



ERIK GUTSHALL  
CHAIR

JANE SIEGEL  
VICE-CHAIR

# ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

## ARLINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

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



MICHELLE STAHLHUT  
COORDINATOR

GIZELE C. JOHNSON  
CLERK

May 23, 2017

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

**SUBJECT: 11<sup>th</sup> and Vermont Streets Special GLUP Study**

3. **11<sup>th</sup> and Vermont Streets Special GLUP Study** Special General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Study to evaluate a request to amend the land use designation from “Low-Medium” Residential to “High-Medium Residential Mixed-Use”

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### **The Planning Commission recommends the County Board:**

Advertise a change in the GLUP, with the proposed Note, for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street North/North Vermont Site as recommended in the draft staff report dated May 4, 2017 at the appropriate time in conjunction with an application for a site plan for the subject site.

#### **With the following amendments:**

1. The Planning Commission recommends the County Board find that any site plan proposed for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street North/North Vermont site be limited to six stories sculpted and that guidance in the proposed GLUP note stating the step down to 3 to 4 stories 80 feet into the block be observed and further that there be at least a 30-foot separation between built elements of the proposed plan and the existing structures of Westview II north to south and 50 feet east and west
2. The Planning Commission recommends the County board find that the public open space for a tot lot or similar amenity for young child use should be found in the area known as North Ballston in the Ballston Sector Plan whenever any site plan building requests a major site plan amendment that includes additional height and density.

Dear County Board Members:

The Planning Commission heard this item at its May 11, 2017 public hearing. Anthony Fusarelli, Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development (CPHD) – Planning presented

**P.C. #38**

the findings of the Special GLUP Study. Michelle Stafford, Department of Environmental Services (DES) – Transportation and Bob Duffy, Director, CPHD-Planning were also present.

### **PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

There were six public speakers.

Dana Hofferber, Westview II resident, thanked staff for responding to many resident concerns in their staff report and recommendation but would like further consideration paid to potential negative impacts of having new structures be too close to the existing Westview II building. She noted that there is a petition with 500 signatures concerning the proposed GLUP change and that one element of the petition indicates that “neighborhood feel” has been a motivating factor in choosing this area to live. “Neighborhood feel” would be diminished by having structures too close together. They would like staff to incorporate more specific language for parameters for any new building on the block. She also stated residents would like a FAR limitation of 2.5 in the GLUP note which respects the taper from Fairfax Drive down to 11<sup>th</sup> Street North.

Barb Gerk spoke on behalf of Dana Gerk, a Westview resident and originator of the already – mentioned petition. She requested the Planning Commission deny the proposed GLUP change and keep the current GLUP designation in place. Westview is built with all glass exterior sunrooms which are a main selling point and their light would be blocked or greatly diminished with a tall structure next to Westview. She went on to note the 2015 traffic studies do not consider ridesharing services which have increased traffic and reduced Metro ridership. The proposed towering building will adversely impact value and use of existing residences and its height should be lower. The builder has had lawsuits with the EPA and DOJ since 2010 and cannot be trusted. Ms. Gerk stated the 20-foot separation between buildings is inadequate. She stated nearby new buildings will be deficient in parking. Arlington has sufficient new and existing residences without changing the zoning to increase the profits of a builder. Ms. Gerk said Arlington has had a lot of growth in the last five years and that supports the lack of need for residences on 11th Street. The effect of the new Ballston Quarter mall is yet to determined. This area already has high density and congested traffic. She also stated the developer knew the Low-Medium zoning when the property was purchased.

Kristine Kassekert, Homeowner's Association (HOA) President, Victoria at Ballston Townhomes, asked to not approve the GLUP change and to respect the current Ballston Sector Plan and Neighborhood Conservation Plan. The Ballston Sector Plan states that higher density commercial and residential projects adjacent to low rise residential areas such as the townhomes should include effective transitions. However, the box being proposed along 11th Street North does not and cannot comply with that guidance. The commission should ask what is the benefit of the proposal rather than whether or not it can be done. There is no compelling reason to go over the current zoning and the burden should be on the developer to demonstrate why longstanding requirements should be disregarded. It not fair to the community to make the case for not complying with the existing standards. The current proposal should include an effective transition. Finally, she noted, there is total lack of community support for the project.

Nia Bagley, Ballston-Virginia Square Civic Association President, said they were fearful that there would not be enough time given to this process. The Civic Association would like to come

away from this process with some specific protection for the neighborhood and asked for the GLUP Note to be more specific regarding the taper.

Francis Daulong asked if there would be a change to the traffic in the neighborhood near the new project and if the height shown on staff's modelings is inclusive of mechanical units on the roof.

Jim Hurysz, Fairlington resident, said the proposed GLUP Amendment is another consequence of Arlington's dedication to Smart Growth which can be described as putting as many people, vehicles and activities within the minimal amount of infrastructure available.

David Freeman, Windsor Plaza resident, said 11th Street North is a nice street and is concerned this building will change the character that residents enjoy. They are concerned about the closeness of the building to the Westview. The traffic will also change the character of the neighborhood.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

Commissioner Iacomini reported the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission met three times on this Special GLUP Study. The LRPC considered the study without reference to a specific site plan although it was triggered by the filing of a site plan and GLUP change request to accommodate the site plan. Over the course of the LRPC meetings, members discussed the extensive modeling studies and other research provided by staff, and heard comments from the public present at the meetings. Commissioner Iacomini stated at the third meeting, the LRPC members came to consensus on the following points: Given the already built context of the area, it is in the realm of possibility to entertain a GLUP change for this site to High Medium Residential Mixed-Use (HMRMU) within the follow parameters:

No bonus density permitted for the site;

Massing on the site should step-down from the southern portion of the site to 11<sup>th</sup> Street North in conformance with the Sector Plan;

A lower base density should be established that would yield a tower of 5 to 7 stories;

Design the massing of any project to conform to the 40-foot height "line" already established on blocks to the east of the site; and

Insure a significant setback from the existing Westview Condominium for any new construction on the site. She indicated LRPC members also made other comments including:

Asking staff to explore a taper to 11<sup>th</sup> Street North greater (so less than) 40 feet in height;

No need to provide any green space at the corner of North Utah and 11<sup>th</sup> Street North;

Do not provide any green space that would cause density to be "piled up" on the site.

LRPC members noted that support for any change in the GLUP would be dependent upon the ability to codify/make firm the parameters listed above.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

### **Transportation**

Commissioner Iacomini noted comments from the public about concern for increased traffic in the area if the GLUP were changed. She asked about the current patterns in the area and

observed that both North Utah Street and North Taylor Street deadend at 11<sup>th</sup> Street North and then are a one-way pair north of 11<sup>th</sup> Street North and that there is a traffic light at the intersection of Glebe and 11<sup>th</sup> Street North. She asked if any of this would change. Ms. Stafford said there is no planned change of traffic patterns and explained the traffic assumptions based on studies conducted between 2012-2015. Queuing on Glebe was not studied and any changes that have happened in traffic are likely due to Safetrack on Metro and temporary in nature.

### Density

Commissioner Siegel asked for clarification on the modeling done by staff. Mr. Fusarelli clarified the models are intended to be building envelopes and the studies do not go into architectural details that would be part of a site plan. The slide illustrations are general models that allow gross square footage of each floor which can be aggregated for the whole building and feed into FAR calculations. The heights are to the main roof and do not include mechanical penthouses although staff recognizes a site plan would likely include penthouses in some form.

Commissioner Lantelme pointed out that if the existing zoning is kept, there will still be 45-foot tall buildings on both 11th and Vermont because townhouses allowed by the current zoning of R15-30T can be that tall. The 45-foot height should be considered a baseline.

### Urban Design

Commissioner McSweeney asked about tapering toward 11th Street North more than 40 feet and about the staff assumptions regarding distances between buildings. Mr. Fusarelli said that for most scenarios, the tightest separation between an existing and potential building is from Westview I to the south facade of the residential building along Vermont which was approximately 30 feet. There was information at LRPC #3 that shows the building façade of Westview I is approximately 9-10 feet from the property line, so staff felt they needed to go beyond offsetting 9-10 feet and wanted to provide at least 30 feet of separation as an absolute minimum. A 30-foot minimum was the working urban design minimum in the modeling. Along the north/south property line with Westview II, staff gave more relief due to the standard residential depth of the building. While it undulates, there is approximately 50 feet of separation between the west façade of Westview II and the east façade of the modeled building. On the north side of Westview II to the model, the distance is approximately 20 feet for a double-loaded corridor but this was a primary reason for transitioning down to a single-loaded corridor to provide more relief close to 40 feet. These assumptions are carried through most of the modeling.

Commissioner Gearin asked for clarification on where the balconies start on the Westview. Mr. Fusarelli responded there is an inset balcony at the second floor and enclosed sunrooms starting at the third floor.

Commissioner Hughes pointed out that this site is a quarter mile from a Metro station and of these 7-9 story examples, and there are taller buildings on Columbia Pike that are about three miles from the nearest Metro station. As we think about values and who is being helped in the community, it's important to think about that in crafting an appropriate GLUP Note.

Commissioner Weir asked in light of discussing a height lower than allowed and not allowing bonus density, are there ways to transfer density (TDR) to allow the project to be viable. Mr. Fusarelli said TDR is always a possibility but any consideration would need to be tied back to County goals and policies that could be achieved through TDR. There are site plans that have been approved below the maximum FAR where density has not been transferred but the GLUP speaks to whether density is appropriate in certain areas.

Commissioner Hughes said that when thinking about the sculpting he feels it is possible to both construct the taper and complete the block and lower the height but address the taller building to the south. This could be done by considering whether the taper should begin and crescendo down 11th Street from Glebe. The furthest north corner on the site perhaps should be five stories and taper its way down. He noted the exact taper might best be left to the SPRC when a site plan is considered, however perhaps such a taper should also be considered when crafting the GLUP Note.

Commissioner Lantelme wondered whether the Westview stepdown was built to respect the larger block and that the step down from Fairfax toward 11th and perhaps should be used as a guide for this site.

Commissioner Iacomini responded that a portion of Westview I starts its taper too soon and is farther back in the block which is not what is seen in the blocks to the east. The Westview was originally built as apartments. The developer tapered to the existing church and not to 11<sup>th</sup> Street North as do the consolidated blocks to the east. It is more appropriate to consider the blocks to the east of the site. As for the thought about the taper addressing the block to the west, the Fairview Building, and Glebe Road, when that block comes in for redevelopment there is a lot of open space at the Vermont corner that might be a home for a tot. Such a transition to open space might have a different taper. Her view is that the block under discussion should follow the tradition of those to the east rather than the west.

Commissioner Schroll asked about the three or four stories portion of the GLUP note and why maximum height wasn't used instead, given many of the massing diagrams had a 42 or 45-foot height. Mr. Fusarelli responded that the three to four stories were crafted to bracket the spectrum that is already seen along 11th Street. It could be revised not to be a range and other options can be considered. In terms of stories versus feet, there was consideration of changing the GLUP but reinforcing the transition from 11th Street North down to the neighborhood. However, if the remainder of the block in question develops with townhouses, under the current zoning, townhomes could be 45 feet. The use of stories seemed to be more prudent.

Commissioner Siegel asked for a reminder about build-to lines and sidewalk widths. Mr. Fusarelli responded the building edges on the four blocks facing on 11th Street North between North Randolph and North Utah Streets vary. The sidewalk widths generally exceed what is called for in the Rosslyn - Ballston Streetscape Standards, but, on average, there is roughly 20 feet between building face and curb which is what staff assumed for modeling.

### Open Space

Commissioner Siegel stated it seems the LRPC was more concerned about containing height rather than maintaining open space.

Commissioner Gearin stated she understands the community sees the tradeoff between maintaining open space on the site and height and she respects that and thinks it is appropriate. She wants to explore the options for being proactive moving forward in this area. The applicant is also proposing to redevelop the area across 11th Street North which currently includes a surface parking lot and tot lot. Perhaps in guidance for forthcoming site plans and redevelopment, commissioners should recommend open space be reclaimed nearby to the extent it is an option in the future.

Commissioner Hughes asked if the tot lot is private or public. It was stated that the tot lot is left unlocked and is used by the community. Commissioner Hughes asked if the proposed text of the GLUP Note could be changed before it is formally adopted. Mr. Fusarelli said there would be an opportunity to revise or enhance the GLUP Note between the RTA and adoption because the GLUP Note is policy rather than law such as zoning ordinances and so the issue of scope would most likely not apply.

Commissioner Siegel clarified that the next time Planning Commission would see the study, it would be in conjunction with a site plan. Mr. Fusarelli agreed.

Commissioner Weir asked if, given the site constraints, it would be advisable to say that to the extent there is a need for open space, the site immediately to the west is the right place for open space. Commissioner Iacomini responded that it might be interesting to memorialize open space thoughts in a letter or through motions.

### School Enrollment

Commissioner Weir pointed out that the scenario involving no change to the GLUP would likely yield more students on the margin than an elevator condo or elevator apartments given the kind of units that generate students.

Commissioner Gearin asked if student generation numbers represent what we can expect at a specific point in time in terms of number of students that will be enrolled in APS schools and if the projections will be audited. Mr. Fusarelli said the student numbers were based on the recent Community Facilities Study work and these are the APS students-generated-per-housing unit by housing type as of 2015. Drawing from the 2015 student enrollments by housing type, APS and County staff have been able to identify the generation rates. Before any site plan goes to the County Board, County staff will submit a request to APS for estimated student generation. The estimates tonight came from APS in March using 2016 student generation rates. Commissioner Gearin clarified that these are meant to represent at any point in time over the lifetime of this development, and in any given year, we would expect to have maybe seven students total generated by high-medium mixed use. Mr. Fusarelli said they can reflect that based on current trends and generation rates of what we are currently seeing by housing type. The numbers are not intended to reflect 30 years from now. It is possible student generation rates may be very different and these numbers might not reflect that.

### GLUP Note

Commissioner Iacomini asked staff to discuss GLUP Notes and how site specific they are as opposed to being about a general area. She feels there are issues the Commission may wish to weigh in on and wonders if it should be through the text of the GLUP Note or in findings by the Commission.

Mr. Fusarelli responded that was a fundamental question that staff has been grappling with during this process. Based on the current proposal where, in addition to rebalancing the GLUP pattern, interest in adding the Note is to not only speak to this site but articulate the guidance that would apply to this block. We want to reinforce the vision and goal for the area from North Vermont Street all the way to North Randolph Street. As staff considered the LRPC summary findings, staff asked what guidance could be included to speak to all five block frontages as opposed to adding specific guidance that might apply to this site only but that might be in conflict with previously approved and built projects on the other four blocks. The note text is meant to be a balance between specificity but being broad enough for the general area.

Commissioner Schroll asked about what staff views as sufficient separation between buildings as crafted in the second bullet and why not put "at least" this amount. Mr. Fusarelli responded staff has not specified the meaning of sufficient but could do more study on the wording before bringing it to the Board. If a specific dimension were included, staff would want to analyze the other five blocks in this location along 11th Street North. The block across the street has approximately 30-31 feet between two buildings that are parts of the same site plan. If staff finds across all five blocks there is no separation less than 30 feet and it is considered sufficient, a specific number could be something to consider as part of the GLUP Note. Commissioner Schroll said that it would be helpful to incorporate some specificity around that issue.

Commissioner Siegel agreed that 50 feet of building separation is better and asked if putting in a minimum would make a builder build to that number. Mr. Fusarelli said that site plans vary in their approach and there is a lot of thought by the applicant in terms of the overall form of the building. He is unable to say if stating a minimum would result in achieving the minimum but did point out that if this site were to redevelop, it is constrained in terms of dimension. He clarified that in the modeling there was a 50 feet of separation in one of the models east to west.

Commissioner McSweeney said she has sympathy with the comments about getting to the density under this scenario with a GLUP change versus by-right development. This is a small narrow street and tapering makes some sense. She is also grappling with tapering toward the Westview building because of glass sunrooms. However, when someone purchases a home they do not purchase the view or the sun. We have heard this same issue many times in single-family home areas when new infill houses are built. She would like to respect the existing building but it seems that the most logical tapering is higher toward the Fairfax Drive side. It seems that the most height makes sense to be oriented toward the Westview.

Commissioner Weir inquired if it is possible to suggest the location of something like a courtyard that would preserve the view into the open space as opposed to an across the board

taper. He noted the sunrooms are on the north side of the building. The view of the sun at risk is from the building that does not yet exist.

Commissioner Siegel said Commissioner Gutshall has expressed a concern regarding GLUP Notes generally. Commissioner Siegel believes GLUP Notes are useful to have and that such Notes give some indication of an appropriate density through a suggestion of height and form. The elegance of the Note is an art.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION**

Commissioner Iacomini thanked everyone from the neighborhood who came to speak and said she has literally been in their seats having been in officer in BVSCA many years ago. She knows what it is like to represent the deeply-held sentiments of a community. She assured them the Planning Commission does hear them but Commissioners also have to weigh adopted County plans and policies. This block needs to fit into the already-established context of blocks along 11<sup>th</sup> Street North that are already constructed in compliance with the vision of the Sector Plan. This is difficult because redevelopment happens in stages over a period of time and we are dealing with the last third of the last block to redevelop.

Commissioner Iacomini made a motion that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board advertise a change in the GLUP, with the proposed Note, for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street North/North Vermont Site as recommended in the draft staff report dated May 4, 2017 at the appropriate time in conjunction with an application for a site plan for the subject site. Commissioner McSweeney seconded the motion.

Commissioner Iacomini then moved, as an amendment to the main motion, that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board that any site plan proposed for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street North/North Vermont site be limited to 6 stories sculpted and that guidance in the proposed GLUP Note stating the step down to 3 to 4 stories 80 feet into the block be observed and further that there be at least a 30-foot separation between built elements of the proposed plan and the existing structures of Westview II north to south and 50 feet east and west. Commissioner Lantelme seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hughes said there is a shortage in the supply of homes in Arlington which causes an increase in the value of homes. He noted this site is a quarter mile from Metro and it is too early to define the mass and height before they see what is proposed and will not support the motion. The national reputation for Arlington's commitment to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) should stand the test and this site is an excellent candidate for respecting the taper, finishing the block, and seeing what may be proposed and what may be appropriate prior to the SPRC process. If this guidance is adopted we would be, in effect, limiting the number of units, people, and neighbors who could one day live here.

Commissioner Weir said the concerns of the community are not misplaced but sympathizes with the location of the site so near to a planned additional entrance to an established Metro station. He doesn't disagree with the spirit of the amendment but suggests saying that the Commission



prefers a certain FAR close to 3.0 and sculpted form might allow the architects to design something appropriate.

Commissioner Iacomini said a particular FAR on the site may not be the best approach. She feels compelled to put parameters on general building form to avoid repeating the inevitable debate at SPRC if there is not clarity now. This site is the un-redeveloped portion of a block that is already two-thirds (or more) built. If it were an entire block that was just being consolidated, she would support Commissioner Weir's suggestion.

Commissioner Siegel said seven stories sculpted is 2.8 FAR and wondered if Commissioner Weir wanted to make an amendment and Commissioner Weir deferred.

Commissioner Hughes moved to amend the motion by adding language replacing six stories sculpted with seven stories sculpted. Commissioner McSweeney seconded the motion.

Commissioner Iacomini said she chose six to be as respectful as possible to the already-built condition on the block and yet allow a different building form on this portion of the block that could respond to Westview II. Her motion aims to try and meld the feelings of the residents and the County policies and staff models.

Commissioner Gearin asked about the heights of buildings on the block to the east. Mr. Fusarelli said in the two blocks east, Windsor Plaza is a seven-story residential building, and the Ballston Park condominium steps up to nine stories from 11<sup>th</sup> Street North and then the two blocks further east have three to four story townhomes.

Commissioner Lantelme stated he supports six floors because it gives enough high beyond townhomes and most of all it respects the Westview building and residents and fits in with the existing tapers along 11<sup>th</sup> Street North. He feels by limiting any new building to six stories, it helps completes this block.

Commissioner McSweeney stated she supports seven stories. After looking across the block, seven seems to be more consistent with the existing building and across North Vermont Street there will likely be a larger building.

The motion to amend the amendment failed 3-7 with Commissioners Hughes, McSweeney, and Ricks in support and Commissioners Iacomini, Lantelme, Gearin, Siegel, Schroll, Shelby, and Weir opposed.

The Planning Commission voted 8-2 to support Commissioner Iacomini's amendment to the main motion with Commissioners Iacomini, Gearin, McSweeney, Siegel, Schroll, Lantelme, Shelby, and Weir in support and Commissioners Hughes and Ricks opposed.

Commissioner Iacomini moved to amend the main motion with a further motion that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board find that bonus density is not appropriate for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street North/North Vermont Street site. Commissioner Schroll seconded the motion.

Commissioner Iacomini said that modeling presented to LRPC showed that bonuses really skewed what would be appropriate at this site. Even with a six story height, bonus density could increase the building to eight stories.

Commissioner Hughes stated he would not support the motion because the two items that get bonus density are environmental stewardship by being LEED certified and affordable housing contribution. If bonus density is denied these would be pulled off the table and without them we are relying on the good will of a developer choosing to put affordable units on-site instead of cash contribution at a site near Metro, which has never happened.

Commissioner Iacomini said there is only so much density that can fit on this remaining portion of an already built block. The motion is not intended to vote against affordable housing but rather for what is appropriate for this constrained site. It is intended to say there is a certain amount of FAR that can fit on this remaining portion of the block and putting bonuses on it changes that a lot. The Ballston Methodist Church site was supposed to be 3.24 but through the bonuses is approximately 4.7. Through bonuses, we regularly recommend projects way above the GLUP designation which is possible for some sites but is not possible for this site. Commissioner Siegel agrees with Commissioner Iacomini and this is not a recommendation against affordable housing, but rather not offering an incentive at this site.

Commissioner Shelby asked if there are other tools to encourage affordable housing or environmental sustainable building. Mr. Fusarelli said there are provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for any site plan project over 1.0 FAR but there are options that developers choose from whether it is on-site units, off-site units nearby, or a cash contribution. For a FAR above 1.0, there would be some contribution toward affordable housing, but it is difficult to know what that would be at this time. The green building incentive program and bonus density is one of the primary ways the County encourages sustainable development. Commissioner Siegel asked if there is a required contribution to AHIF and Mr. Fusarelli re-confirmed that for FAR above 1.0 it is required applicants choose one of the three options for affordable housing.

Commissioner McSweeney asked how much affordable housing is available in this neighborhood. Mr. Fusarelli responded staff would need to collect that information, however the Jordan on Wakefield Street has 90 committed affordable units, and the recently completed Springs project and Commissioner Iacomini added Buckingham is also within vicinity of Metro. She also noted the recently-approved affordable housing at the Ballston Methodist site – North Fairfax Drive and North Stafford Street.

Commissioner Lantelme asked if there were buildings that achieve environmental sustainability for marketing purposes. Sustainable buildings are more cost effective for owners in the long-run. Mr. Fusarelli said they have heard that more and more developers are doing so. However, staff has not had a developer not take advantage of bonus density when it was available.

Commissioner Iacomini asked how long the LEED bonus has been available. Mr. Fusarelli said it has been a County policy for at least the last 10-11 years. Commissioner Siegel said she participated in a review of the LEED standards and bonuses. When discussing Silver, there is a difference in the level of sustainability today versus older standards. Operationally, sustainability

is economical and there are market incentives for green buildings. Commissioner Lantelme said is it possible that the building would be green without a bonus.

Commissioner Weir asked if there is any way to say we want to limit the bonus FAR to something less than 1.0 but more than 0. He is uncomfortable with of limiting bonus density for affordable housing. He is mindful of trying not to let some bonus density create a tall, barely sculpted project, but wishes to find a way to locate some marginal committed affordable (CAF) units here.

Commissioner Iacomini said the parameters of the adopted affordable housing policy gives an applicant a range of choices and even if there is an FAR number that might be acceptable, it does not ensure the provision of on-site CAF units.

Commissioner Hughes asked if an applicant were to choose bonus density and the CAF option, is there anything other than on-site to choose from.

Mr. Fusarelli said when bonus density is considered, the benefit is negotiated more than stipulated by the Zoning Ordinance. There is leeway in the end result. In a number of those negotiations, the County has achieved on-site CAF units. In other negotiations, a larger contribution has been achieved.

The motion to amend failed due to a split 5-5 vote with Commissioners Iacomini, Gearin, Siegel, Schroll, and Lantelme in support and Commissioners McSweeney, Ricks, Hughes, Shelby, and Weir opposed.

Commissioner Iacomini moved to amend the main motion that the Planning Commission recommend the County Board find that public open space for a tot lot or similar amenity for young child use should be located in the area known as North Ballston in the Ballston Sector Plan whenever any site plan building requests a major site plan amendment that includes additional height and density. Commissioner Hughes seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gearin said this could come up on multiple sites in the Ballston area.

Commissioner Iacomini clarified she specified the North Ballston area, which is limited in definition in the Ballston Sector plan to the contextual blocks we have been discussion this evening.

Commissioner Lantelme said there are other sites ready for redevelopment north of Fairfax.

Commissioner Iacomini clarified her motion applies to any existing site plan that comes back in for amendment.

Commissioner Siegel said during the Public Open Space (POPS) process, it was noted there are numerous tot lots throughout the County and Commissioner Iacomini clarified this area is not oversaturated for tot lots. The nearest one is two blocks north of Washington Boulevard.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 10-0 to support the amendment to the main motion with Commissioners Siegel, Iacomini, Schroll, Hughes, Gearin, McSweeney, Lantelme, Ricks, Shelby, and Weir in support.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously 10-0 to support the main motion, as amended, with Commissioners Siegel, Iacomini, Schroll, Hughes, Gearin, McSweeney, Lantelme, Ricks, Shelby, and Weir in support.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Arlington County Planning Commission  
Erik Gutshall

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Gutshall', written in a cursive style.