

Response to Staff Comments

Main Comments:

1. **Land Use Compatibility**– The subject property is zoned B-2, *central business* and designated for mixed-use redevelopment in the city’s comprehensive plan. The zoned subject property is located on the edge of the designated city center area and its western boundary abuts an RM, multi-family residential district of the Winter Hill neighborhood that consists of townhouses and apartments. There needs to be special attention to transitional elements in terms of the building setbacks, height and massing, site feature and related buffers to minimize potential impacts.

RESPONSE: *The revised plan addresses the concern about the need for transition to the neighboring townhouses by shifting the massing/height to W. Broad Street and thus, pulling the building mass away from the neighboring townhouses and providing more than the required buffer and landscaping.*

2. **Parking** – Further study and analysis is needed regarding the proposed grocery store parking. An additional parking study is needed to analyze the grocery store (Harris Teeter) parking by conducting a survey of the actual parking demand of existing Harris Teeter stores in Northern Virginia. The proposed 40 percent parking reduction from the city zoning code rates (1 space per 200 sf) for “retail” uses (1 space per 335 sf) as proposed is significant and needs further justification. A *Parking Assessment* study, dated October 23, 2012 was submitted with the application.

RESPONSE: *The redevelopment project that is proposed has an identified grocery store tenant to occupy the majority of the ground floor retail space. This tenant is Harris Teeter and their commitment will be significant in terms of capital, jobs and community relations. Harris Teeter would not be prepared to make this commitment if their specific requirements including parking were not being met. Providing adequate parking is crucial to their business, the total amount of parking spaces required on the P1 level of the underground garage and that has been approved by Executives at Harris Teeter for this location is 183.*

The Parking Assessment memorandum that is enclosed with this submission provides an evaluation of the City’s parking requirements for the retail portion of the project. The layout and corresponding floor area of the retail portion of the grocery store has been broken down into uses such as storage and mechanical. This breakdown is summarized in Table 1 of the memorandum and it demonstrates that based on the City of Falls Church’s parking rates, the site’s retail space requires 230 parking spaces, or 195 parking spaces when applying a 15% retail internal capture. The number of parking spaces dedicated to retail in the project exceeds this figure by 10 for a total of 205 spaces.

Parking for the project was also assessed by using national parking demand rates from the ITE Parking Generation, 4th Edition. The results of the ITE parking demand analysis are shown in Table 3 of the Parking Assessment. The rates used for general retail represent the weekday (non-Friday) demand during December, the busiest shopping

Rushmark
Properties

period of the year. Based on the ITE Parking Generation manual, the proposed mixed-use development will have a parking demand of 538 spaces during the weekday peak parking period. The site's 573-space parking supply will be adequate to meet the proposed demand.

The Parking Assessment memorandum also provides data on parking ratios found at six (6) other Harris Teeter locations that have opened in the last several years or are under construction in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. The parking ratio (1/300 sq. ft.) that is proposed is supported by the average parking ratios found at these Harris Teeter locations. Please see Parking Memorandum (Enclosure 6) Table #4

3. **Service Drive (Deliveries/Loading)** – Staff recommends that the applicant review further options in terms of the service drive along the western boundary of the subject site and to consider the eastern site boundary. Moving the associated delivery, moving and trash pick-up vehicular uses to the east side of the site adjacent to the existing commercial uses. This location would have less impact on the residential neighbors to the west and provide for future opportunities for shared or expanded facilities as the adjacent commercial property redevelops in the future.

RESPONSE: *Relocating the service drive to the other side of the site was explored, however, issues with grade and traffic cueing concerns at W. Broad Street make this option infeasible. In order to reduce the visual and auditory impacts of delivery, trash pick-up and moving, the loading dock and service drive has been fully enclosed. All loading, unloading and backing up of commercial vehicles will occur within this enclosed area.*

4. **Building Massing/Step Downs** – The applicant has designed a high quality building in terms of architectural design and exterior materials. The building mass is intentionally broken up and stepped back by large elevated courtyards in the front (north) and rear (west) building faces to create a smaller scale. Special exceptions for increased height are considered for exemplary projects and preferred uses. In that context the special exception criteria indicates that the height of all buildings that abut a residential district must be tapered to be compatible with the maximum heights permitted in the adjacent residential district. In addition, the upper stories of the building should be stepped back to be compatible with the maximum by-right permitted height permitted within the business district.

RESPONSE: *The building layout has been redesigned to pull the mass away from the neighboring townhouses. The Applicant also changed the plan from 5 to 6 stories of residential units above ground floor at a height of 90 feet of height along W. Broad St. which is still less than the 115 feet height limit permitted by a special exception.*

5. **Traffic** – A Traffic Impact Study (TIA), dated October 16, 2012 has been provided. A preliminary review has been completed and several discrepancies were noted by staff regarding the traffic data and capacity analysis. These issues need to be reconciled before a final analysis can be completed.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Please refer to the revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Gorove/Slade. (Enclosure 5)*

6. **Transportation/Circulation** – There are concerns over vehicular traffic and truck circulation that need to be fully addressed. Staff has suggested several recommendations and options for street configurations and improved ingress and egress for the site that should be explored.

RESPONSE: *The overall vehicular circulation for the site has been re-examined by Gorove/Slade and as a result they have updated their Traffic Impact Analysis. (Enclosure 5) Concerns over commercial traffic flow have been addressed by shifting the entrance for commercial vehicles to Annandale Road and exit to W. Broad Street.*

7. **Landscaped Buffer Areas** – a minimum 20-foot setback (variable 20 to 38 foot building setbacks) is provided at the rear of the property against the adjacent R, residential district and Winter Hill townhouses, as required. Within this setback there is a landscaping buffer strip between zoning districts required. However, the required landscape buffer, in terms of the required width of 15 feet is deficient under the selected landscape Buffer Type E option. While a waiver to this requirement has been requested and noted (under Section 48-1184 (b) (10) *Exceptions*) an adequate buffer between the existing, adjacent R, residential district and the Winter Hill neighborhood townhouses is still needed. This Buffer Type E includes the installation of a screening element (6-foot masonry wall) with trees and plants per the specifications in a 15-foot wide area planting area within the 20-foot building setback.

RESPONSE: *The buffer area adjacent to the Winter Hill neighborhood has been redesigned and the planting area has been upgraded/increased to a minimum of 15 feet. A waiver of the buffer requirements is no longer necessary.*

8. **Neighborhood Concerns** – The adjacent Winter Hill neighborhood to the west has is very interested and concerned about potential impacts of the proposed mixed use project. The neighbors have numerous concerns and issues that need to be carefully reviewed and specifically addressed. The most recent correspondence received by staff is enclosed for your review (Enclosure 1).

RESPONSE: *The design concerns of the community have been heard, thoughtfully considered and addressed to the best of our ability in the plans that are now being submitted. Furthermore, appropriate measures will be taken to mitigate risks and concerns during construction. See Enclosure 2 – Neighborhood Concerns Response*

Specific Staff Review Comments

Rushmark
Properties

Planning Division – Special Exception/Development (review)

1. On the western side of the subject property a minimum 20 foot or better (20, 26, 30 & 38 foot) building setback is provided as required under the city code. Within this setback area a minimum 15 foot wide landscape buffer is required as a screening element with trees and plantings as required under Buffer Type E.

RESPONSE: *The buffer yard has been upgraded/increased based on new site and building layout. The proposed six-foot high screen wall will remain, where required, and landscaping material has also been upgraded/increased as requested. See also see response to Comment 7 under Main Comments.*

2. The standard required parking under the zoning city code is a total of 790 spaces for the proposed mixed use project based upon the following city code ratios:

- Retail >1 space per 200 square feet @ 63,910 sf = 320 spaces
- Units
- Multi-family residential > 1 space per efficiency (30) = 30 spaces
 - > 1.5 per one bedroom (176) = 264
 - > 2.0 per two bedroom (88) = 176
- Total 790

A reduction to the required parking is being requested under Section 48-971 (2) *Collective use of off-Street parking and loading facilities* and modifications in parking ratios are subject to approval of the Planning Commission.

RESPONSE: *The number of parking spaces required by the lead retail tenant, Harris Teeter, is 183 parking spaces. As stated in the response to Main Comment – Question #2, the Parking Assessment has been updated with parking data at several Harris Teeter store locations in Washington DC /Northern Virginia. The proposed residential parking ratio is 1.3 parking spaces per unit. The bottom two levels of the underground parking garage will provide 368 parking spaces for the residential tenants.*

3. The proposed mixed use project has planned 586 parking spaces or a 26.1 percent reduction in parking spaces based upon a parking assessment study, dated October 23, 2012. The study cites reductions in parking based upon the ITE Parking Generation manual, with the proposed mixed use development having an estimated parking demand of 554 spaces during the weekday peak parking period. The Gorove/Slade, Transportation Planners and Engineers study concluded that the subject site's 586 space parking supply will be adequate to meet the proposed parking demand.

RESPONSE: *The proposed 301 W. Broad Street development will be served by 573 parking spaces within a three-level below-grade parking garage. Of those parking spaces, 368 will be dedicated to residential use and 205 for commercial use. The P1 level of the garage will house the 205 commercial parking spaces and will be accessed from both W. Broad Street and W. Annandale Road. Below P1, the P2 and P3 levels will contain 226 and 142 residential parking spaces, respectively, which will be accessed via W. Annandale Road. The*

Rushmark
Properties

retail and residential levels are disconnected and vehicles will not be able to travel internally between these levels.

The results of the ITE parking demand analysis are shown in Table 3 of the Parking Assessment. (Enclosure 6) The rates used for general retail represent the weekday (non-Friday) demand during December, the busiest shopping period of the year. Based on the ITE Parking Generation manual, the proposed mixed-use development will have a parking demand of 538 spaces during the weekday peak parking period. The site's 573-space parking supply will be adequate to meet the proposed demand.

4. The applicant is requesting a total parking space reduction of 185 spaces (26.1%) for the proposed mixed use project, combined commercial and residential uses. The requested commercial parking reduction for the retail uses are significant in that the “general retail rate is (1:200) while the proposed rate is (1:335) based upon the projected needs of the major retail use the Harris Teeter grocery. The grocery store occupies 95 percent (60,800 sf) of the total retail space of 63,910 square feet. Having an identified user for the retail space assists greatly in estimating the parking demand, since the retail type is known and the calculations are more precise and accurate for the particular user.

RESPONSE: *Please see response to Main Comments – Question#2.*

5. The parking assessment uses the latest ITE *Parking Generation*, 4th Edition for an urban type supermarket to project the parking demand. However, further specific parking demand survey information on the actual parking demands for existing area Harris Teeter grocery stores is needed to adequately review and justify consideration of a proposed 40 percent retail parking reduction for the grocery store.

PARKING Tabulations

Uses	Size (sf)(#)	Zoning		(ITE)		(Applicant)		Requested Parking Reduction	
		Parking Ratio(sf)	Req. #	Parking/Est. Ratio	#	Proposed Ratio	#	(%)	(#)
Supermarket	60,800	1:200	304	1:440	139	1:335	182	40.1%	122
Retail	<u>3,110</u>	1:200	<u>16</u>	1:266	<u>12</u>	1:335	<u>10</u>	37.5%	<u>6</u>
Subtotal	63,910		320		151		192***	40 %	128
Hi-Rise Apts.	294*:1:1.60**		<u>470</u>	1:1.37	<u>403</u>	1:33	<u>392</u>	16.6%	67
Total			790		554		584***	26.1%	185

Notes: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation, 4th Edition

*Multi-Family Dwelling Units (DU,s)

** Parking space per

Rushmark
Properties

*** Adjusted “Totals”, different from *Parking Assessment*, dated 10-23-12 due to errors in retail square footage figures in which corrections are pending.

RESPONSE: *The results of the ITE parking demand analysis are shown in Table 3 of the Parking Assessment. (Enclosure 6) The parking rates used for general retail represent the weekday (non-Friday) demand during December, the busiest shopping period of the year. Based on the ITE Parking Generation manual, the proposed mixed-use development will have a parking demand of 538 spaces during the weekday peak parking period. The site’s 573-space parking supply will be adequate to meet the proposed demand.*

The updated Parking Assessment (Enclosure 6) that is included as part of this submission also examines parking data at several Harris Teeter store locations in the Washington DC /Northern Virginia area. Please also see response to Main Comments – Question#2

6. The commercial square footage varies in size between the Special Exception Booklet/Plan set and the Traffic impact Analysis and Parking Assessment? Please reconcile these numbers in all documents, as needed.

<u>Uses</u>	<u>Booklet</u>	<u>Plan</u>	<u>TIA</u>	<u>Parking Assessment</u>
Supermarket	60,800	60,800	60,883	60,883
Retail	<u>3,110</u>	<u>3,110</u>	<u>4,011</u>	<u>3,110</u>
Total	63,910	63,910	64,894	63,993

RESPONSE: *The square footages have been reconciled within the submitted documents.*

7. The proposed service drive is planned for use by trucks for commercial deliveries, residential moving and trash services. A preliminary usage and operations plan needs to be outlined and developed. The neighbors concerns regarding potential noise, lights, frequency and times of day should be considered and a plan developed that mitigates any potential adverse impacts. It was stated that Harris Teeter has a coordinator, reservation system and operations plan for all deliveries to their stores. Physical improvements to the building or site would also be options to further mitigate potential impacts. Ultimately, the 24-hour operation of Harris Teeter and delivery time restrictions should be coordinated with the supermarket management and put into the *Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits and Terms* sheet or other binding documents.

RESPONSE: *Discussion and coordination efforts with Harris Teeter regarding their operations plan for the site are ongoing. Limiting impacts to the neighbors from operating activities is the goal for both the Applicant and Harris Teeter. An operation plan which will include permitted truck delivery times will be put into the *Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits and Terms* sheet.*

Rushmark
Properties

Conceptual Development Plan (CDP):

8. Parking garage exhibits - need dimensions and “typical” for parking spaces and aisles for staff review purposes. Also will need a brief outline of a garage operations plan for the residential and retail parking - access, uses, segregation, reserved or open parking and any sharing opportunities.

RESPONSE: *The operating details of the garage will be determined, outlined and disclosed to the City prior to site plan approval. For the dimensions of parking spaces, please refer to Conceptual Development Plan (“CDP”) sheet #5*

9. The applicant should provide additional architectural conceptual drawings to graphically depict the typical views from the adjacent residential district and residents.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, these architectural concept drawings are included in the Special Exceptions Booklet – Revised January 2013 that was filed with the City as part of this submission.*

10. [Sheet 2 or 10] Add to the “Special Exception notes:” city code references Section 48-90. *Special Exceptions* (General requirements) and Section 48-488. *Special Exceptions* (B-2 requirements).

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #2*

11. [Sheet 2 of 10] Correct “Total Parking” tabulation figure 835 space is actually 790 spaces.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, Total Parking has been revised on CDP sheet #2*

12. [Sheet 2 of 10] Add to the end of Table footnote sentence (2) *parking reduction plan...* “by the City Planning Commission under section 48-971(2) of the city code.”

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #2*

13. [Sheet 2 of 10] Under the “Waiver/Modification Requests:” revise the statements to indicate the extent of the waivers (distances, amounts etc.). Example the proposed entrance is \underline{x} feet from a R, residential district or a reduction of \underline{x} parking spaces or buffer area width is \underline{x} of the required 15 feet for linear distance of \underline{x} .

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #2*

14. [Sheet 4 of 10] The approximate limits of the underground garage are shown at the western property line – correct and revise on conceptual development plan.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, the limits of the garage at the western property line are 20 feet from the property line. Please see CDP sheet #4*

Rushmark
Properties

15. [Sheet 4 of 10 and 6 of 10] Label in dashed or other lines the required building setback line at 20-feet and the landscape Buffer Type E required width of 15-feet from the property lines along the west property boundary.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet # 4. Also note that the buffer along the west boundary is now 20 foot in width and provided with a Type D buffer yard.*

16. The required buffer area and screening on the west side of the site adjacent to the existing residential district is variable in width and large portions are deficient in width. These 5 and 10 foot wide areas do not provide proper planting areas that are sufficient to support the required trees and bushes for Buffer Type E. Revise. Can the proposed one-way service drive be reduced to 22 feet in width?

RESPONSE: *The buffer along the west boundary is now 20 foot in width and provided with a Type D buffer yard. The proposed service drive running parallel to the southern building edge is now 15 ft in width with a one-way direction to reach the service/loading area. In order to accommodate proper truck turning dimensions for entry into the loading dock, the service drive is 25 feet in width.*

17. Provide a typical of the proposed 6 foot height masonry wall screening feature. Indicate profiles, height and materials. Note the Zoning Administrator has indicated a maximum height of the wall may be 7 feet versus 6 feet in height and any higher would require a variance. Consider raising the wall height to seven feet in height. Are there walls serving as retaining walls, as well, or just privacy/screening walls? Appropriate construction and structural “profiles” are needed.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, the screen wall where it is necessary will remain as previously depicted at 6 feet in height. Some portion of the screen wall may serve as partial retaining wall where necessary along the property line (to be verified at time of final site plan). Additional design details and structural profiles have been provided as requested. Please see Annandale Road streetscape section of CDP sheet #7.*

18. There are three transformers located on a pad in the required buffer area and need to be relocated. A typical of the screening needs to be provided.

RESPONSE: *The transformers have been relocated outside of the required buffer area on the other side of the service drive. The new location of the transformer can be found on CDP sheet #6. At this location the transformers will not be screened.*

19. Provide additional information on the proposed commercial and residential loading areas including outlines operational plans, use times, restricted times, capacity, maximum number of vehicles cueing at any one time etc. Staff would like to understand and appropriately mitigate any potential noise impacts on the proposed 24-hour grocery store.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, the design plan submitted includes an enclosed loading dock. Delivery time restrictions will be coordinated with Harris Teeter supermarket*

Rushmark
Properties

management and put into the Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits and Terms sheet or other binding documents.

20. Look at options to relocate the proposed one-way service drive from the west of the site to the east side adjacent to other commercial areas.

RESPONSE: *This option was thoughtfully considered, however due to site grade elevations and traffic cueing concerns on W. Broad Street the option is not feasible. Also see response to Comment 7 under Main Comments*

21. Label all garage and loading entrances indicating one-way, two-way and user types (delivery/loading, residential and/or commercial).

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #6*

22. [Sheet 5 of 10] parking Layout Plan – label ingress/egress points and provide “typical” for the size of all parking spaces. Also provide the number parking spaces by sections. Enlarge the plans for better readability (1:30 or 1:40 scale).

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP Sheet #5 and Appendix 6B of the Special Exception Booklet.*

23. Perform a field survey of five existing Northern Virginia Harris Teeter stores in early January (during the periods of January 3-4 of 10-11 etc. conducting a single all day count for each store). Provide background data on store size in square feet, number of existing parking spaces, type of parking (surface or garage) any shared arrangements, and proximity of the nearest transit and metro locations, if applicable. The parking usage field survey data should be collected for five stores selected from Pentagon Row, Lee Harrison Shopping Center, Shops at Foxchase, Village at Shirlington, Hyde Park Plaza, Barcroft Plaza, (Potomac Yard, if reopened by January 1st.) and/or other comparable stores in Maryland of D.C.

RESPONSE: *Please see the response to Main Comment #2 and Parking Assessment Memorandum (Enclosure 6).*

24. [Sheets 4, 6 & 7 of 10] Label existing bus stop in front of the old Post Office Building and show new sheltered bus stop location and structure typical. Label the existing bus stop across W. Broad Street in front of the hotel.

RESPONSE: *The existing bus stops have been more clearly labeled as requested on CDP sheet #3. The installation of a new sheltered bus stop is a voluntary concession that will be discussed with the City. A proposed location for the bus shelter is depicted on CDP sheet #4.*

25. A detailed layout and use plan for the first floor retail and particularly the grocery is needed. The emphasis is on determining the gross versus net space and accessibility for pedestrians.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Harris Teeter will modify their floorplan to accommodate the design changes made in this submission. The square footages for the mix of uses that were identified for a previous draft floorplan are summarized in the chart below. This floorplan resulted in 33,240 square feet or 55% of the store for retail sales.*

MIX OF USES IN GROCERY STORE	SQ. FT.	%
Back of House/Freezers/Mechanical	11,200	19%
Office/Staff	2,000	3%
Pharmacy	600	1%
Deli	2,600	4%
Shelving/Display	9,000	15%
Elevators/Escalators	800	1%
Checkouts	560	1%
Retail	33,240	55%
TOTAL GROCERY STORE SQ. FT.	60,000	100%

26. The designation of a retail “store type” window frontage space as a separate, but integrated part of the Harris Teeter is also needed. The concept would be a coffee, sandwich, bakery, wine or other themed shop with its own distinct window storefront.

RESPONSE: *The concept as described in the comment will be conveyed to Harris Teeter. Harris Teeter is responsible for the design of their floorplan and storefront. It is possible, however, that most ‘store type’ uses will be located within the store and away from W. Broad Street and therefore distinct window storefronts would not be possible. Additionally, at least 50% of the glass on the ground floor frontage on W. Broad Street will be glazed.*

27. The *Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits, Terms and Conditions*, dated October 25, 2012. Preliminary city staff comments are pending. The City Council’s Economic Development Committee (EDC) and staff committee will require further review and make comments during the public review process.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted.*

Special Exception

Special Exception Criteria Review – Staff review of the special exception criteria and compatibility of the proposed mixed use project indicates that the primary criteria and most of the secondary criteria are met by the special exception application for *301 West Broad Street*. A comprehensive detailed annotated staff analysis will be provided at the time of a future correspondence memorandum to City Council on this application. The specific special exception secondary criteria that need some further effort and/or justification include:

1. ***The resulting development is not disproportionate to surrounding land uses and planned land uses in size, bulk, or scale:*** While the subject

Rushmark
Properties

property is zoned for commercial uses up to a maximum of 75 feet high and planned for mixed use redevelopment the existing abutting residential neighborhood to the west needs to be addressed in a sensitive manner in terms of an existing lower density land use. The proposed mixed use project has first floor retail with five stories of multi-family residential above in a building that is 83 feet in height. The building occupies much of the footprint of the 2.63 acre site and allocates most of its building setbacks to the rear or west portion of the site. The building is architecturally designed to break up the massing with large elevated courtyards and spaces along the front and rear. Further stepping down of the building extensions or wings at the adjacent residential scale (35 feet or less) is needed where the building setbacks are at the 20 feet minimum and possibly other locations. In addition, landscaping buffers along the rear or west side of the site need to be appropriately sizes and the screening elements effective.

RESPONSE: *The revised plan addresses these concerns by shifting the massing/height to W. Broad Street and thus, pulling the building mass away from the neighboring townhouses and improving the buffer width and landscaping. The building now occupies less of the footprint and consists of 6 stories of residential units above the retail level. The building will be constructed with high quality, long-lasting materials such as concrete and will measure approximately 90 feet from grade at W. Broad St. to roofline.*

2. ***The resulting development does not overburden the existing community facilities, including the school, transportation, and water and sewer systems:*** The proposed multifamily residential uses will have an impact on school facilities and appropriate financial support is needed to offset existing and future capital costs of additional students. The traffic impact study is being revised and final figures will indicate the potential impact and possible mitigation measures. Adequate traffic circulation and access to the site is still an area of review and discussion.

RESPONSE: *The Traffic Impact study prepared by Gorove/Slade has been revised (Enclosure 5) to calculate the impacts of new plan that has been submitted. Voluntary Concessions will reflect mitigation of the potential impacts on schools. Furthermore, in order to reduce residential traffic flow from the project, a Transportation Demand Management program will be established. A draft of the proposed plan can be found in Enclosure 10.*

3. ***The resulting development provides community benefits, such as affordable housing, as it is described in article VII of this chapter:*** Six (6) percent affordable housing is proposed as part of this project's multifamily component that represent 18 apartments based upon the proposed 294 total units. The nearby Big Chimney park across the street on West Annandale Road is in the immediate vicinity of the proposed mixed use project. The existing neighborhood residents and also the potential new residents and

Rushmark
Properties

workers in the proposed project would benefit from area park improvements. The park has a master plan and current needs include 1) changing the grade at the W. Annandale Road entrance of the park so that it is more open and accessible from the street; 2) replace old playground equipment; 3) improve drainage throughout the park and related water and erosion issues.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Community benefits and voluntary contributions will be discussed with City staff.*

4. ***The resulting development provides for a reduction of single-use parking requirements through the use of shared parking.*** Opportunities for additional shared parking option should be pursued.

RESPONSE: *Opportunities for shared parking will be evaluated and if feasible they will be pursued.*

5. ***The resulting development encourages multi-modal transportation through design and other techniques, to reduce the reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, and utilizes sheltered stops for mass transit whenever feasible.*** Further details are needed on the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program and strategies proposed.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Voluntary Concessions will include the specifics of a proposed TDM program., A draft of the Transportation Demand Management plan to reduce residential traffic flow from the project can be found in Enclosure 10.*

B-2, Special Exception Criteria:

A height bonus is allowed up to 40 feet above the, by right, maximum height of 75-feet in the B-2, central business district under the special exception criteria. The proposed six-story, mixed use building height (83 feet) and mass will be notably higher than the existing three-story office building on the subject property. A height bonus of eight (8) feet is being requested by the applicant using the special exception to allow for the six-story (83 foot) building supported by three levels of underground parking. The application needs to further address the tapering of the building in some portions of the building that remain vertical faces at the 20 foot setback line. This is needed to be compatible with the special exception building step back objectives in transitioning the building to be more compatible with the height of the abutting residential structures.

RESPONSE: *Please see response to Comment 7, under Main Comments*

Rushmark
Properties

Planning Division – Transportation Planning

1. Pedestrian connections between West Broad Street and Annandale Road are envisioned for this large block. There is a proposed public pedestrian access shown on the plans that appears to lead from Annandale Road through either the building or parking garage. How does the sidewalk connect to West Broad Street? Is the pedestrian connection dedicated (public easement) and does it traverse through the grocery store?

RESPONSE: *The proposed pedestrian link would connect Annandale Rd. to West Broad St via the Harris Teeter parking level allowing pedestrians to exit onto W. Broad St either thru the upper store level or by continuing along the pedestrian pathway thru the shared pedestrian/vehicular garage exit located at the northeast building corner. Please see cross hatched area in P-1 level of CDP sheet #5.*

2. The Developer has agreed to reconstruct the City's adopted *West Broad Street Streetscape Plan* design for the frontage on West Broad Street in an expanded 20-foot wide, front setback.

RESPONSE: *The building design for the frontage and 20-foot wide front setback will represent the goals of the adopted West Broad Street Streetscape plan.*

3. Show the continuation of sidewalks across all drive aisles.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #5*

4. The installation of a sheltered bus stop should be considered along West Broad Street. Currently, the existing bus stop sign is located in front of the former post office building on West Broad Street.

RESPONSE: *Please see response to Comment 24, under Planning Division*

5. Show the locations and provide details for the designated areas for bicycle storage for public visitor locations and internal bicycle storage for workers and residents.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #5*

6. The City Center Concept/Transportation Plan envisions a mid-block street extension of Little Falls Street to provide a break between the 200 and 300 blocks of West Broad Street. However, the ability to redevelop the subject properties and provide for significant contiguous first floor retail in the case of the grocery store appears to rule out any other configuration being practical.

RESPONSE: *Comment is acknowledged and we concur with the conclusion.*

7. On-street parking on West Broad Street is also envisioned in the City Center Concept/Transportation Plan. The current proposed project configuration provides for

Rushmark
Properties

an optimal streetscape width of 20-feet (versus typical 14-foot) on West Broad Street that is a competing objective for frontage space. However, in the event any changes may occur in the building footprint this on-street parking option should be considered.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged*

8. See attached memorandum from Wendy Block Sanford, dated November 15, 2012 for further details and comments (Enclosure 3)

Urban Forestry – Ben Thompson, City Arborist 703/248-5183

1. Review was based upon the assumption that the conceptual development plan was also a full site plan thus a combined concept plan (special exception) and site plan. As a result many of the comments and requirements are more detailed at a site plan level. For purposes of this special exception stage and conceptual development plan these comments should be carefully reviewed and noted as they will have an impact on any future site plan consideration and approval.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged*

2. A 15-foot wide buffer area is required between the residentially zoned adjacent properties to the west or rear of the site. This required buffer area is within the 20-foot building setback.

RESPONSE: *Please see response to Comment 7, under Main Comments.*

3. A conceptual perimeter landscaped buffer area plan should be developed at this time. The required 20-foot buffer adjacent to residential district requires a minimum 20-foot (Type D) or 15-foot (Type E) landscape screening element within the buffer.

RESPONSE: *Buffer yard has been revised based on new site and building layout. Where necessary, the screen wall will remain as previously depicted and landscaping material has been upgraded/increased as requested. Also please see response to Comment 7 under Main Comments.*

4. All perimeter landscape buffers should not be placed above underground parking structures. The required landscape buffers should be planted in existing mineral soil to ensure the long-term viability of the buffer.

RESPONSE: *The landscape buffer will not be placed above underground parking and will be planted in existing mineral soil.*

5. A detailed and fully developed landscape plan is required at the site plan stage. Various comments about planting and landscaping the site, upper-story courtyards, streetscape, public right-of-way, buffers and also the need to provide related design and standard planting details are noted.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, a detailed landscape plan will be presented for site plan approval. At that time, all details including species, locations, arrangements, and sizes of all Streetscape plant materials will be provided .*

6. A preliminary tree survey is required at site plan, but is also recommended at the special exception and conceptual development plan stage. At the present time the concept development plan omits numerous trees that will be affected by construction activities at the site. On-site, co-owned, and off-site trees within ten feet of the property line must be included in the preliminary tree survey.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, a survey of existing trees that was conducted by a certified Arborist has been provided. See CDP sheet #9*

7. Note that there are two large willow oak city streetscape trees on West Broad Street along the site boundary. These trees must be noted and preserved throughout any future construction process.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Treatment or preservation of these trees will be coordinated with the City Urban Forester*

8. At the site plan stage formal streetscape plans are required that conform to the adopted Streetscape Plan for West broad Street.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged*

9. The proposed streetscape concept for the Annandale Road is encouraged, but does not necessarily have to be designed and constructed with the same elements as the West Broad Street Streetscape design. For example, it is recommended that the streetscape planters on Annandale Road be an alternative design and provide a minimum of 1,000 cubic feet of rooting area and irrigation that is based upon runoff containment for the site.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged*

10. Also consider opportunities to assist with vicinity community improvements to improve safe pedestrian access across Annandale Road and enhancements to Big Chimney Park.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Community benefits and voluntary contributions will be discussed with City staff.*

11. See combined DPW memorandum from Ben Thompson, dated November 26, 2012 and detailed streetscape and urban forestry comments (Enclosure 4).

Rushmark
Properties

Housing Division

1. The applicant has agreed to provide, within the residential component of the project, 6 percent of the units as affordable dwelling units. Staff edits to the terms as proposed in the *Draft Voluntary Concessions, Community Benefits, Terms and Conditions* are provided.

RESPONSE: *Voluntary Concessions will be discussed with City staff. Revisions to the document will be made accordingly.*

2. Based upon the currently proposed 294 residential units in the project the six (6) percent would represent 18 affordable dwelling units.

RESPONSE: *The plan has reduced the unit count to 282. Community benefits including the number of affordable dwelling units will be discussed with City staff.*

3. The city is currently in the process of adopting a new affordable dwelling unit ordinance in February, 2013.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted.*

4. See memorandum from K. Denton, dated November 29, 2012 (Enclosure 5).

Parks and Recreation

1. There is a city Master Plan for Big Chimneys Park facility. The park is located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed mixed use project adjacent to the southern portion of the subject site across W. Annandale Road.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged*

2. There is an opportunity for community support in the form of a financial contribution for planned public improvements to address drainage, equipment replacement and accessibility needs.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Community benefits and voluntary contributions will be discussed with City staff.*

3. See enclosed email correspondence and Big Chimneys Park Master Plan for further information (Enclosures 6)

Fire Marshal Tom Polera, Captain (FM-EM) 703/248-5058)

1. General (conceptual/site plan) concerns are related to - fire control room access and location; FDC and hydrant locations; drive through areas design for Fire Department access (Height/Width); weight limitations for fire apparatus on top of parking garage; and access and egress barriers such as streetscape.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Concerns have been noted and ongoing communication with the Fire Marshal during design development is expected.*

2. See memorandum from T. Polera, dated November 28, 2012 (Enclosure 7).

Zoning Administrator

1. A special exception is required to allow the proposed height and mix of residential with commercial.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. The massing, density and height of the project has shifted to W. Broad Street where the building from grade to roofline measures a height of 90 feet. This height is still substantially less than the 115 feet height limit permitted by a special exception.*

2. Architectural Advisory Board (AAB) preliminary review is schedule for January 9, 2012.

RESPONSE: *Our AAB preliminary review meeting has been rescheduled with City staff for February 6th.*

3. Required parking indicates a shortfall. Overall based upon the proposed uses 790 spaces are required by code and 586 are proposed, resulting in a shortfall of 185 spaces or a 26 percent reduction.

RESPONSE: *Please see the response to Planning Division – Question #2*

4. Provide an enlarged typical for the parking spaces showing dimensions and, if known, where the support columns will be located, if within a parking space.

RESPONSE: *The parking will be engineered so that no columns are necessary within parking spaces. For parking space dimensions, please see CDP sheet #5*

5. Provide the parking totals on the drawings for each row, etc. Call out how many parking spaces are in each row parking.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #5 and Appendix 6B of the Special Exception booklet*

6. While support columns are allowed to some extent to occupy parking spaces in parking structures their intrusion into these parking spaces has been problematic. The applicant is urged to engineer the parking garage such that no columns are necessary within the parking spaces.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, the parking will be engineered so that no columns are necessary within parking spaces.*

Rushmark
Properties

7. Confirm loading spaces have vertical clearance free of obstructions to at least 15 feet at site plan.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, vertical free clearance for loading spaces will be confirmed at time of site plan.*

8. Confirm the setbacks from adjoining streets and properties.

RESPONSE: *Setback requirements meet or exceed City code.*

9. The methodology for determining building height must be shown on the plans and reflect the use of the existing or finished grade, whichever is higher.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #2*

10. A landscape buffer/screen of 15-feet in width is required within the 20 foot setback area to the west of the subject site.

RESPONSE: *Buffer yard has been revised based on new site and building layout. Where it is necessary the screen wall will remain as previously depicted and landscaping material has been upgraded/increased as requested. Please see response to Comment 7, under Main Comments*

11. Provide the methodology used for measuring the building heights. Height must be measured from the lower of the finished or existing grade.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #2*

12. Confirm that no transformers are located in a require yard or buffer area?

RESPONSE: *Confirmed, the transformers have been relocated out of the required buffer yard. The new location is identified on CDP sheet #4*

13. The B-2, central business district required setbacks are – Street frontage setbacks at 14 feet as measures from face of curb and abutting a residential district to the rear of the site requires a 20 foot setback from the property line and no setback is required along adjacent business zoned property.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. The building setback along Broad St has been provided at 20 ft (to accommodate proposed streetscape), 20 ft along the west and 15 ft along the southern property line abutting the R-M district, and 0 ft along the eastern property line abutting similar B-2 district.*

14. The proposed masonry screening wall along the western part of the site may be allowed to a maximum height of seven feet (Enclosure 8)

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *The proposed masonry screening wall is 6 feet in height. The wall was not increased to 7 feet given the fact that the full buffer yard width is now being provided.*

15. In order to evaluate the parking tabulations and requirements, more information is needed on the intended uses for the ground level commercial space including a layout plan. For example, uses suggested as part of the proposed Harris Teeter grocery store such as storefront café or other integrated, but separate functional areas and accessory use areas not part of the net retail space.

RESPONSE: *Please see the response to Main Comment #2.*

16. See memorandum from J. Boyle, dated November 26, 2012 for further comments and details (Enclosure 9).

Public Utilities Division

1. Adequate water and sanitary sewer is available for this project.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted. Water/Sewer engineering details will be covered during the site plan phase.*

2. See memorandum from T. Geis, dated November 19, 2012 for further details (Enclosure 10).

Dept. of Public Works (DPW)– Kirsten Munz, P.E., Civil Engineer – 703/248-5331

The following are summary comments on transportation, site, stormwater and streetscape features:

Transportation:

[Recommended Concepts]

1. A single entrance on W. Broad Street should align with the existing intersection of Little Falls St. No more than one access point should be provided on W. Broad Street.

RESPONSE: *A single point of ingress for vehicular traffic on West Broad Street is provided. A creation of sense of place and entry has also been created by the placement of the main entrance of Harris Teeter at the terminus of Little Falls Street.*

2. Consider sharing an entrance with the adjacent Burke and Herbert Bank to minimize entrances off of Broad St.

RESPONSE: *This comment was thoughtfully considered however due to business matters and cueing concerns at the intersection of W Broad a shared entrance is not feasible.*

Rushmark
Properties

3. A single access point is preferred along W. Annandale Road.

RESPONSE: *Two entrances on Annandale Road are required in order to adequately address traffic flow between truck loading, retail traffic/parking and residential parking.*

4. Provide a safe, logical pedestrian access point for the residents of the Winter Hill development to access the retail services proposed.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see the cross hatched area on the detail of the first level of the parking garage (CDP sheet #5).*

5. The City Center Concept/Transportation Plan recommends an extension of Little Falls Street that connects W. Broad St. to W. Annandale Rd. The ideal configuration would align the Little Falls extension with the existing Little Falls Street, east of W. Broad Street, creating a conventional four-leg intersection.

RESPONSE: *The site has been studied at length to try and get a four-leg intersection as noted in the comment. However, due to site development constraints, this configuration is not a feasible option. Therefore, the two right-in/right-out access points are continued to be the proposed condition.*

6. The City Center Concept/Transportation Plan recommends a reconstructed cross section for W. Broad Street which includes on-street parking, a middle travel lane, bulbouts and bike lanes.

RESPONSE: *A reconstructed W. Broad Street would preclude this development and the many City Center concepts (pedestrian friendly, sustainable, urban) that it can achieve.*

[Required]

7. Provide additional crosswalk and pedestrian signal for the northwest leg of W. Broad/Little Falls intersection

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. This crosswalk will be provided.*

8. Dedication of right-of-way along West Broad Street and Annandale Rd is required to provide adequate public right-of-way for public improvements.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. A deed will be executed and recorded to dedicate the appropriate right of way to the City.*

9. Public access easements should be dedicated along all public rights of way. In general, a minimum 14-foot easement is recommended.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. A deed will be executed and recorded to dedicate public access easements along public right of ways.*

10. Clarify how proposed sidewalk will tie into existing sidewalk on Annandale Rd.

RESPONSE: *A pedestrian link has been proposed that would connect from the existing sidewalk at Annandale Rd. to West Broad St via the Harris Teeter parking level allowing pedestrians to exit onto W. Broad St either thru the upper store level or by continuing along the pedestrian pathway thru the shared pedestrian/vehicular garage exit located at the northeast building corner*

Site:

1. Identify location of trash enclosure. Ensure that the refuse area provides adequate space for trash and recycling receptacles and collection.

RESPONSE: *The trash enclosure is located behind the residential lobby and it is adjacent to the residential loading dock. Please see Concept Floor Plans exhibit (Appendix 6A) of Special Exception booklet.*

2. Significant retaining walls are proposed on property lines. Be prepared to provide temporary construction and grading easements from adjacent property owners.

RESPONSE: *The length of the retaining wall has been reduced from the previous plan. The current plan (see CDP sheet # 4) begins the retaining wall about 25 feet west of where the service road turns behind the building. That wall extends down to Annandale Road. Any temporary construction/grading easements will be identified at the time of final site plan design and pursued with the adjacent property and/or HOA at that time.*

3. Be advised that an approved Management of Traffic/Construction Management Plan shall be required prior to issuance of any permits.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted.*

Rushmark
Properties

Stormwater:

[Required]

9. Calculations shall be required at the final site plan stage to demonstrate the following:
Total runoff volume is not increased from pre-development conditions

Additional 10% phosphorus removal is achieved.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted. Water/Sewer engineering details will be covered during the site plan phase.*

10. An erosion and sediment control plan shall be required at the final site plan stage. The applicant is advised to begin planning a strategy for runoff containment on-site.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted. Water/Sewer engineering details will be covered during the site plan phase.*

[Recommended]

11. Applicant should treat all rooftop runoff with either a green roof or cisterns.

RESPONSE: *The final SWM plan will contemplate various alternative compliance measures.*

12. Streetscape designs on W. Broad Street and W. Annandale Road should incorporate measures to collect and treat roadway runoff from adjacent streets.

RESPONSE: *Incorporation of these measures may be considered at the time of final site plan.*

Streetscape:

[Required]

13. This plan must show implementation of the City of Falls Church's adopted Broad Street streetscape plan and demonstrate that those design elements are reflected in the current plan.

RESPONSE: *From the mix of uses to the treatment of W. Broad Street and Annandale Road facades and streetscapes, the project exemplifies the goals of the City's Design Guidelines. Numerous pedestrian friendly elements are provided throughout the project including bicycle racks, street furniture, pedestrian scale*

Rushmark
Properties

lighting, wide sidewalks and attractive landscaping. A conceptual streetscape plan has been provided on CDP sheet #7.

14. All landscaped areas within the City's right-of-way (ROW) must show irrigation to be installed. This includes a water meter(s), control valve(s), and backflow preventer(s) located in the ROW that are accessible to the City at all times.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Design and details of irrigation elements shall be provided at time of final site plan*

15. Public access easements should be dedicated along all public rights of way. In general, a 14' easement is recommended.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged. Required public access easements will be dedicated.*

16. The final site plan must adequately specify all materials and streetscape fixtures including but not limited to lights, trash receptacles and benches to ensure they are in compliance with City standard improvements.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged and noted.*

17. See combined memorandum from B. Hicks and Kirsten Munz, dated November 26, 2012 for further items and details on all DPW comments (Enclosure 4).

Sabra, Wang & Associates, Inc. – Jyothi Paladugu, P.E. PTOE (all contact thru DPW)

The City's traffic engineering consultant, Sabra Wang & Associates (SWA) has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study submitted. Their comments are summarized below:

1. **Traffic Data:** Significant discrepancies exist between the traffic counts provided in the report and historical City counts used for signal timing. Explain the discrepancies and propose actions to resolve.
2. **Capacity Analysis:** Capacity analysis should be re-checked due to volume discrepancies described above.
3. **Background Conditions:** The background conditions should include the following future developments:
 - 540 S. Washington Street
 - 400 N. Washington Street
 - Capital One Bank
4. **Parking:** The site is significantly under parked and the reduction does not appear to be justified. How will separated parking requirements be regulated and enforced? Could retail spaces be available to residents in the evenings?
5. **Transportation Demand Management:** Significantly more information is needed specifying the strategies proposed for implementation. Address various transportation modes. Identify current needs and future projections.

Rushmark
Properties

6. **Traffic Calming:** Traffic calming techniques on residential streets in the vicinity should be explored.
7. **Site Access:** Site access on W. Broad Street may encourage unsafe maneuvers, such as illegal left turns and U-turns.
8. **Queuing:** An independent analysis using the traffic simulation shows queues backing up past the proposed entrances on both W Broad Street and W. Annandale Road, creating unsafe conditions for entering and exiting the site.
9. See memorandum from P. Paladugu, dated November 28, 2012 for further items and details (Enclosure 11)

These above comments are in summary form and the enclosed memorandums from staff detailing their comments need to be individually addressed. In the case of the Planning Division – Special Exception/Development (review) comments they represent the detailed comments.

RESPONSE: *Please refer to the enclosed Traffic Technical Memorandum (Enclosure 4) and updated Traffic Impact Study (Enclosure 5) prepared by Gorove/Slade.*

Recommendations:

Specifically staff recommends the applicant to further review options to:

1. Review options to relocate service drive and related uses from the western side of the subject site to the eastern side and include mid-block sidewalk pedestrian access.

RESPONSE: *The relocation of the service drive to the eastern side of the site was examined extensively however issues with the site elevation and commercial loading requirements makes that the location of the loading dock on the eastern side of the site infeasible. A pedestrian link has been proposed that would connect Annandale to West Broad St via the Harris Teeter parking level allowing pedestrians to exit onto W. Broad St either thru the upper store level or by continuing along the pedestrian pathway thru the shared pedestrian/vehicular garage exit located at the northeast building corner.*

2. Provide full landscape buffer width and plantings adjacent to the adjacent residential district at Winter Hill or comparable screening elements.

RESPONSE: *Buffer yard has been revised based on new site and building layout. Where it is necessary, the screen wall will remain as previously depicted and landscaping material has been upgraded/increased as requested.*

3. Add additional step down features to building side facing the west and the adjacent residential district.

RESPONSE: *The building layout has been redesigned to pull the mass away from the neighboring townhouses.*

4. Add additional parking for retail uses.

Rushmark
Properties

RESPONSE: *Please see the response to Main Comment #2 and Parking Assessment Memorandum (Enclosure 6)*

5. Reduce density and height of the proposed building through a reduction in the number of multi-family residential units, in order to, provide for adequate parking, traffic and building massing to mitigate related potential impacts, if other measures are not feasible.

RESPONSE: *The revised plan addresses these concerns by reducing the density/number of units, shifting the massing/height to W. Broad Street and thus, pulling the building mass away from the neighboring townhouses and providing the required buffer and landscaping*

6. Optimize traffic circulations patterns and vehicular movements including streets, drives, entrances, cueing and turning movements.

RESPONSE: *The circulation shown on the plan is optimal for the planned uses on the site and for vehicular maneuverability along West Broad Street. See revised Traffic Study.*

Additional Application Requests:

The following materials and/or information are needed to adequately review the current application:

1. Perform a shadow study of the proposed building to determine impact on adjacent residential townhomes.

RESPONSE: *The shadow study provided (Enclosure 8) demonstrates minimal impacts throughout the year on the adjacent residential townhomes.*

2. Conduct and provide a parking demand survey and related data for five existing Northern Virginia area Harris Teeter stores to determine actual use type parking need.

RESPONSE: *A Parking Assessment was prepared by Gorove/Slade that examines parking data at several planned and operating Harris Teeter store locations in Washington DC /Northern Virginia. See Enclosure #6*

3. Provide additional architectural views of western side of the proposed building to depict typical views from adjacent residential townhomes.

RESPONSE: *These views are provided in the Special Exception Booklet (Page #5) filed with this submission.*

4. Parking Garage

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, please see CDP sheet #5*

Rushmark
Properties

5. Update Traffic Impact Study (TIA) and related data to reflect staff comments.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged, the updated Traffic Impact Study has been revised (Enclosure 5) to reflect staff comments. A Traffic Technical Memorandum (Enclosure 4) was also prepared in order to specifically address the questions posed by Sabra Wang.*