



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 CLARENDON BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
ARLINGTON, VA 22201
(703)228-3525 • www.arlingtonva.us



CHRISTOPHER FORINASH
CHAIR

NANCY IACOMINI
VICE-CHAIR

MICHELLE STAHLHUT
COORDINATOR

GIZELE C. JOHNSON
CLERK

November 10, 2015

Arlington County Board
2100 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 300
Arlington, Virginia 22201

SUBJECT: 2. SP# 436, Ballston Oaks Townhomes, Stuart-Ballston LLC to request a final site plan to permit construction of 12 townhouse dwelling units in the R15-30T zoning district. Property is approximately 25,000 sq. ft. The proposed density is 21 UNITS/ACRE. Modifications of zoning ordinance requirements include: reduced front and rear yard setbacks, increased lot coverage, reduced rear yard parking setback, and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan. (ACTION)

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Planning recommends that the County Board:

Adopt the attached Ordinance to approve Site Plan #436 to permit the construction of twelve townhouse dwelling units with modifications to reduce required front and rear yard setbacks, increase lot coverage and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan subject to the attached ordinance with the following amendments:

- 1. Direct staff to work with the Fire Marshal to preserve some additional parking spaces in front of the redevelopment.**
- 2. Direct staff that if it is not possible to preserve additional on-street parking adjacent to the site that staff work with the applicant to design and implement two or three curb nubs or extensions along the North Stuart Street frontage to narrow the travelway of the street while accommodating the Fire Marshal's need.**

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission heard these items at its November 2, 2015 public hearing. Arlova Vonhm, Department of Community Planning Housing and Development (CPHD)-Planning, gave a presentation on the background and details of the proposed project. Other staff present included Steve Cover, Director, CPHD, Jane S. Kim, Department of Environmental Services (DES)-Transportation, and Kevin Carl, Captain, Arlington County Fire Department (ACFD), and Doug Insley, Chief Fire Marshal and Apparatus Chief, ACFD.

P.C. #33.A

Lauren Rote, Bean, Kinney, & Korman, presented on behalf of the applicant Jon Eric Ritland, and gave an overview of the proposed project. Jeremiah Potter, W.C. Ralston Architects, presented an overview of the architectural design of the project. Karen White, civil engineer with Walter L. Phillips, Inc. presented the proposed streetscape improvements, Loren Helgason, landscape architect with Studio 38, presented details of the landscape plans.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

There were no public speakers for this item.

REVIEW PROCESS

Commissioner Schroll said the Transportation Commission (TC) discussed the proposed elimination of the six on-street parking spaces, and proposed change from yield condition to a two-way street. The TC voted to approve the proposal with no specific recommendations.

Commissioner Siegel reported the SPRC met two times on the proposal. The applicant was responsive to requested changes from SPRC. She highlighted the ongoing concern regarding the proposed loss of the six on-street parking spaces and the removal of the yield street in favor of a two-way street in front of the development, dictated by emergency services requirements. She introduced suggested topics for discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission discussed the land use and zoning for the site including requested modifications for: set-backs; lot coverage; building architecture; transportation; TDMs and permitted on-street vs. off-street parking; and, community benefits. The Commission raised concerns related to the high parking ratios set for townhomes; the impact of the fire code on the design of this project; and, the precedent that could be set by this project for future projects, regarding the elimination of public on-street parking and/or yield street conditions on local streets in transitional neighborhoods. A full transcript is appended to the PC letter. Key highlights of the discussion are detailed below.

Land Use and Zoning

Commissioner Gutshall pointed out that this townhome project proposes the highest lot coverage yet lowest units per acre of any site plan townhome project in the area. The applicant responded that condition was driven largely by fire code and parking requirements.

Commissioner Siegel asked why almost none of the homes on N. Stuart Street had anything like a 25 foot set back, causing applicants to ask for modifications. Ms. Vonhm replied that the applicable zoning district, established in the 30's, did not have restrictive setbacks. Therefore, we have an environment that was established before the more modern rules were developed.

Site Design and Characteristics, Emergency Services

The Planning Commission held an extensive discussion with the Arlington County Fire Department representatives about the implication of the fire code on the site's design, especially with regard to the removal of six parking spaces and the conversion of the yield street to a two-

way street. Commissioners pointed out that removing on-street parking and changing a yield street into a two-way street produces a street with faster cars, creating a daily risk to users of the street. Several Commissioners suggested that risks to pedestrians should be balanced with fire risks. Commissioners also noted the infrequency of fire emergency risk compared to the daily risk to pedestrians.

The Fire Department representatives explained the space needs for fire equipment, which must be stabilized on a minimum of 22-26 foot clear expanse in the street in order to reach buildings over 30 feet in height. The Marshalls emphasized that they work hard to purchase the smallest and most urban equipment available. However, the fire code dictates building access requirements for equipment, and these requirements must be met in design of the site. There was extensive discussion about possible ways to reduce the amount of the street that would be needed for the fire equipment.

Transportation

Commissioner Forinash pointed out that the parking requirements, at 2.2 spaces per unit, is high and should be revisited in the zoning ordinance. Additionally, the high parking ratio allowed for the taller buildings, which in turn drives the fire code impacts on the street, and also increases the expense of the townhomes at a time when the County is focused on housing affordability.

Precedent

Commissioner Cole expressed concern that the site was characterized by no unique or limiting conditions that he could discern that would prevent future developments from imposing negative constraints on public parking and yield streets.

Commissioner Harner followed up, suggesting that the County should take a broader view of redevelopment and the impacts on local streets. He said we need to understand these transitional areas, how they function in larger contexts, and how sites and streets should be designed to support the safe, lively public realm we seek.

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

Main Motion: Commissioner Siegel moved that Planning Commission recommend the County Board adopt the attached Ordinance to approve Site Plan #436 to permit the construction of twelve townhouse dwelling units with modifications to reduce required front and rear yard setbacks, increase lot coverage and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan subject to the attached ordinance. Commissioner Gutshall seconded the motion.

Amendment: Commissioner Siegel moved to amend the main motion that the County Board direct staff to work with the fire marshal to preserve some additional parking spaces in front of the redevelopment. Commissioner Ciotti seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted to support the amendment 8-0-3 with Commissioners Siegel, Forinash, Iacomini, Ciotti, Harner, Gutshall, Sockwell, and Schroll in support and Commissioners Cole, Hughes, and Brown abstaining.

Amendment: Commissioner Forinash made a motion to amend the main motion that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board direct staff that if it is not possible to preserve additional on-street parking adjacent to the site that staff work with the applicant to design and implement two or three curb nubs or extensions along the North Stuart Street frontage to narrow the travelway of the street while accommodating the fire marshal's need. Commissioner Harner seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission voted to support the amendment 9-0-2 with Commissioners Siegel, Forinash, Iacomini, Ciotti, Harner, Gutshall, Sockwell, Brown, and Schroll in support and Commissioners Cole and Hughes abstaining.

The Planning Commission took up the main motion and voted 8-3 to approve with Commissioners Siegel, Forinash, Iacomini, Ciotti, Harner, Gutshall, Sockwell, Brown, and Schroll in support and Commissioners Cole, Hughes, and Sockwell against.

Discussion of the Motion:

Commissioner Cole asserted his deep concern about the effect of the design of the site on the block and its potential to create similar problems throughout the county. He said he very much wanted to actively support the proposal, but could not, since staff had provided no information on whether this site is unique such that the street design issues would not be repeated elsewhere in the county. Commissioner Cole also noted that the applicant had created some of the problems by maximizing density by building 40 foot tall units, the equivalent of five stories including the underground basement.

Commissioner Hughes said he would not support the motion because of the design of the site. He noted that in a DC federal style street there would be 20 units created, 10 on top and 10 English basements, which would make some of the units more affordable. In addition, he noted that the existing site fails to embrace the street, and buries three town homes in the back. The site plan is focused on getting cars, and fire equipment, into the site, which proposes two-car garages. Furthermore, the site does not create the appropriate density, given its proximity to metro, which is less than ¼ mile from Ballston.

Other Commissioners, including Commissioners Harner and Gutshall, said they would vote to recommend approval in fairness to the applicant, despite the deep concerns regarding the impact on the public street.

Respectfully Submitted,

Arlington County Planning Commission
Christopher J. Forinash



Commissioner Forinash: Mr. Schroll. I'm sorry, Commissioner Schroll. Tell us about the Transportation Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Schroll: Sure. Thank you, Chairman Forinash. The Transportation Commission heard this item on Thursday, this past Thursday. As Ms. Vonhm noted, there was some discussion of the elimination of the six on-street parking spaces, the change from a yield street to a two-way street. The Transportation Commission did not make any recommendations in this motion. It did vote to approve it as Ms. Vonhm noted all in favor except for one abstention.

Commissioner Forinash: So, that was clean, there was no recommended changes?

Commissioner Schroll: There were no recommended changes.

Commissioner Forinash: All right, thank you. Now, I'll turn to Commissioner Siegel for the SPRC report.

Commissioner Siegel: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm gonna very quickly summarize what's been very well summarized. There were two SPRC meets held on July 23, and September 21. Most of the issues regarding building architecture accessibility and the nature of modifications being sought were raised and changed in response to community concerns. A trellis side yard setback, side yard setback, screen wall height, parking space encroachment into the rear yard. Permeable pavers were added and several other that we can go into if anybody is interested. They're laid out in staff report. There was concern raised at the second and last of the SPRC meetings regarding, and I think you've heard some allusion to this, removal of the six public parking spaces at the northern end of North Stuart Street and the change in the street condition, namely, the removal of the yield street in favor of two ways in front of the redevelopment. One of the questions raised at the final SPRC was what would happen when the other said of the street might redevelop? What would that do to the public street condition? And it was noted that public parking spaces and yield streets create additional safety and traffic calming measures on such residential streets, even if that is an unintended but benign consequence of that kind of design. I think I just would say that most of the issues were raised and resolved. I think we've heard that we heard constructive SPRC meetings and the applicant responded to community concerns. The only issue that I really wanted to do a little more work on tonight and thank the fire marshals for attending and staying so late with us has to do with the redesign of the street and the removal of the parking spaces. You have my agenda, everybody does. Perhaps, we can go through that and I will raise some further concerns about street design when we get to site design and characteristics, which sort of links with the transportation, okay.

Commissioner Forinash: That works for me. Are there areas of concern, discussion, or questions beyond the six that Commissioner Siegel has listed here that the folks want to be sure to add? Commissioner Schroll.

Commissioner Schroll: I have some questions about the screening of the staircases. I don't know if that would just fall under general architecture.

Commissioner Forinash: I think that's building architecture, yup. Other areas? Nope. All right, I do want to ask the gentleman from the marshal's office, do you have presented materials you wanted to share or do you just want to be available to respond to questions? Okay. Great, thank you. And thanks for being here. All right, first category on land use and zoning. You see Commissioner Siegel's notes here. Are there questions? Yes, Commissioner Hughes.

LAND USE AND ZONING

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you, Commissioner Forinash. This is a question for staff. I believe, and I always ask sort of dumb questions 'cause I'm so new. What was the most recent site plan that was approved for a townhouse development within a quarter mile of a metro stop?

Ms. Vonhm: Of any metro stop?

Commissioner Hughes: Any one is fine.

Ms. Vonhm: I couldn't tell you.

Commissioner Hughes: How about this one?

Ms. Vonhm: There's a table on page 10 and 11 that has nearby townhouse site plan approvals in this same zoning district. I believe the most recent one was at least 10 years ago, I think that was 2005.

Commissioner Hughes: Thanks. My only comment to the Commission and my fellow commissioners is that we just talked about a 292-foot building in the antiquated site plan. I believe--the Sector Plan, excuse me, and I believe this site is closer to the Ballston Metro Station than the one we just approved.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Gutshall.

Commissioner Gutshall: Is the modification for lot coverage, is that under this one?

Commissioner Forinash: Yes.

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you. So, I am curious. The table that Ms. Vonhm just referred to you, Table 2 in the staff report starting on page 10 is a very interesting table because when you look at the coverage that's there and then the trying to sort of decipher the relationship between coverage and units per acre, I'm actually struck that, and this is a question for the applicant. Maybe you can help me to understand this, that your coverage is it the highest? It is the highest, I think, in that whole table, but your

units per acre is actually among the lowest. And so, I'm interested in what's driving that? What's the relationship there?

Eric Ritland, Applicant: I think part of that was we started with a much more dense site.

Commissioner Forinash: I'm sorry to interrupt but if you just introduce yourself for the record.

Mr. Ritland: I'm Eric Ritland. I'm the applicant.

Commissioner Forinash: And pull the microphone as close as you can comfortably do so. Apologies. Thank you.

Mr. Ritland: Eric Ritland, the applicant. We started with a more dense design, but I think a lot of it is driven by the fire code and we had to have such a wide entryway coming into the site. And the parking required, a lot of those other as you've noted, they were approved over a decade ago. The parking requirement, I think, was about 1 per unit and we have 2.2 now so we have a much larger parking requirement, and then we have to put the parking downstairs. So, the buildings get taller, the buildings get taller, they need wider circulation so the whole mass ends up getting less efficient. They're bigger units and there are fewer of them and they need more space.

Commissioner Gutshall: So, this is a question for staff, did I understand correctly then that the parking requirement has increased in the last 10 years?

Ms. Vonhm: I think it was in the mid '90s it changed. It has and when a lot of these were approved in the late '70s, early '80s, it was 1.15 spaces per unit. Then at some point it bumped up to two and then it was 2.2. It's actually the most, it's actually the highest parking requirement for residential and the code is for townhouses.

Commissioner Gutshall: Is the applicant eligible to seek a modification of the parking requirement?

Ms. Vonhm: Sure, through the site plan, sure.

Commissioner Gutshall: So, that is modifiable by the County Board? So, for the applicant, did you consider seeking a modification to the parking requirement as opposed to a modification to the lot coverage?

Mr. Ritland: No, we didn't.

Commissioner Gutshall: Okay. Yeah, I guess I'll leave it at that. So, thank you, I appreciate your candor.

Commissioner Forinash: Ms. Vonhm, picking up on that, we just had a discussion in the context of the last site plan about the residential parking study that's apparently ongoing. Do you know is that study, and Ms. Kim is still here, this may be more appropriate for her. Will that study consider site plan buildings such as these?

Ms. Kim: I believe it only for multifamily buildings at this time.

Commissioner Forinash: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Siegel.

Commissioner Siegel: I just wanted to ask about the setback requirement. It's in the zoning, correct, the 25-foot setback? What puzzles me is that's the modification. If the setback requirement were less than that, there would be less need for questioning of a modification. So, in the discussion of the context, it seems that almost none of the-- okay, you get the point. Almost none of the existing homes meet this setback requirement. So, this kind of puzzles me. Can you just elaborate a little bit on why we are in that sort of odd position?

Ms. Vonhm: So, for the site plan townhouse projects, they requested modifications similar to the ones that are being requested tonight. For single family, or honestly, any building that was constructed before either the zoning ordinance was established in 1930 or before the R15-30T zoning district was accomplished, which I honestly don't remember. But the early zoning districts didn't have such restrictive setbacks so if a building was built in the '20s, '30s, early '40s, it wasn't bound by these regulations and they came later, and so we have an environment that was established before the rules came.

Commissioner Siegel: Good, thank you, thank you for that clarification.

SITE DESIGN AND CHARACTERISTICS

Commissioner Forinash: Further questions or discussion on land use and zoning? See, none. Moving on to site design and characteristics. Before we get to the street part, I have one question on the building on the north on the right side here. Where are the fronts? Where are the entrances to those units?

Mr. Ritland: So, for the unit that is on North Stuart Street, you can see the canopy over the stoop peeking out at the bottom. And then for the two units interior to the site, it is next to the garage door.

Commissioner Forinash: So, it's on the left off of--it's not on the right off that--

Mr. Ritland: Correct. It's off the driveway.

STREET DESIGN AND PARKING

Commissioner Forinash: Okay, thank you. Anything else on site design and characteristics before we get to the street design and the parking issue? All right, Commissioner Siegel, you want to start us off?

Commissioner Siegel: Yeah, I have a couple of questions that I hope I can frame the commission's consideration and discussion. One of my first questions is, would this development set a precedent? And we'll go through the emergency measurements and concerns in a minute, but just sort of bottom line for me, this is a portion of North Stuart Street. I've traveled it many times looking at the existing conditions. When I go, it's never crowded 'cause I'm not going at rush hour. There's a curb, we call it a curb nub on the west side on Washington Street and Stuart Street. So, aside from the concern with this area, which we're gonna get to in more detail in a minute, my concern is, are we going to be losing yield streets as developments like this come before us? And I think that would be a problem. Then the other question is, are there other techniques that can be used to satisfy emergency concerns while maintaining parking and yield street conditions? And I also read back, read the streets element and parking in curb street management elements of the Master Transportation Plan and it seemed that those elements called for the maintenance of parking yield street conditions and things like that. They were not called out in documents that were used to evaluate the site plan, but I think they should be. So, that's how I would start the discussion. If other commissioners want to jump in at this point, they can or I can continue.

Commissioner Forinash: I think what would be best now, since we have the Marshal here or someone from the Marshal's office. Apologies if I've given you a field promotion, is if you could walk us through the Fire Marshal's reasoning for why, I guess, access around the site in general and the implications for the street out front.

Greg Karl, Captain, Arlington County Fire Department: My name is Greg Karl: I'm the Captain from the Fire Department. One of the issues that we have is by state code, any building that's gonna be built over 30 feet high is gonna require aerial access. There's some photos there. There's a photo towards the end. So, this is currently our tower ladder. It's the newest ladder truck we have in the fleet. That, with the stabilizers out, that sits at 19 feet wide. Those are required fully extended to stabilize that ladder truck so it does not tip over. The piece of pavement that it's sitting on is a 26-foot wide piece of pavement so that gives you some idea of why we need the area we do to operate around that ladder truck. By restricting the parking on one side of this street, it would give us 22 feet, plus it would give us the trees and the sidewalk to operate around the vehicle, and that's kind of where we're able to give up the full 26 feet as required by the statewide fire prevention code. When you came on to the site, there were the three townhouses that were situated to the right of the site that kind of front on to the driveway. That is 27 feet wide to accommodate the ladder truck because again, they're over 30 feet higher and would require aerial access. The 3 that are situated to the back part of this site, the driveway's only 20 feet wide because the aerial access drops

because they're under 30 feet in height, so we'd only have to get a fire engine back there as opposed to the ladder truck.

Commissioner Forinash: And that requirement of needing aerial access, as you described it to anything over 30 feet tall, is regardless of whether a building is sprinklered or non sprinklered, residential, commercial?

Mr. Karl: Correct. It's a 30-foot building height. In some instances where buildings aren't required to be sprinklered, one of the tradeoffs that we are able to do within the code is if they fully sprinkler a building, we could lessen that dimension of the street but most of the time when you're gonna go over 30 feet, especially multifamily or multi, connected units, one unit is going to affect the others. So, if it were a standalone single-family dwelling, we could say okay a sprinkler, we can forego the 26 foot. But when you're impacting the other people on that site and in that unit block, then we would look at, you know, making sure that we do have aerial access, adequate access to the site.

Commissioner Forinash: So, that multifamily connected buildings argument comes into play since we have a lot of single family homes now that are being built more than 30 feet, with occupiable space above 30 feet.

Mr. Karl: Correct. Those are plans that we--because they're by right, we would never even see them from the fire department if somebody's gonna build just a single family home.

Commissioner Forinash: Nor would we.

Mr. Karl: So, and that's where the other thing that we have though is because you're only impacting one unit, we still have ground ladders and things like that we can work around, but it really gets into where you're going to potentially impact the other units in that block that the aerial access is going to kick in.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Schroll.

Commissioner Schroll: Captain, thank you for being here. A few questions. There's another site plan that's being considered, 1411 Key Boulevard, you may be familiar with it. The streetcar cross section there is much narrower than the one we're seeing here. It's a multifamily building. I think it's 60 feet or something up to that height roughly, and it's narrower than the street we're seeing here. Can you explain how you get a narrower street for a taller building in Rosslyn and you have 29 feet here or 26?

Commissioner Forinash: Twenty-two clear feet.

Commissioner Schroll: Twenty-two clear feet. What's the explanation?

Mr. Karl: I'm not familiar with that particular site, but Ms. Kim was able to help me out and she said that what happens is the aerial access is for one complete side of the

building or 150 feet, whichever is greater. So, on the site you're referring to in Rosslyn, the street on the side of it is wide enough to accommodate the aerial truck so that's how you're able to get away just because of the way they're situated on the site.

Commissioner Schroll: Okay, that, I guess, is helpful. What's serving, what type of truck is serving Stuart Street today?

Mr. Karl: This ladder truck right here. All of our ladder trucks, whether it's the tower ladder or a straight aerial ladder, all have the exact same specifications as far as the stabilizers and everything that come out, so they all are 19 feet wide when they come out and are down for the fully operational. So, there's no difference whether it's the tower or one of our other three ladder trucks, they're all going to have the same footprint that's required.

Commissioner Forinash: The same width.

Mr. Karl: The same width.

Commissioner Schroll: So, it's a 15-foot plus 15-foot 2 inches yield street today. This is 19 feet when it expands out. So, they wouldn't be able to come down today on Stuart Street, that's what you're saying.

Mr. Karl: They wouldn't be able to set up down Stuart Street.

Commissioner Schroll: Now, are there other configurations, other types of equipment that could serve Stuart Street, Taylor, Stafford or other streets that are similarly situated or is this kind of the only thing, I mean, on the market?

Mr. Karl: This is it. This is what we have.

Commissioner Schroll: I guess I'm not asking that question.

Mr. Karl: I understand what you're saying. Anytime you get into an aerial device, once you have in stabilize it because you're gonna bring the ladder up and work off of one side, you need that side, you need it to be completely stable. And as you can see, it's a little hard to see in this picture, but the rear end of the ladder truck actually comes up off the ground, so all the wheels are off the ground and all of the weight is on those stabilizers. So, when we swing that ladder off and fully extend it the hundred feet that it's capable of extending, we have to be able to counterbalance that weight and that's why we need the stabilizer.

Commissioner Schroll: I appreciate that explanation. I guess I'm wondering, is this the smallest dimension of equipment that could serve a building that's taller than 30 feet, or are there other pieces of equipment on the market today?

Mr. Karl: This is it.

Commissioner Schroll: I'll have more when we debate later.

Mr. Karl: Chief Insley is the Chief Fire Marshal. He's also our Apparatus Chief. He can answer the dimensions question maybe a little clearer than I did.

Commissioner Forinash: Apparatus Chief is quite a title. If you wouldn't find introducing yourself for the record.

Mr. Insley: My name is Doug Insley. I am Deputy Fire chief with the Fire Department. I also hold the title as Chief Fire Marshal for the County and Fire Official. I've had the opportunity to oversee our apparatus design and purchasing program since 2001, so I'm intimately familiar with the OEMs, the design of our fire apparatus, and the evolution of fire apparatus, as we shall say. The as Captain Karl has alluded, we constantly are evaluating the newest technologies in trying to determine how we can shrink our fire trucks. We work with our partners and other agencies daily on all of these plans reviewed issue. If we could shrink our truck down, we definitely would but NFPA, which is the governing body that governs the standard by which fire apparatus is designed, really handcuffs you to the capabilities and the limits of an aerial. And obviously, we are an urban fire department that responds to lots of elevated emergencies. And as we swing that aerial out, you know, it's not such a big deal when you're 4 or 5 feet out, but when I put that aerial at a hundred feet out, there is an incredible amount of load and side loading of the vehicle for which, just like any crane, that's pretty much what this is, this is a crane that's got a 500-pound tip load that we have to make sure that we have the appropriate subbase, that's why you actually see on the picture that's up on the screen, you have your outrigger and then you actually have a deflection plate that actually increases the surface area so we don't punch through the street. We've actually had several scenarios with our other tower ladder, where we actually, in the summertime, the summertime is one of our highest risk profiles for marginal streets. We've actually punched through the street and it causes the entire fire truck to shift. And when you have firefighter at the end of that bucket, it creates an incredible risk. So, what we've tried to do, and you brought a great question about the difference between a six-story structure in Rosslyn versus the townhouses. Aerial access is only defined at one--Greg tried to explain, but I'll try a little bit better. Aerial access is required to only be on one side of the building. It doesn't care which side of the building, that's why sometimes you may not see the aerial access on the address side of the structure. It could be on a different side.

Commissioner Schroll: So then, what I don't understand is the internal drive aisle is 23 feet across, correct? So, you would have access to the building from, based on your definition, from one side, correct?

Mr. Insley: Are we talking about the Stuart Street side?

Commissioner Schroll: The internal drive aisle to the project, correct? You would have a 23--

Mr. Insley: We couldn't set up to operate the aerial on the rear, the set of units that's in the back, that's why we required those to go below 30 feet. There's four sets, one, two, three, four sets of building, is that correct? And then the one that's in the back, you're talking about the internal drive aisle as you drive in?

Commissioner Schroll: And it would be internal to all four.

Mr. Insley: Yeah, we couldn't get in there. We couldn't get in there, nor could we make the turn to get in there with the aerial for the back ones. I mean this truck's 40 feet long.

Mr. Karl: The issue is also that the Stuart Street units are two separate blocks and so each block would require access in front of that unit. There is no other side that you could resituate the ladder truck. They have the ladder truck for those two units that front on Stuart Street, they have to have their aerial access on Stuart Street. That's the only place that we could situate it that it would function.

Mr. Insley: Right. But following up on your original question, I just want to conclude that we take a great amount of effort to, number one, make sure that the vehicles that we're serving our community with meet the mission, the ever-evolving mission of the fire and emergency services, but we take very great depths to try to shrink our fire trucks when we can but there's only so much we can do within technology and then ensuring that we can serve our mission correctly. That's the size and the fire truck issue.

Mr. Insley: Even if we had a--I'm not sure if you're familiar with the different kinds of aerials, but if we had a tractor drawn aerial, a tiller truck, for say, which is a much more maneuverable ladder truck as far as you see like in the District of Columbia, they have mostly tractor drawn aerials, one, that requires additional staff which is a whole different money component and then other, the outriggers are still the same without. So, I can drive it easier, but it still sticks out 19 feet pin to pin. So, that's in our world with our manufacturer and our OEMs, that's where we're at.

Commissioner Schroll: Just by way of comment, and I appreciate the explanation from the Chief and the Captain on these issues is that I feel like there are several parts to this project, parking being one, and certainly the fire being second, that is really driving the way our public realm is being designed. And I know some of that's outside of both of your concern--control. But I think other things are suffering because of it. I've lived, I used to live on that street for 4 years and I know how much in demand on-street parking is. I know that the applicants parking is gonna be handled on site and those who are gonna be living here aren't gonna be eligible for on-street parking but you're taking six spots away, not you personally, but this project is taking six spots away from a really high in demand area. And I think there are other things that could have given to allow the space you needed but also more maintaining kind of a yield street and a marking configuration here and that's not what we're seeing. I think that's a mistake.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Ciotti and then Commissioner Iacomini. Sticking to this topic please, 'cause I have some--

Commissioner Ciotti: Just to follow up. So, if you had one of the more modular units like Washington, D.C. does, like New York City does, you could have used the drive aisle for aerial coverage?

Mr. Insley: No, it would have never, no, because the outrigger design is still the same so, no. The impact to accessing 'cause we're continuing to talk about the drive aisle and its access but really, that's not where your parking impacts were to start with. Your parking impacts were on Stuart Street which is where we've reduced the on-street parking from so that's where our issue is.

Commissioner Ciotti: But, if you had a more modular unit, you could retrain on-street parking by using the drive aisle for your outrigger. Isn't there enough space there?

Mr. Karl: No. Because of the way the fire code is written and the separations between each block of three units, each one of those is treated by the fire code as a separate building. So, when even if we're able to get the ladder truck to the backside of that site, there still isn't enough room to put the outriggers down. And if you go to the last picture in here, because we still need to work around the ladder truck and once you put those outriggers down and once we hit physical barriers, such as cars or another building, those compartments there and the equipment in those compartments is inaccessible without potentially injuring firefighters. So, this is a perfect picture. You can see the firefighter at the cab there in the back of the picture getting his gear, and they are gonna basically not be able to access any compartment on that ladder truck so that's why we need--if we even were able to get to the backside of those units, we still wouldn't have the space to safely put the outriggers down to stabilize the ladder truck and then function around it.

Mr. Insley: And finally, one of the things that we, as a concession or work around where we try to help, 'cause we hear the parking demands and we try to work within our confines of the code to try to accommodate this as much as we can. We look at options like mountable curb and using the street and the curb in totality to get our 26-foot width because, you know, we can edge up to the curb and so long as let's say we're only out in the street by 2 feet, but so long as we have the 26 feet, we can accommodate that. And I know that you had one of the questions you raised earlier is, what about if the other side of the street gets developed, how does that impact? Quite honestly in our eyes, I don't think it would impact anything because, or at least mostly it could not impact anything, because as long as we have the aerial access today, that's with the parking on that side of the street. So, if you built a structure there, so long as the setbacks and the other code requirement were met, I'm not sure it would impact anything as far as future parking requirements.

Commissioner Forinash: In other words, the trucks are exactly where you would set it to serve this building?

Mr. Insley: It's gonna hog up the whole street.

Commissioner Forinash: To reach the other side across the parking.

Mr. Karl: We have a minimum setback, the minimum setback from the street for us, from the building to the ladder truck is 15 feet and our maximum is 30 feet. So, you're dealing with 30 feet from where a new potential building could be out to the street where the ladder truck would set up at. So, you have 30 feet to work with to, you know, situate those buildings on that site to move them closer to fall within that 15 to 30 feet as required by code.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Iacomini and then Commissioner Harner.

Commissioner Iacomini: Thank you. I had a question about the interior drive aisle. Is any of that width due to fire code?

Mr. Karl: Yes, the drive aisle that, as you enter the site, there is the 3 townhouse units on the right hand side, that is 26 feet wide to access those three units because they are over 30 feet high. Then it diminishes down to, I believe, 22 feet, 20 feet as you come to the backside there where the three units of the back of the site are situated. That diminishes down and that's able to do that because those 3 units are below 30 feet in height, so we'd only need to get an engine back there as opposed to an aerial truck. An engine is a pumper. You see them so the water hose, they're much smaller units, much more maneuverable, and once you go under that 30 feet as required by code, we can go just back there with an engine and operate off ground ladders.

Commissioner Iacomini: So, just to follow up. Given the vintage of some of the townhouse developments that we have in Ballston, I'm taking, I take it that the fire code has changed many times since 1980.

Mr. Karl: Yes.

Commissioner Iacomini: So, that's why we see different amounts of pavement and configuration all through that area?

Mr. Insley: Correct. And remember, sometimes the statewide fire prevention code gets pitted against Arlington County Transportation Policy and, you know, that's a never-ending struggle and battle. But all of those efforts are to reduce the risk profile, you know, for our citizens and we, sometimes we get to be portrayed as the bad guys but in reality, we're just trying to make sure that when there are fire and EMS emergencies, that we're able to respond and serve our community as best we can.

Commissioner Forinash: I'm actually gonna preempt to Mr. Harner for a minute. The point you just made about balancing risks is what this comes down to for me, not the demand for on-street parking, although that's a secondary consideration. But my

concern is, I mean you know how rare the eventuality is that there will be a structure fire that's not immediately addressed by the sprinklers in these builds. That's an extremely rare event.

Mr. Insley: I wouldn't say extremely. And the one variable to sprinklers that it does not address is remember, these townhouses are 40 feet high so we don't have a ground ladder that can access the roof of this building, period. It doesn't exist on any of your fire apparatus today, all right? We carry a 35-foot ladder and once it steps out, you're about 30 feet. If a thunder storm in the summer time comes along and lightning hits the roof of your home and you're in a townhome, the sprinkler system's not gonna get to it until you're burning the roof off the structure. So, for us, we'd like to be able to have those aerial access to be able to mitigate these emergencies when they are small and that happens incredibly frequently. Every single summer, we are running fire calls where there are small lightning strikes, small roof fires that you can--

Commissioner Forinash: In townhomes?

Mr. Insley: With a fire extinguisher in some cases if we can just get to it. So, that's--it's not about the big, what you're envisioning the burning a city block down but a lot of times it's just a quick and emergent response that we can get there and locate the problem before the sprinkler system ever activates. And I suspect, I don't even think it requires sprinklers.

Mr. Karl: That would be the other point. It would depend on what sprinkler system was put in there. Most are for escape of residents. They are for extinguishment of the fire. It's to keep it in check for them to escape and it's generally just in living areas, so you wouldn't have a sprinkler system up in an attic space. They aren't sprinklered because they're not heated and it would be a dry type system where there's no water in it, which is it gets very expensive to run those systems in those unclimate control conditions.

Commissioner Forinash: I believe the top floors of these are occupied space so that's not an issue here.

Mr. Karl: But there would still be a, there's still a gap space between the roof and the upstairs.

Commissioner Forinash: Certainly your point about the sprinklers being to buy enough time for people to--

Mr. Karl: It's gonna catch anything below, but nothing above.

Commissioner Forinash: My concern is that that risk is, you know, the other side is that we can guarantee now that people will be driving faster on this street. We can guarantee that every day will would be driving faster on this street because they don't have to worry about, you know, the great benefit of a yield street which is you have to pay attention, right, as a driver, you actually have a pay attention. You to have slow

down and navigate whether it's a chicane of parked cars or whether it's another vehicle coming at you to control speeds. And you know, that's an every single day occurrence that is a counterbalancing risk to the risk that you're describing. And I understand you're the fire marshal, but when you describe that it conflicts with County transportation policy, it's not just 'cause, you know, we like urbanism. That's also safety driven in many cases. And so, I mean I'm torn. I understand, I fully understand your need to be able to put the outriggers down. I understand you need to be able to get access to these buildings. I have a question, if those six units fronting Stuart were connected so that they were one building, would you then need a single place where you could set down the outriggers halfway along the length of the building?

Mr. Karl: The way the code is written, it's one complete side of the building or 150 feet, which ever is greater. So, if they're not longer than 150 feet at total length, which I'm not sure the length of all of them would be, it would still need to be the whole front length of building.

Commissioner Forinash: So, the code requires 150 feet of continuous frontage access.

Mr. Karl: One complete side or 150 feet, which ever is greater.

Commissioner Forinash: And that's a ladder swing issue? What's the 150 feet connected to?

Mr. Karl: That's for positioning of the ladder truck, so you aren't putting your ladder truck 150 feet setting up in one space and your fire is down here.

Commissioner Forinash: What I'm trying to get at is, you know, if you can set up in the middle of those what are six not quite connected units, and leave one or two parking spaces on either end, is that possible or do you really need six parking spaces?

Mr. Insley: I think you're trying to make the assumption that it's the perfect world and the perfect access requirements are gonna be there for us.

Commissioner Forinash: I have to find a middle ground.

Mr. Insley: Yeah, sure. I think the middle ground is we've reduced--

Mr. Karl: Right, we've went from 26 feet to--

Commissioner Forinash: That's one dimension. I'm working on the other dimension now.

Mr. Karl: Yeah, that one unfortunately there wasn't much we could do about that just because of the way the code is. We were able to narrow the street from 26 to 22 because of removing parking but to try and shorten that, it really would put, it would

really constrain the units when we showed up operationally because what's going to happen if that, the aerial is a finite, you know, mechanism. So, if they were to position here and, like I said, if there was a fire or if there's someone that needs to be rescued from a window that's just out of that reach because we didn't get those two extra parking spaces eliminated, now, we've put that person at risk unnecessarily because we've tried to shorten that and try and set up--we can't necessarily set up in one specific spot. We need that variable space that we can set up for those three units or those three units.

Commissioner Forinash: Does the code provide you any flexibility in that? Because I think the parking spaces on either end, you would, if you look at the geometry, you would not need to the outriggers in those parking space at either end of that row of six to reach all of the units with your--and I don't know if the code allows you that kind of flexibility or not.

Mr. Insley: I think, I will tell you I'll be willing to look at that and see if we felt like with some calculations the aerial could reach the top of the 40-foot structure from one space in on each end. I would be willing to consider to look at that for sure.

Commissioner Forinash: We'd appreciate that, thank you. Commissioner Ciotti and then I think others were waiting.

Commissioner Ciotti: You said that--oh, please don't go away, that you don't have a ladder that could get up to a four-story building.

Mr. Insley: Accept for the aerial. We don't have a ground ladder.

Commissioner Ciotti: Ground ladder, you don't have a ground ladder that doesn't get-- isn't that in the realm of possibility to get a ladder that can go up to the fourth story?

Mr. Insley: Not on our apparatus with making the fire apparatus subsequently longer and bigger. It's that constant fight of the square box and how much we put it in.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Harner and then Commissioner Gutshall.

Commissioner Harner: Thanks Commissioner Forinash, and thanks to our great emergency responders for being here to help us with this. Just a few follow-up questions. Let's just pretend that this is a generic situation not related to the specifics of this exact application. So, help me to understand, if I believe in our Master Transportation Plan we ask for 11-foot lanes. So, would it be possible for us to have a street with 2, 11-foot lanes and parking on both sides and have a 40-foot townhouse on one or both sides? If that's a correct characterization of a typical street that we go for?

Ms. Kim: That would 36 feet of curb to curb width, 36, 22 feet travel lanes plus 14 of parking.

Commissioner Harner: That's correct. So, is that--am I correct that that's a typical street in our master transportation plan? We have a 2, 11-foot lanes? It's an Urban Center Local street classification. So, I want to understand, is the street that we, as citizens, think that is the kind of street we want, is that street actually not achievable due to the fire code? So, a 22-foot wide clear area is the street that's in our Master Transportation Plan actually not acceptable to the fire department?

Mr. Insley: It depends on the overall height of the structure.

Commissioner Harner: I'm stipulating that there's a 40-foot structure plus or more?

Mr. Insley: No.

Commissioner Harner: So, the answer is that street would not be acceptable.

Mr. Karl: In our eyes, no.

Commissioner Harner: So, an Urban Center Local street in the plan doesn't seem to be an acceptable street. So, one of the problems for us is that, you know, these, we've spent a lot of time creating this Master Transportation Plan that has characteristics that we want to achieve in these kinds of areas. And so as a Commission, we're asking yourselves wow, you know, how often are we gonna actually find that the street that we thought we were gonna get from our plan actually is not allowable by the fire department? And Mr. Cole is gonna restate the question in a more elegant and sophisticated way.

Commissioner Cole: It's not possible with a 40-foot building. It is possible with a shorter building.

Commissioner Harner: I'm stipulating with a 40-foot building. A single family home can go up to 35 feet which is over 30 feet, so it seems as if almost any of our buildings are greater than 30 feet, which kicks in this requirement. So, I'm just worried that we have a policy that does not, you can't implement.

Mr. Insley: We do, not you, us, Arlington County as a whole, we do.

Commissioner Harner: And so, it begs the question of, what do we do about that and when are we gonna see this next? And, you know, we're getting a result here. I mean this shows us that we have a problem when we saw this street and we're fearful that it could be--happen in more areas.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Gutshall, before we go to you, I think the applicant wanted to offer something. Do you mind? Okay, please.

Mr. Ritland: Just one thing. The Fire Department measures to the top of the building. There's a calculated formula for how they determine overall building height, but the

zoning department measures it to the midpoint of the slope of the roof. So, a 35-foot house for zoning is a 40-foot house for the fire department. So, single family houses, the way the fire department measures it, is a 40-foot building, just so you know.

Mr. Insley: With that mansard roof, it would go to the top of the mansard as opposed to the [inaudible] gutter.

Commissioner Forinash: Right. Thank you for that. Commissioner Gutshall. Okay, Commissioner Gutshall, then we'll come back to Commissioner Harner.

Commissioner Gutshall: Yeah, so actually following up on that height measurement and just in general the code that we're talking about, is this, what's the specific code? The building code is like the IRC, the International Residential Code. This is?

Mr. Insley: It's the Virginia Statewide Fire and Prevention Code. I believe it's Section 503 Appendix D.

Mr. Karl: It's Appendix D, 105.

Commissioner Gutshall: And does that come out from an international model like the way the building code comes from the--?

Mr. Karl: That's from the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code which is taken from the International Fire Code. Virginia adopted it and did their amendments to make the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.

Commissioner Gutshall: Do you happen to know whether this section was part of an amendments?

Mr. Karl: I don't believe so.

Commissioner Gutshall: Presumably this is the international--

Mr. Karl: I believe it's consistent internationally.

Commissioner Gutshall: Right. So presumably, I guess that means that internationally in countries that use these model codes in the developed world primarily, the same apparatus are available generally, right? So, one of the things that I'm having, and this is a comment for Ms. Vonhm in terms of when this goes to the board, is trying to understand, I mean we've heard a lot of things. We've heard the staff report refers to a 22-foot clear width. I think the fire marshal has mentioned something about 26 feet as desired, then there's 15-foot setbacks from buildings. So, the numbers are really all over the place here and this is why I think we are having somewhat of a sidebar here in trying to drill down to being able to use that center aisle and then you finally explained well it has to deal with the buildings. So, I think it would be very helpful to save some time tonight having that very clearly delineate what all those numbers are.

Mr. Insley: We can clearly supply the code section to the Commission very easily.

Commissioner Gutshall: You know, pictures are worth a thousand words and a very nice diagram could be worth more. I don't know how many words we've spoken this evening but something like that. So, then my next question is this code, so how is it, 'cause I'm also hearing that I'm hearing in your answers that there's room for your interpretation of how the code applies or not.

Mr. Karl: In some applications, in some things, they are locked hard and fast but then some cases, there are some concessions that we have give, yes.

Commissioner Gutshall: And so--

Mr. Karl: I can give you another example. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off, but one of the code requirements is that you must all access roads, not aerial access roads, access roads must be within 150 feet, can be no further than 150 feet from a structure. But if you fully sprinkler that same structure, you can be set back to 200 feet in certain applications of certain occupancy types. There's a lot of variants based on occupancy type, whether it's a single family--well, not single family but, you know, part of the buildings, the highrises, and educational facilities, and stuff like that. So, there are some wiggle room. And I know for us, we try to say, okay, can we count the curb? Can we make it a mountable curb? I know we've done several plan reviews whereby, you know, the street width was only 18 feet but we needed 20, okay? So, we said, okay, if you mount the curb in times of an emergency, we can mount up on the curb and drive up on the curb to have access to it. So, there is so flexibility sometimes, but I always try to keep the perspective and the fire department always tries to keep the perspective is we are the advocate for the citizens and the advocate for fire safety, so that's kind of where we're always gonna lean towards ensuring a safe environment.

Commissioner Gutshall: And I think that's--I'm glad as a citizen that you're doing your job. So, I want to state that unequivocally that I appreciate you're doing your job, however, I think that, you know, we bring this forward and I think Commissioner Forinash did a nice job of characterizing probably where I am, where there are other concerns that are not your responsibility and having to do with the issue of the safety of the streets from a pedestrian and, you know, a kid on a bike or anything like that, and I think that those are other concerns that the Board has to weigh. So, the question that I have for staff, my final question on this is, what is the ability of the Board to override the Fire Marshal's recommendation? And he has his recommendation, it's based on the code, is that a strict adherence that the Board cannot approve something that is not in compliance with the Fire Code?

Mr. Karl: The Fire Code is state law, that's the plain and simple down and dirty of it. Just like the Building Code is state law, the Fire Code is the state law as well, so there are areas, like the Chief said, that we could work within that, you know, work it with what we can give and take but ultimately we still have to follow what the code is. Once they

said that and said these are the minimums or these are the maximums, we have to stay within those same confines.

Commissioner Gutshall: So, it's not like the Building Code. The Building Code is state law as well but you can apply for a waiver and, you know, for ceiling height in the basement, for example. The Building Official provides waivers all the time. You sign the little document and it goes and that's technically it's a waiver from the law. That's not possible here?

Mr. Karl: I think when you get into what you're talking about, code modifications for interior of the building, you're not talking about a life safety risk.

Commissioner Gutshall: No, that's just one example. I think you can--

Mr. Karl: A ceiling by a foot or 2 feet, that's not a life safety risk, not providing aerial access for a building over 30 feet creates a life safety hazard for the people that are gonna occupy that, building and that's just something that I don't think I wouldn't feel comfortable, and I'm sure the chief wouldn't feel comfortable with saying, You know what? We're gonna go ahead and hope that nothing happens here and good luck to the people who live there. We wouldn't want to take that risk of potentially something happening and somebody losing that are life. You know, when you modify the building code, those are interior things, not really life safety related. But once you get into actual life safety code, that's something that I don't think we have a whole lot of room that we would say we're gonna grant modifications to because we don't want to have that responsibility or put that responsibility on the County saying, yeah, we've granted this and now something has happened. I'm sure that opens up a huge liability for the County as well.

Commissioner Gutshall: Well, I'm gonna do you a favor and not share with the firefighters that their life safety is not an issue in a low, a short basement 'cause that is a life safety issue. And I say that somewhat tongue and cheek, and I appreciate your answers but I'm trying to discern what the County Board has authority to do. I understand what your position is.

Ms. Vonhm: I couldn't answer that. I can't imagine that they would want to but I don't know. I don't know the answer.

Mr. Insley: I as well. I've never been asked to get to that point, so I'm not sure where that lays.

Commissioner Gutshall: All right, thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Hughes, hang on. Commissioner Harner was teed up.

Commissioner Harner: Thanks Commissioner Forinash. And again, I really do appreciate your being here and answering the questions and also the applicants, you know, working with staff to try to balance all these hard issues. And so it's hard to ask this question but it's just I've had this issue before and I may be misunderstanding something. But in some of my past experience, any fire lane that was longer than 150 feet required a turnaround for the truck so, are we longer than 150 feet on this fire lane?

Mr. Karl: There's different fire lanes. This is an aerial apparatus. This is access for aerial apparatus. The fire lane that you're speaking about where it goes over 150 feet would be something like a driveway, something that you only have one way in or out off of the site. So, at that point, once you go over that 150 feet of driving in. So, let's say if you were to build a townhouse community that was a dead end into the community and if you went over 150 feet coming into that driveway to get to the furthest development that's there, the furthest units that are there, you would be required to put a turnaround in.

Commissioner Harner: Don't with have that condition here?

Commissioner Forinash: You're talking about Stuart Street. You're talking about the drive alley between the buildings.

Mr. Karl: No, the driveway going in was only less than 100 feet so it's not required 'cause the ladder truck is only gonna go in perpendicular to Stuart Street and stop. We're not gonna go to those back units 'cause we're not required to be able to access those three back units.

Commissioner Harner: So, just how does that actually work in the code in terms of units that are interior to a site? So, there's a specific rule that says you only have to get within a certain distance of those units?

Mr. Karl: Depending on the height is what apparatus needs to be able to get there. So, if they go under 30 feet, which those 3 back units are under 30 feet in height, the engine is the only thing that has to get back there. They are under the requirements, the aerial apparatus requirement goes away because they're under 30 feet.

Commissioner Forinash: The aforementioned ground ladder, whatever your term--

Mr. Karl: Will go to the roof of that.

Commissioner Harner: Let me just make sure I understand. So, a truck, any fire truck can go back a hundred feet and not have to turnaround.

Mr. Karl: They actually did have room for the turnaround, and they're with the parking that was there on the end, they're able to show they're able to get in and then back out to come back out to Stuart Street. They did what's called an auto turn analysis which shows the movements of the fire trucks on the site and the auto turn showed that with

what they have on the sight, we can move an engine, which is significantly smaller than a ladder truck, around the site without having the required turnarounds. >>

Commissioner Harner: And you used parking spaces at part of the turnaround? I just want to, these are--

Ms. Vonhm: Yes, that's actually the analysis that was done earlier on.

Ms. Helgason: You actually have to use the actual parking space.

Commissioner Harner: Okay, so you have, so this accomplishes the turnaround requirement.

Mr. Karl: Correct.

Ms. Helgason: And just to be clear, the length in front of those units 10 through 12, that is less than 150 as well. So, it is only 142 feet but even so, you can back out.

Commissioner Harner: Okay, thanks.

Commissioner Forinash: I was coming back to Commissioner Hughes, but I saw Mr. Cover wagging his finger.

Mr. Cover: Just very quickly. It sounds like we're getting on track here. Just the recommendation to the planning committee, this is a topic that might be worthy of a separate discussion with the planning commission and there's so many different factors. There are waivers, other things that are possible. I think I'd just like to recommend to the planning commission to really focus on the project that's before you tonight because I think there's plenty of discussion on this topic.

Commissioner Forinash: Mr. Cover, with due respect, we've definitely been focusing on the project here tonight, but I appreciate that we can educate ourselves better on the fire marshal's options and--

Mr. Cover: I think there's more discussion to this that maybe we could do it other time so--

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Cole, I have Commissioner Hughes up next. What's this in regard to? Commissioner Cole, what's this in regard to?

Commissioner Cole: It's not directly related to the fire department's response, but it is related directly to the site plan and that is that the issue at hand is important because the question before us is the extent to which the conditions that would be created here could be repeated throughout the several block area near the Ballston Metro Station and then throughout the County. And the question therefore for staff is, what are the limiting conditions of this particular site plan that give us confidence that approving this

site plan will not result in establishing a precedent that repeats itself throughout the area and therefore, we don't lose the on-street parking. And it's just a very significant extent, have an ability of the dwellings and safety in the streets for pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles. And before we're done here, you don't need to answer right now, but I'm gonna come back to this because I want a clear answer from staff about what are the limiting conditions here? What are the unique characteristics of this site that suggest this is necessary here but could not be repeated as a rule throughout the County?

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Hughes.

Commissioner Hughes: I guess I just have one quick technical question for our fire experts while they're here 'cause I've been listening carefully. I come from a different profession and heavy industry is something I'm very familiar with, and so I know that we have almost enough space, but not quite enough to set up the hydraulic, you know, apparatus, to set the whole crane up and I'm wondering if--and you guys, I know you guys get results and I can tell you that in my neighborhood and in many neighborhoods I can promise you, A, there are structures above 35 feet, and, B, that the clear lane is significantly less than 22 feet. So, I guess that you have a plan and I'm guessing that those hydraulic rams are probably strong enough to push the cars more or less, and to obliterate them and set yourself up, if you needed to in a case where it was an extenuating circumstance in which life and safety was at risk. So, my quick question is, is our apparatus capable of setting up God and country, you know, if necessary? Do you just push the car out way?

Mr. Insley: We have never pushed a car out of the way in Arlington.

Commissioner Hughes: I'm glad we haven't, have others?

Mr. Karl: I've seen in New York City where they have a bigger aerial scope where they'll slam the outrigger right down through the roof of the car.

Commissioner Hughes: That's all I was asking. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: That sounds kind of like fun, doesn't think? Let's see, was anyone else seeking recognition on this topic which was, to remind us, site design and characteristics? Right, building architecture, let's see. Commissioner Schroll, you had mentioned specifically the screening of the stairs, this also includes architecture into its other dimensions so we'll start with you, Commissioner Schroll.

BUILDING ARCHITECTURE

Commissioner Schroll: Yeah, this is a question more for the applicant. It seems that there's more screening of the staircases and the elevators that you're proposing from the front view of these buildings than the back. Wondering why there isn't kind of the screening of that all the way around the building? Was that looked at? Like building, this building 4, for example, page 22, it looks like there's screens sort of on the rear

elevation on the front of those buildings but not the back. Just wondering if the applicant can comment.

Mr. Potter: Sure. So, one of the reasons is just to provide drainage to that roof rather than provide an interior roof drains so the back of that roof is left open so water can shed off the back of the roof more efficiently. There's rail across the back of that unit, so it's not like there's just a stair tower floating in space so there would be some articulation above the gutter line.

Commissioner Schroll: Was there any--thank you for that answer. Was there any other thoughts or other ways to screen the rear elevations and sort of these that would also allow for the drainage that--

Mr. Potter: I think this is definitely the best way if I were life safetying in that unit, this is the way to go because there are ice issues and leaves issues. You got things that get clogged, but I don't think that should be screened. I have the totally reverse idea on that. Those three units are coming with roof gardens and trellises. They don't have private outdoor space except for the small balconies near the garage doors. The idea is to celebrate a roof garden and all the other units that are taller look down and even the units over in Ballston, they're gonna say, hey look, that's a new way to, it's a feature that I want to show off, so I don't necessarily want to screen it. I think the cornice on the front sort of is more sympathetic with the courtyard feel and we've done other things to make that courtyard beautiful. Textured concrete and brick pavers so that's another kind of a hardscape garden. But those are vestiges of the original concept that we had about doing gardens and different levels, so I don't think it's something that we should be ashamed of, I think it's something we should celebrate.

Commissioner Schroll: All right, thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Hughes.

Commissioner Hughes: Thank you. I guess I have two quick questions for the applicant. Number one, I notice that the basement units have optional, I believe basement extensions in them, and so I guess my question is that is below the two-car garage. Is that correct?

Mr. Potter: Yes.

Commissioner Hughes: And there is no provision inside of your design for exterior entrance to the basement level. Is that flexibility or option capable of being added by an owner at a later date possibly, or would the design architecture limit that possibility?

Mr. Potter: No. There's an egress window well at the front of the units on Stuart Street.

Commissioner Forinash: Please, pull the microphone a little closer. Sorry to bother you about it.

Mr. Potter: No problem. There's the egress window well on the front of the units that face Stuart Street and on the north side of the three-unit B-type units. There is no stair. Also explaining a little bit might help you that there's a grade issue so to build those townhouses to have the driveways come in, of course, you can't climb 4 feet with your car so it has to happen gradually, and the front and back units share the same driveway. So, we split the grade level and that's why we have the large stoops. So, we're already coming 4 feet out of ground. Townhouses are short of storage space so it seems sort of silly not to go that extra 4 feet down and finish the job and make it habitable for maybe a media room or storage. It's a cellar space.

Commissioner Hughes: My only comment to the Commission is I know in other documents we've begun to sort of hint and allude to the concept of more flexible unit dwellings and, you know, we're leaving six units on the table here that would easily be English basements if we were just across a river.

TRANSPORTATION

Commissioner Forinash: Further questions or discussion on the building architecture topic? Nope. Transportation? We did pretty well cover that except I did want to ask probably Ms. Kim, this issue that came up earlier about the parking requirements and how we have higher parking requirements for this townhouse type, and maybe Ms. Vonhm as well, than any other residential unit type in the County, yet, we're not looking at that as a potential, you know, as an amendment change and, in fact, the last thing we did was raise it 20 years ago. So, I just want to ask if there's any appetite within County staff to take a look at our residential parking requirements for multifamily? What would you call this, multifamily non-tower?

Ms. Vonhm: It's specifically for townhouses. Yeah.

Commissioner Forinash: Thank you. Oh yeah, I didn't have a word for that, thank you. So, the answer to the question about potentially revisiting the egregiously large parking requirements is?

Ms. Vonhm: As with all of the other priorities that we have to manage in terms of amending the zoning ordinance, it's certainly that we could add to the list, but I'm not sure how or when the decision was made about the larger residential parking policy and why or why not townhouses wasn't included in that.

Commissioner Forinash: Certainly turning back to Commissioner Hughes just a moment ago. If one of our priorities coming out of the affordable housing plan is creating opportunities for affordability by design, then requiring townhouses to have at least 2.2 parking spaces, even if they're within 850 feet of the metro entrance, seems like, seems like we're going in the wrong direction.

Ms. Kim: It's something that we can also--I can also bring up with the folks in our department working on the residential parking setting to include the townhouse parking Zoning Ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Forinash: Great. Commissioner Schroll.

Commissioner Schroll: And to pick up on that point, we heard from the applicant in response to previous question that the reason that these units are potentially as tall as they are is because they're on top of parking and then that gets us into the fire, potentially some of the fire discussion we were in. And so, we may not be there if we were in a reduced height.

COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Commissioner Forinash: All right, other comments or discussion on the transportation section? Community benefits, section five. Commissioner Gutshall.

Commissioner Gutshall: I got two questions. One--well, I'll just take the first one first. The TDM what's the, what kind of TDM do we have here?

Ms. Kim: So, there's a modified TDM obviously the, you know, retail and office requirements don't comply. I believe the draft staff report includes the modified TDM to meet the townhouse building type for this project.

Commissioner Schroll: Can you refer me to a page?

Ms. Kim: It's number 42.

Commissioner Schroll: Number 42, okay. I'll look that up. Thank you. And then on-site public art.

Ms. Vonhm: So, that's actually there it was some change between the draft and the current proposal. The applicant--so the County would, at this point, would not be asking for the standard 75,000 contribution for public art for a project of this size. The applicant indicated a willingness to do on-site public art but it will not be a condition requirement.

Commissioner Schroll: Was this discussed at SPRC?

Ms. Vonhm: No.

Ms. Rote: And if I could just jump in? I think public art was something that was discussed very early on in this project in the applicant was interested in discussing and incorporating. As the development continued to progress, we did talk with public art again and they did make it clear that a condition wasn't something they would require or request for the project this size, this project. That said, there is still an interest in

potential that some would be done on site. It's just is [inaudible] would not be a formal condition of the approval.

Commissioner Schroll: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Further questions or discussion on community benefits? Construction and phasing issues? Any remaining issues before we move to a motion? Commissioner Cole.

PRECEDENT

Commissioner Cole: I want to return to the question I raised before which is the extent to which there are unique conditions here that the staff would indicate to the County Board that suggests that the conditions that are being, that are the result of this site plan here would not be repeated in other places.

Ms. Vonhm: I think that's difficult to answer for any or all future requests. I think the standard is that what are the conditions that justify approving it here, but not that we could guarantee it won't happen again in the future?

Commissioner Cole: Again, establishing precedence is frankly one of the most important things that we do here when we are modifying requirements in order to meet.

Ms. Vonhm: Right, but every site plan is taken in its own merits and every project is different.

Commissioner Cole: That's not necessarily true. Every site plan is measured against the policies of the County Board. And we are intentionally accepting some of the policies of the County Board in order to approve this site plan, let's be clear about that. And so, the question is, do the conditions here warrant those exceptions? And if they do, then we have to understand that that can happen elsewhere.

Ms. Vonhm: Exactly.

Commissioner Cole: To say they don't happen here, no one will be able to point to this and say, well, you did it here and you have to treat like situated entities the same. You know, I've been doing this long enough to watch lawyers argue, you know, that they deserve to be treated similarly, that their projects should get the same benefits as another project. Received. And I mean this in all seriousness, the staff can't come up with a limiting conditions here.

Ms. Kim: Are you speaking specifically to the removal of the on-street parking or some of the other modifications?

Commissioner Cole: I'm actually speaking of the removal of the on-street parking because that is a standard County policy with respect to Urban Local Center street type. It may not be on the site of the actual application, therefore the applicant may not be

requesting that modification. It's actually a modification, frankly, which staff is seeking in order to accommodate the applicant's design. Nonetheless, the point remains exactly the same which is if we can't, in good judgment, think that this will not be a precedent setting approval.

Ms. Kim: So, I can speak to a couple points. So, I think one was raised about I think Commissioner Schroll mentioned the kind of the amount of available on-street parking within this vicinity and that it is a limiting commodity and that we are removing, proposing to remove six on-street permit spaces here. Our permit parking team has indicated that there are four current permits amongst the four houses that are currently there. So, the actual net loss of on-street parking would be two spaces since the future tenants this development are not allowed permits to park on the street. So, that's just one comment kind of, you know, yes, we are moving six spaces but in actuality it's, you know, it can be considered two. And also I believe Commissioner Forinash mentioned the concern of if we have a two-way street condition for this part of Stuart Street that cars will move at a faster speed. We do have the ability to evaluate a street for volume and speed concerns and implement other traffic calming measures if necessary, and that could include things like speed humps, four-way stops, curb extension mid-block that could be mountable by a fire truck but would also serve to limit the width of the travel lanes. So, there's options that we have if the removal of on-street parking here and the subsequent, you know, potential for speeding vehicles kind of shows that we need more measures. So, it's not just an all or nothing. And, you know, I would also like to add, originally the plan showed a 26-foot section which pushed the proposed curb line closer to the west, actually widening the curb to curb width. You know, we worked very closely with the fire marshal's office to get that down to 22 feet to keep the existing 29-foot width. If in the future our fire access needs change or something else changed, the ability to add back on-street parking still exists. If there's a future condition that would cause something like that, that we do still have the ability by not actually narrowing the road. You know, we do have that ability and we do manage our streets and look at them from an operational standpoint.

Commissioner Forinash: If I may, this is a site plan now and generally we require of site plan developers that they mitigate anticipated consequences so saying that this road will undoubtedly lead to an increase in vehicle speeds, which it will, we know it will, right? How much we don't know. How many cars will go through there every day, we don't know, but we know that they will be going faster on a non-yield street than on a yield street. Doing nothing to mitigate that as part of a site plan is not the way we operate. And so, I'm prepared to offer an amendment that taking not undo advantage, but taking into account what the Marshal said in terms of potential flexibility, not that he's guaranteeing anything, but that he's willing to look and see if there's a possibility of introducing one or two more of those parking spaces back, which would, to me, a much [inaudible] consideration, accommodate a little more demand for on-street parking but a much higher level objective is to narrow the functional width of the street for the vehicles to drive down it and the people who walk along it every day, that the marshal is willing to work with staff to see if we can get one or two of those on-street parking spaces back. And the condition I would offer, excuse me, the amendment I would offer would be if

that's not possible, then we need those curb nubs that you just described, Ms. Kim, as part of the project, that we need to work with the Marshal and find out where the appropriate places along that curb would be and locate those curbs and those nubs and design them in such a way that the fire apparatus can function with them there to lower the speeds on that street in an everyday, in the everyday condition in which it will exist. Boy, that was tortured. So, do we have further--I know Mr. Commissioner Cole, you had started that line of wrap-up questions. Do you have more?

Commissioner Cole: I don't have more. I'm ready to deal with it in the context of a motion.

Commissioner Forinash: Great. Commissioner Gutshall and then Commissioner Iacomini.

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you. If the chair will indulge me, I'd like to just follow up then on the TDM question which is for staff, just to remind me that the, or verify for me, that everywhere where it says the developer, when this becomes presumably these units will be sold off and it's gonna be a homeowner's association or something like that, but the purchasers of the townhomes have to comply with what is a wherever it says developer. Is that correct? Mr. Kinney is kind enough to nod his head yes. Thank you, Mr. Kinney. So, when it says provide one time per person to each new residential lessee or purchaser, the \$65 metro fare card and 1 year bike show, that means if I go to sell my townhouse I have to say, here you go. Here's your \$65 metro fare card.

Ms. Vonhm: That would be upon initial purchase, so that would be provided by the developer upon the initial purchase.

Commissioner Gutshall: Oh, that's where throughout initial occupancy, I get it now. How often have we done this TDM like this for a small scale townhome?

Ms. Kim: There is a similar TDM condition with the cover homes townhome project that was approved earlier this year. It was a form based code project, but it has some more language.

Commissioner Gutshall: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Iacomini.

Commissioner Iacomini: I'm sorry to prolong this, but I'm intrigued because I'd forgotten about the parking permit. And so that street, that block, is permit parking and it's only the single family houses that have stickers for that? That can't be.

Ms. Kim: So, I believe there is at least one townhouse development on the other end of the street and those townhomes--and that development fronts on both Stuart and Stafford, I believe. And I believe those units do have permit parking spaces because they were prior to the residential permit parking plan that stipulates that new townhouse

developments are not allowed permits. Some of the older developments are grandfathered in.

Commissioner Iacomini: So, that's the only one that's grandfathered in? Because there's the ones right across the street from this.

Ms. Kim: I believe there's several of the older, I believe like in 1990, anything prior to 1990 or so would be grandfathered in.

Commissioner Harner: I just find it, I don't think it's necessarily troubling, but it is really unequal that the new townhouses coming in were in an area zoned for townhouses will be treated differently than the townhouses that exist.

Ms. Kim: I also would like to say that on Stafford Street actually, so the next block over closer to the not whatever that following street is, I think it's a numbered street, there is no parking on one side of the street in front of the townhouse development for a portion of that block which turns that yield street into a two-lane travel street for about a third to a half of block. So, this is not a unique condition, not even to this direct neighborhood.

Commissioner Forinash: I think that's exactly the concern. Commissioner Hughes.

Commissioner Hughes: I apologize but I wish to ask my fellow commissioners a very simple question for the longer serving ones. Have we approved a townhouse development in a metro corridor as a 4.1 filing on a form base code filing in our tenure here? Anyone in senior tenure. Commissioner Cole is saying yes, okay.

Commissioner Forinash: You trailed off at the end so not everyone heard the full question. You were just asking if we've approved, if we've recommended the Board approved townhouse development as a 4.1?

Commissioner Hughes: Correct. And Commissioner Cole is nodding his head in the affirmative, and so that's what I was curious to know. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: All right, are we ready for a motion? Commissioner Siegel.

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION AND VOTE

Commissioner Siegel: I'm gonna move the approval and give you language in a moment. There were two amendments. Shall I just move the main motion and then we'll ask for amendments. Let's do it that way. Okay, I moved the Planning Commission recommend the County Board adopt the attached ordinance to approve Site Plan #436 to permit the construction of 12 townhouse dwelling units with modifications to reduce required front and rear yard setbacks, increase lot coverage and other modifications as necessary to achieve the proposed development plan subject to the conditions of the attached ordinance with the following modifications. I had two that I was gonna but I would defer to--

Commissioner Forinash: No, finish your motion.

Commissioner Siegel: I'm finished the main motion. Oh, am I gonna get a second?

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Gutshall, thank you. Discussion or amendments to the main motion to recommend approval? Are we waiting for me at this point? Let me see if I can get language that I've scrawled out.

Commissioner Siegel: I have something.

Commissioner Forinash: Please.

Commissioner Siegel: Okay, the following modification. The County Board should-- sorry. I'm gonna make this as a motion rather than request. I move the County Board direct staff to work with the Fire Marshal to preserve some additional parking spaces in front of the redevelopment, that would be my--

Commissioner Forinash: Motion to amendment has been made by Commissioner Siegel and seconded by Commissioner Ciotti. I don't think you can move an amendment to an amendment that's on the table, unfortunately.

Commissioner Siegel: And suggest language change?

Commissioner Forinash: Let's act on that one clean. Any discussion of this motion?

Commissioner Harner: What are we voting on? Is this a separate motion?

Commissioner Forinash: This is a motion to amend. We have a motion on the table. We couldn't have a second motion on the table. So, this is a motion to amend the main motion to recommend that the County Board directs staff to work with the fire marshal to preserve additional on-street parking on North Stuart Street adjacent to the subject property. All those in favor of the motion to amend, raise your hand. Opposed? Abstain? Eight to zero to three. I'd like to move that we recommend that the County Board, and this is an amendment, that we recommend that the County Board directs to have that if it is not possible to preserve additional on-street parking adjacent to the site, that staff work with the applicant to design and implement two or three curb nubs, curb extensions along the North Stuart Street front edge to narrow the travel way of the street while accommodating the Fire Marshal's needs.

Commissioner Harner: Second.

Commissioner Forinash: Seconded by Commissioner Harner. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to amend, raise your hand. Opposed? Abstain? Motion passes nine to zero to two. Ms. Stahlhut, I'd be happy to work with you on the language although I

guess we have the transcript. Further discussion or amendments to the main motion as amended? Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner Cole: I very much would like to be able to vote in favor of this proposal. As someone who is actually looking to be able to live out of a single family house to a more urban environment, I live in a place not dissimilar from the one that is being proposed here. I understand the need for this kind of housing in the County. As is apparent I think to everybody, I at the same time am extremely concerned about the adverse effect of this particular design on the block that it's on and the potential of that adverse effect throughout the County. The result is that as proposed and as staff has interpreted both the fire code and the master transportation plan, I'm faced with the decision of having to decide which is the best of, frankly, not very good alternatives. As a result, while I would very much like to support the proposal, I cannot support the proposal and will vote in opposition to the proposal with the understanding that if there were a way to find justification for why this case is unique and can't be repeated throughout the County and/or the actual substantive issues could be addressed, I would actively support this proposal. I would note, and I think it's important to note, that the applicant has created some of this problem and they've created some of this problem by insisting on maximizing the density that they could on the site by seeking to build units that are 40 feet tall and, in fact, the equivalent of five stories, I believe, including the underground basement. That seems to me to have been an overreach and could easily be--the whole situation could be addressed by the applicant. But in fact, they have not chosen to address it so I in the end will oppose this proposal and recommend that the board do the same.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussion or motions to amend? Commissioner Gutshall.

Commissioner Gutshall: Thank you, Commissioner Cole. I agree with much of what you've said. I think I will support the motion though mostly because it's my impression that the applicant was also caught off guard by this, by the Fire Marshal's determination, and I don't think it's fair to hold the applicant accountable for it as we try to sort these things out. I will say that I agree with you though, that it would be within the power of the applicant to devise a better solution and I do hope that staff will work with the applicant to come up with the justification that would preclude setting up precedence as you described. Having said that, I do think that, and I want to go on record here, as saying that as Commissioner Hughes' questions sort of alluded to, and I heard someone mumble the words affordability by design in forthcoming studies in that regard, I think what this project actually shows, this site plan application shows is how our zoning ordinance and what our zoning ordinance, and plans, and the type of development that they're incentivizing, how they're out of date and they're out of step with actually where we're trying to go. Two car garages in twenty-one townhomes within a quarter mile of the metro is, I don't think, where we County wants to be. I don't think it's where our heart is. I don't think it's where the policy direction of the board has been, but we have these artifacts and I don't begrudge the applicant for taking advantage of what's available to them, and I think that they've more or less played by the rules and so therefore it would

not be right. But having said that, I don't I would hope that we would see less of these in the future and that future applicants, given the same conditions, site, and other constraints, and hopefully staff will work and figure out this the issue with fire access that we can see much more creative use of these transition sites and these added conditions to meet the needs of our County. And I do think that's hopefully the affordability by design study among other things that we're gonna be looking at as part of the implementation for Affordable Housing Master Plan will start to guide our development community in that direction. Thank you.

Commissioner Forinash: Commissioner Hughes and then Commissioner Harner:

Commissioner Hughes: First, I don't want to begrudge the applicant because I do appreciate your investment in our community and I want to say thank you. But I do not plan to support this application. I would simply say as my questions allude to, many of these homes do not embrace the street. Three of them, in fact, are buried in the back. It is focused on the car getting into the two-car garage. The lots, if they were a DC federal style street, would have 20 units, 10 on top and 10 on the bottom and they would face the street and, you know, that would be a transition even though I would support a much higher density in this area given its proximity to metro considering what we approved earlier in the evening. So, for the reasons of Commissioner Cole and others and from what I've earlier stated, I will not be supporting this application, although thank you for the investment in the community.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussions or motions? Oh, excuse me, Commissioner Harner:

Commissioner Harner: Good try though. So, appreciate the conversation tonight and I know for the applicant, for the applicant's attorneys, the consultants, you know, these are not easy projects. There's a lot that goes into making these things work. There's a lot of upfront design costs. It's a lot of balancing act. Fire Marshal, I very much appreciate your efforts and coming here tonight has been really valuable so I really appreciate having you here and speaking with the commission. This kind of dialogue may be difficult, but I think everybody benefits from this. The, I think, that my fellow commissioners have made some incredibly good comments and the issues here are important. I would like to associate myself with Commissioner Forinash's recommendations for some middle ground perhaps on extra parking spaces or traffic nubs that I think could go a long ways to working for this particular site plan for improvements. I think that for me the bigger issue is that as a County, everyone would benefit if we just knew upfront what we were working towards, if we knew what kind of street we wanted, if we knew if it was achievable, and if we knew what we had to do to get those streets and to get those public spaces. You know, we have a really simple formula in Columbia Pike. The building lines are set, we know that we're gonna get the curb side parking. We know exactly what kind of landscape strip we're gonna get. We know everything we're gonna get, and it works, and it's vetted out, and we get the transportation that we want. And again, we talked about a sector plan earlier. This just goes to show how a sector plan update could help to define these streets and to set the

rules in advance. I agree with Commissioner Gutshall. It's really difficult to say to the applicant after staff has tried hard to work with the applicant, the applicant's invested a lot. It's very difficult to say, you know, this just doesn't come up to snuff with what the community would really like to see here. We're a little bit too far down the line for me to say that, so I think Commissioner Forinash's recommendation is a fantastic opportunity to perhaps close the gap. And I do think the need, and I'm sorry that Mr. Cover is not here. I cannot stress enough the need for looking at these streets and these situations as a typology, making sure that we can accommodate the fire apparatus with the kind of street that we want. Maybe we have to have a two-lane street, and we're gonna have to put a bike lane on every street in order to get the 26-foot width 'cause I'm not gonna support 2, 13-foot travel lanes but we--this is a serious issue that we need to look at immediately. And we need to get ahead of this if we want this County to continue to develop in a positive way. We can't be ad hoc'ing these kinds of solutions every time we get something like this.

Commissioner Forinash: Further discussion or amendments before we vote on the main motion as amended? All right, hearing none. All those in favor--does anyone need the main motion as amended read back? Nope. Commissioner Siegel. No, Commissioner Siegel, I just asked if anyone needed it read back, I didn't ask you to read it back. Nope. All those in favor of the main motion as amended, raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Opposed? Three. Abstain? Motion passes eight to three. Thank you. I think we're done with that item. And thank you to our represents from the fire department for joining us. It was really was educational for us. I hope it was worth your time as well. And to our Zoning Administrator and County staff for joining us.