake, Parks and Recreation Commission Chair, attended for Stephen Beggs.

City Staff Present: Mr. Farner, Deputy Director, P&Z; Ms. McIlvaine, Deputy Director, Housing; Mr. Sindiong, Principal Planner, T&ES; Ms. Contreras, Urban Planner, P&Z; Ms. Friedlander, Urban Planner, P&Z.

Representing Duke Properties: Luan Tran.

Community members present: James E. Brown, Bud Jackson, James Durham, Tom Yager, Shirley Downs, Raka Choudhury, Lauryn Douglas, Kathie Hoekstra, William Martin, Judy Cooper, Rebecca Hierholzer, Michelle Reinshuttle.

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by David Baker at 9:10 am.

I. Approval of December 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Donna Fossum made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 12th meeting, seconded by Cathy Puskar.

Motion carried, meeting minutes from December 12th accepted.

Dave Cavanaugh requested that the 12/17/12 email from staff member Ms. Friedlander be attached to the 12/12/12 minutes to clarify the VDOT response to the Transportation Alternatives Report. The group determined that because the email was not distributed at the meeting, it could not be included after the fact. Mr. Cavanaugh requested that it be attached to 1/26/13 minutes (attached).

Affordable Housing Update

Helen McIlvaine, the City's Deputy Director for Housing, provided a brief overview of the ongoing affordable housing process with the Alexandria Housing Advisory Commission (AHAC) and noted upcoming meetings associated with affordable housing:

- Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC)
Thu Feb 7, 2013 7:00 PM - 8:00 PM
Regular meeting
Location: City Hall, Room 2000, 301 King St.
Contact: Mildrilyn Davis, 703.746.4990

- Housing Town Hall
Sat Feb 9, 2013 9:30 AM - 12:00 PM
Housing Allocation in the Beauregard Rezoning, Presentation and opportunity for public comment(Spanish Interpretation Provided)
Location: William Ramsay Elementary School, 5700 Sanger Ave.
Contact: Mildrilyn Davis, 703.746.4990
- Draft Housing Master Plan Town Hall Meeting
Mon Feb 11, 2013 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM
Presentation and opportunity for public comment (Spanish Interpretation Provided)
Location: Jefferson Houston Elementary School, 1501 Cameron St.
Contact: Mildrilyn Davis, 703.746.4990
- Staff is also planning a meeting with non-profit partners, lenders and funders. City will work with these partners to determine how to leverage resources to develop affordable housing over the next 20-30 years.

Don Buch stated that the housing chart indicates that the City is short approximately 14,687 affordable units and expressed concern that there would ever be an ability to create that many units. Ms. McIlvaine responded that City has committed to 800 units through developer contributions and will make every attempt to maximize City and developer resources. Cathy Puskar stated that she was concerned that Hector Pineda, At-Large member, had not been able to attend meetings, and that JBG has been acting as a fair landlord. She believes that, while the Tenants & Workers United group will ask Council for more housing, the Plan is a totality and should be considered as such.

The group asked Ms. McIlvaine what the total number and percentage of affordable housing units currently exist in the City. Ms. McIlvaine noted that there were approximately 4,000 committed units, with an additional 95 units being delivered in 2013. This does not count market rate units, or buildings smaller than 10 units. She will provide additional information to the group.

II. Design Standards and Guidelines Presentation

Marina Khoury, DPZ

Presentation of the latest Design Guidelines: On December 1, 2012, the AG reviewed chapters 1-5 of the Design Guidelines and will review chapters 6-10 today. There are a handful of items still being worked out between the developers and the City which are more minor in nature. Two major issues which are recommended by the Small Area Plan are minimum block sizes and how blocks are measured. The Small Area Plan recommends a 1600 ft perimeter with 400 ft by 400 ft block sizes. Because of topography and accommodations for large-format retailers, the developers needed a little more flexibility, which explains why the Design Guidelines are slightly different from the Small Area Plan, which is a compromise. If the block has a mid-block pedestrian passage, the entire block may be a little bigger because it still allows for walkability and connectivity. Signage guidelines are to encourage creativity and visibility to pedestrian/vehicular traffic.

Lighting standards are not to preclude any future technological advances.

Street hierarchy and lining of structured parking is designed to create excellent pedestrian environments along important streets and to concentrate loading & curb cuts on minor (“C”) streets and alleys.

The road along Dora Kelley Park is to be different than other roads, possibly a texture on the roadway, no curb or gutter along park side of the road and light bollards instead of urban street lights along the park side of the road. Bikes will be encouraged to travel along roads with dedicated bike lanes rather than this road.

Street cross sections are required in the Design Guidelines to establish standards for when development occurs in the future. Stormwater elements should not preclude future technological advances.

III. Topic Area Review

Topic Area 1: Standard Practice/City-Wide Policies – Practices

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 3.21, 8.4, 8.8a, 8.32a

TOPIC AREA 1 COMPLETE

Topic Area 2: Blocks & Street Network

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added:

3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.22, 3.24, 3.28, 4.26, 8.8b, 8.8c, 8.9c, 8.10a, 8.5, 8.6, 8.9, 8.21, 8.24, 8.25, 8.27

Items with further discussion:

8.26 moved from Design Standards & Guidelines to DSUP, checkmark added

8.10b TBD retained, staff will bring back to AG on February 11

Topic Area 3: Land Use

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 4.14, 4.16, 4.54

Items with further discussion:

7.3, 7.4, 7.5 moved from Design Standards & Guidelines to DSUP, checkmark added

8.34 moved from Design Standards & Guidelines to CDD, checkmark added

4.15 TBD retained, staff will bring back to AG on February 11

Topic Area 4: Built Environment

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 3.31, 4.55b

TOPIC AREA 4 COMPLETE

Topic Area 5: Open Space – Ecology

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 4.25, 4.28, 4.29, 4.30, 4.31, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35, 4.36, 4.37, 4.38, 4.39, 4.40, 4.41, 4.42, 4.45, 4.46, 4.48, 4.47, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4

Items with further discussion:

4.43, 4.44, 4.49 moved from Design Standards & Guidelines to CDD, checkmark added

4.27, 4.42 Other Process

TOPIC AREA 5 COMPLETE

Additional discussion:

AG discussed adding language regarding the phased implementation of the stormwater pond, leaving open the possibility for it to revert to open space (land).

Lighting requirements are not to preclude technological advances (LEED Dark Skies or better).

Also discussed making sure any pervious paving was ADA compliant or better.

It was noted that page 7.6 in the Design Guidelines shows BRT in the two center lanes (one eastbound, one westbound) along the bulk of Sanger but, per page 7.12, the eastbound BRT lane moves to curbside just as it approaches or comes under I-395. More explanation is needed to show the transition.

IV. Follow-up: Parallel Road

Mr. Farner and Mr. Sindiong gave an overview of the evolution of the parallel road during the Small Area Plan process, and through the last six months as the current Seminary Hills residents became involved. Meetings have been ongoing, at the direction of the City Council. Resident concerns include: lighting, proximity, noise, view of garages, pollution, privacy, impact to property values, security & safety, transition to urban setting.

In consultation with the community, the following conditions will be included with the DSUP, when it comes forward with this site:

As part DSUP process, consider the following in order to lessen the impacts on the existing adjoining residential neighborhoods, in consultation with the adjoining residential neighborhoods:

- The location of the parallel road shall be examined
- Examine re-assigning traffic from the parallel road to the internal street
- Design any road adjacent adjoining residential to minimize vehicular speed and the surface of the road shall include a material to reduce noise.
- The type of buffer along the Adams neighborhood shall include, but not limited to the following:
 - Fencing, landscaping, lighting appropriate given the adjoining residential uses.
- Loading access to be located to lessen impacts on residential uses.
- The surface parking to generally provide a minimum 45 ft. buffer adjacent to the existing townhouses, while accommodating required entrances and circulation.

This language was presented to the community members in a meeting last week. Staff requested that the Advisory Group approve the language in order to provide a report to Council.

Ms. Noritake stated that the Parks & Recreation Commission had recommended bringing the road closer to the buildings so that schoolchildren can cross it more easily. While she understands the staff position about not building a public road over a parking garage, she would like to add language stating that if less parking is needed at the time of redevelopment, the parallel road could be pulled closer to the building.

The group discussed asked how the language would be added into the Plan and the nature of the regulatory process.

V. Public Comment: 11:56am

Luan Tran, the Duke Realty developer representative, noted that Duke Realty is sympathetic to the concerns of neighbors and understands that that the citizens are worried about ambiguous language, but noted that the project would still need Planning Commission and City Council vote.

Rebecca Hierholzer provided revised language to staff for the conditions. The group debated whether to move forward with the language as provided or to postpone the decision to a later meeting.

Staff noted that everyone would need to agree on language at some point. City accepts B and C of edits from Rebecca. Can't accept A (the parallel road vs any parallel road). Road is needed for network. Even if traffic shifts, there would still be a parallel road. Wants to keep A saying parallel road

The Advisory Group discussed the process and the merits of extending the process. Ms. Hireholzer requested that the final decision be extended by one more meeting. Staff agreed to the revisions to Conditions B and C, but could not support the language of the revised Condition A.

Shirley Downs asked if it were possible to list alternatives, as had been done with the dry cleaners site. Cathy Puskar stated that this site is more complex than situation.

Jeff Farner said that staff would include language about the parallel road in the staff report and that the zoning will be a regulatory requirement. He recommends that the community submit letters to Council in order to place their concerns on the record. Ken Wire, the attorney for Duke, has stated that they are willing to commit on record to the intent of conditions.

Dave Baker stated that he is comfortable with the condition as proposed and the opportunity for additional public comment. Don Buch expressed his concern that the language was too broad and open-ended for him to support. Cathy Puskar made a motion to accept the proposed edits to Conditions B and C, and to leave Condition A as written by staff. Kevin Posey seconded the motion.

The motion carried 8-2, with Dave Cavanaugh and Don Buch opposing.

Dave Baker congratulated the group on the way they brought process the process forwarded and stated that he wouldn't vote for it if he didn't believe that it includes the protections being sought. He gave his appreciates contributions of the group to the process.

VI. Next Steps – Upcoming Meetings

Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group Meeting

Mon Feb 11, 2013 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM

Meetings focus on the implementation of the Beauregard Small Area Plan.

Location: Jerome "Buddie" Ford Nature Center, 5750 Sanger Avenue

Contact: Maya Contreras, maya.contreras@alexandriava.gov, 703.746.3816

Beauregard Rezoning Advisory Group Meeting

Thurs Feb 28, 2013 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM

Meetings focus on the implementation of the Beauregard Small Area Plan.

Location: Jerome "Buddie" Ford Nature Center, 5750 Sanger Avenue

Contact: Maya Contreras, maya.contreras@alexandriava.gov, 703.746.3816

Meeting adjourned at 12:17

From: Amy Friedlander
Cc: [Steve Sindiong](#); [Rich Baier](#); [Sandra Marks](#); [Jeffrey Farner](#); [Maya Contreras](#); [Faroll Hamer](#)
Bcc: [dbaker@goodwinhouse.org](#); [davidbaker645@yahoo.com](#); [carolyn.griglione@gmail.com](#); [dacava1@yahoo.com](#); [dnbuch@hotmail.com](#); [edwin12@hotmail.com](#); [Catharine Puskar \(cpuskar@arl.thelandlawyers.com\)](#); [mcaison@comcast.net](#); [jsawislak@gmail.com](#); [steve@tartanproperties.com](#); [Donna Fossum](#); [kposey12@comcast.net](#)
Subject: VDOT Review of the Transportation Analysis
Date: Monday, December 17, 2012 4:53:00 PM

Dear Advisory Group members:

At the December 12, 2012 Beauregard Advisory Group meeting, one of the members requested staff provide additional information relating to the Virginia Dept. of Transportation (VDOT) review of the Transportation Analysis for the Beauregard Small Area Plan.

The City provided the final Transportation Analysis to VDOT (then known as the Chapter 527 Report) on February 8, 2012, which includes traffic analysis for the proposed redevelopment of the Beauregard area.

The City received a letter on April 30, 2012 that found the report acceptable, along with specific comments for the City to take into consideration as future development and additional required traffic analysis occurs. No response by the City was required at that time. Regarding the ellipse, VDOT noted that the recommended improvement is a good concept, but that additional analysis be conducted prior to implementation. All individual future developments within the Beauregard Small Area Plan will require that additional traffic analysis be conducted as part of the Development Special Use Permit (DSUP) process.

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Chapter 527 Report) submitted to VDOT can be found here:

[http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/REVISED%20FINAL%20Beau%20SAP%20VDOT%20527%20TIS%20Report%2002-08-12%20Volume%20I-Technical%20Report\(1\).pdf](http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/REVISED%20FINAL%20Beau%20SAP%20VDOT%20527%20TIS%20Report%2002-08-12%20Volume%20I-Technical%20Report(1).pdf)

The VDOT comments of the TIA can be found here:

http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedfiles/2012-04-30_Beauregard%20Corridor%20Plan_VDOT%20Evaluation%20TIA%20527.pdf

The VDOT summary letter accepting the TIA can be found here:

http://alexandriava.gov/uploadedfiles/2012-04-30_Beauregard%20Corridor%20Plan_VDOT%20Approval%20Letter%20TIA%20527.pdf

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us. Thank you.

Amy Friedlander | Urban Planner

City of Alexandria | Planning and Zoning

301 King Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

703.746.3858 | www.alexandriava.gov/planning