

Date Received: March 5, 2024

Real good to talk to you last week! Thanks for the update. Quick question as we understand the city's goal and thoughts on this area and our site (4651 King) moving ahead.

We understand that we'll likely be under that "Residential or Commercial" designation and the city will support higher density (as we discussed, possibly up to 100' scaled back to 60' on the east side of our site closer to the single family house to the east and northeast).

Saying that, given our site is small (24,000 sf of land area) the only way for us to get to those 100' heights is to get significant FAR on our site. For example if we end of having an 18,000 sf building footprint (just for argument sake), and that goes 8 stories or so (to get to 100')....by the way this VERY rudimentary but I'm simply illustrating our point....that would take the total "above ground" density to around 144,000 sf (8 stories x 18,000 sf per floor).

And If that were the case, it would need a 6 FAR (6 x 24,000 comes to 144,000 SF of density).

Again, we haven't done any sketches yet or density study, but the only way the heights work for us, and the ability to "go vertical" on a smaller site like ours is to get the necessary FAR allowable. Otherwise the heights allowable and the vision of a residential tower is a mute point on a smaller site like ours.

Can you confirm this is the direction you see the City going? To approve the necessary FAR in order for us to max out on density?

Matthew J. Locraft

Date Received: March 20, 2024

Thank you for meeting with us on March 19, 2024. We appreciate you walking us through Staff's Alex West SAP recommendations for **The Rutherford property** (the "Property") shown in the excerpt below.

As discussed, we respectfully request the Planned Mid-Block Pedestrian Connections ("Connections") be removed from the Property for several reasons.

1. The Property was recently entitled for a multifamily building DSUP plan that does not include the Connections. The DSUP plan is ready for FSP release.
2. There are private resident amenities (court and dog park) and garage and loading access ways in the Connection areas. There is not enough area for the Connections.
3. There is steep grade/topography making Connections difficult to build/access/use.
4. The Property owner has resident safety concerns if Connections are permitted along the northern Property boundary.

I have attached an excerpt from the approved multifamily building plan for your reference.

In the future, after the DSUP redevelopment of Property, should it be mutually agreeable, the Property owner supports pedestrian access alternatives that make it easier to access the Winkler Preserve.

With regard to the **Hilton property**, upon future redevelopment, the property owner supports pedestrian passage to make it easier to access major plan nodes. However, as currently shown, the midblock pedestrian connection is shown near the hotel loading area and would cause safety issues.

We are happy to discuss this further should you have follow-up questions.



Thank you,

Megan C. Rappolt, AICP

Associate Attorney

Wire Gill LLP

700 Fairfax Street, Suite 600

Alexandria, VA 22314

C: (703) 362-5232

mrappolt@wiregill.com, www.wiregill.com



March 27, 2024

Via Electronic Mail

Jeffrey Farner
Deputy Director
Department of Planning & Zoning
City of Alexandria, VA
301 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

RE: ALEXANDRIA WEST SMALL AREA PLAN DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

Dear Mr. Farner,

Morgan Properties is the owner of several retail and multifamily properties located within the AlexWest Small Area Plan boundary. As a stakeholder in the neighborhood, we thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Small Area Plan process and to provide feedback on the Draft Recommendations dated March 4, 2024. We are very pleased to be engaging with City Staff and the community in developing the future vision for the area.

As we contemplate the long-term future of the Morgan Properties site, we are aligned with many of the Draft Recommendations, as indicated below. We emphasize, however, that the Small Area Plan should provide the flexibility necessary to account for site-specific considerations as well as evolving development trends, market conditions, and other challenges that will arise during the long-term planning horizon contemplated by the Plan. We recommend that the Small Area Plan contain a clear statement that its recommendations are guidelines meant to inform future project design efforts—and not strict design mandates. This flexibility will allow Morgan Properties and other property owners to be responsive to the needs of the community and to create a livable, vibrant, and sustainable community.

Draft Recommendations Section 1 – Land Use

Land Use, General:

We support the additional flexibility for residential uses shown in the Land Uses Map (Figure 2), as both residential and commercial uses are compatible with the present and likely future of the Town Center, Garden District, and Greenway neighborhoods. This recommendation represents an improvement over the existing Beauregard Small Area Plan (“BSAP”), which contains more prescriptive recommendations for development of office, hotel, and retail uses, particularly within the Town Center neighborhood. The office and hotel uses are not feasible within the Town Center under current market conditions, and likely will not be for some time.



We also encourage the City to consider options for renovation and preservation of existing residential buildings, where appropriate to the neighborhood context and where such preservation is compatible with other planning goals (such as buildout of the street network and provision of open space). While the Small Area Plan is a tool for envisioning long-term redevelopment possibilities, retaining some of the existing buildings can contribute to maintaining housing affordability in the area, as it would create diversity in the housing stock and provide units that would be accessible to residents of various income levels. Additionally, retaining some of the existing buildings would help mitigate displacement pressures by providing current tenants more opportunities to remain within the community if and when redevelopment occurs. Finally, this approach aligns with sustainability goals by reducing the carbon emissions and environmental impacts associated with new construction and promoting efficient use of existing resources.

Retail:

We support the recommended inclusion of retail uses within the Town Center neighborhood. This area already supports several successful retail establishments that are well utilized by the residents of the area. However, we do not believe that the Small Area Plan should set a minimum requirement for the amount of retail to be provided with future development. Additionally, we encourage the City to consider allowing tenant amenities and other active non-commercial uses within the spaces designated as “required retail frontages” in the Land Uses Map. Allowing for flexibility in the provision of future retail space—both in terms of quantity and location—is critical for future-proofing the Small Area Plan and allowing owners to deliver retail and community-serving uses that are responsive to neighborhood needs.

Building Heights:

We largely support the recommendations of the Building Heights Map (Figure 3), which are generally consistent with the current BSAP guidance relative to the Morgan Properties site. However, we encourage the City to reconsider the proposed reduction in recommended building heights (from 60’ in the current BSAP to 45’ in the Draft Recommendations) at the southwest quadrant of the intersection between Beauregard Street and Sanger Avenue. Taller buildings are appropriate in this location, given that the Draft Recommendations depict the Beauregard Street corridor as a major thoroughfare planned for the most significant development intensity. Furthermore, the comparatively low-lying topography of this area offers an opportunity to blend mid-rise buildings into the urban fabric through creative architectural design.

Additionally, we note that, in select locations, the BSAP allows buildings an additional 10 feet of building height where necessary to accommodate buildings with pitched roofs and/or ground floor retail. We recommend that the AlexWest Small Area Plan contain a similar allowance for all low-rise and mid-rise development throughout the entire Plan area.

Density and Intensity



Table 1 of the Draft Recommendations appears to recommend a maximum density of 3.0 FAR for all of the properties located within the “Focus Area.” However, in the more detailed Neighborhood Development Table (Table 4), certain sub-areas of each neighborhood are recommended for development at 3.0 FAR, while others are recommended for development at levels currently contemplated by the underlying Coordinated Development Districts pertinent to those sites. We recommend that the Small Area Plan provide more clarity about the recommended levels of development density. Generally, while we understand the need to set realistic expectations for future patterns of development, we discourage the City from establishing broad, neighborhood-wide recommendations for maximum density that could compromise project design and inadvertently preclude the creation of much-needed housing and other beneficial neighborhood amenities.

Parking:

Parking demand and vehicle ownership trends continue to evolve rapidly in Alexandria and in the region generally. It remains to be seen whether the AlexWest Small Area Plan will include recommended minimum or maximum parking ratios. However, we believe that the Plan should recognize the need to make appropriate decisions regarding parking ratios for individual developments during the DSUP process and empower the City Council to approve modified parking ratios where appropriate.

Additionally, while we support the City’s preference for screening parking garages with active uses or architectural treatments, the AlexWest Small Area Plan should not carry forward the current BSAP guidance for providing one level of below-grade parking in many locations. Implementing below-grade parking is technically difficult to achieve and significantly increases development costs, particularly for low- and mid-rise buildings with podium or wood-frame construction. Reducing the amount of below-grade structured parking is a powerful mechanism for encouraging redevelopment and reducing the housing costs which are passed on to tenants.

Draft Recommendations Section 2 – Housing

We acknowledge and support the City’s goals with respect to implementation of affordable housing. The availability of affordable housing is critical to the overall health of any community, and we believe the Morgan Properties site can play a role in creating the increased housing supply, housing mix, and affordability that is needed in Alexandria.

Implementing affordable housing is costly and technically difficult. As such, we strongly support the Draft Recommendations which allow for a variety of strategies for achieving affordable housing goals, such as public-private partnerships, monetary contributions, dedication of land, inclusion of Committed Affordable Units in new development, and rent buy-downs. Additionally, as noted above, preserving some of the existing buildings might also be part of a larger affordability strategy, as some of the existing units could be suitable for dedication as



Committed Affordable Units. We recommend that the language of the Small Area Plan provide for maximum flexibility and creativity in meeting the City’s affordable housing goals.

Draft Recommendations Section 3 – Mobility

We support the City’s vision for an interconnected neighborhood street grid that facilitates efficient traffic circulation and promotes all modes of transportation with robust pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Future planning of the Town Center, Garden District, and Greenway neighborhoods will ensure these facilities and other necessary mobility enhancements are implemented. However, the extremely challenging topography of the Morgan Properties site may present obstacles to implementing the new street grid precisely as it is envisioned in the Street Network Map (Figure 4). Some street segments—such as the northern extension of Roanoke Avenue—may not be feasible due to the grade change, and instead lend themselves to bicycle or pedestrian connections. Additionally, we believe that maintaining the present alignment of Sanger Avenue provides numerous advantages for implementation of any future redevelopment, including reduced disturbance within the RPA, more efficient and less disruptive development phasing, and simplified utility infrastructure modifications. For all of these reasons, we recommend that the Small Area Plan language and graphics acknowledge the need for appropriate levels of flexibility during street network design (including the location of future curb cuts and other street elements) during the final site design and DSUP process.

Draft Recommendation Section 4 – Public Parks and Open Space

The Draft Recommendations call for a combined total of approximately 37 acres of public parks and open space in the Town Center, Garden District, and Greenway neighborhoods, inclusive of the proposed expansions of Dora Kelly Nature Park and Winkler Botanical Preserve. We are aligned with this recommendation and recognize the importance of public parks and open space for the overall wellbeing of the community. We highlight, however, the need for flexibility as to the location of the public parks and open space, their size, and typology. These details are best determined during the final site design and DSUP process, to ensure that the public parks and open space can integrate with the urban fabric and respond effectively to community needs (thereby maximizing their accessibility and impact). Further, we recommend that the Small Area Plan include language allowing all publicly accessible and private open space to count towards recommended open space minimums.

We note that Recommendation No. 38 calls for an additional 10,000 sf of open space if there are residential uses developed in the Town Center and Garden District neighborhoods. Because the BSAP and Coordinated Development District already call for residential development in these areas, it is not clear what level of residential development would trigger the recommendation for the additional 10,000 sf of open space or whether the recommendation would apply to a mixed-use development scenario. We believe this recommendation should be further refined through the Small Area Plan process, and we look forward to continuing to engage with the City on the topic of open space.



Finally, while we endorse the provision of private open space in new multifamily and mixed-use buildings and townhouses, we also highlight the need for flexibility as to the location and design of such open space. For each building typology, we recommend that the Small Area Plan support the provision of private open spaces at grade, in interior courtyards, on top of structural podiums, and on building rooftops. This flexibility to locate private open space in multiple locations will promote land use efficiency and maximize opportunities for resident amenities.

Draft Recommendation Section 5 – Sustainability and Community Facilities

We acknowledge the Draft Recommendations regarding sustainability and commit to complying with the applicable green building policies in connection with any future redevelopment. We believe this is crucial for shaping a greener future with development that is more energy efficient and better for the environment.

With regards to tree canopy, we note that meeting the canopy cover requirements may prove more manageable in some areas than others, depending on factors such as available space, existing vegetation, public space planning that prioritizes hardscaped areas like courtyards and recreational courts, and other site constraints. Therefore, we suggest that the AlexWest Small Area Plan take a holistic approach to tree canopy cover, allowing each individual development site to provide tree canopy coverage that is suited to the characteristics of the specific project.

* * *

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in the planning process. We look forward to continuing to work with you and the larger community moving forward.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jon Nickel".

Jon W. Nickel Jr.
Vice President
Commercial Assets, Development and Special Projects

VIA EMAIL TO JEFFREY.FARNER@ALEXANDRIAVA.GOV

March 29, 2024

Jeffrey Farnar
Deputy Director
Department of Planning and Zoning
301 King Street, Room 2100
Alexandria, VA 22314

RE: 4550 Kenmore Ave., TM 020.04-01-01 (“Seminary Plaza”) Owners’ Comments
on Alexandria West Small Area Plan Recommendations

Dear Jeff,

On behalf of my client, the owners of Seminary Plaza (the “Owners”), I am writing to provide comments on the March 2024 Draft of the Alexandria West Small Area Plan Recommendations, Figures and Maps (the “SAP Draft”) that we believe would best position the Seminary Plaza site to accomplish the sort of high quality, non-disruptive redevelopment prioritized for Alexandria West.

Building Height and Open Spaces

With regards to the figures and maps included in the SAP Draft, the Owners have consistently expressed concerns that the proposed height maximums dictate a particular building typology that is not necessarily consistent with typologies favored by the Owners for future development of Seminary Plaza.

As drafted, the proposed heights outlined in SAP Draft impact the future development of the Seminary Plaza Shopping Center site. These recommendations entail a significant reduction from the 150 feet of building height provided across Kenmore Ave. to just 85 feet for Seminary Plaza and the adjacent office building site. This represents a considerable 65-foot difference, and in our view, this doesn't reflect a gradual taper but rather a pronounced step down in height. Such a drastic change impacts the desired density and potential of Seminary Plaza, constraining the flexibility of its future development.

For this reason, we request a modification to increase the height from 85’ to 110’ feet. This adjustment represents a 40-foot difference between sites across Kenmore Ave. and is much more appropriate than the currently recommended 65-foot change. It also allows for a smoother transition between the properties west of Kenmore Ave and Seminary Plaza. Considering the

presence of proximate developments such as the 13-story Seminary Towers, the 12-story Alexandria Professional Center building to the south, and the 11-story hotel to the west, we believe taller buildings are suitable for this site which will be complementary to its context.

To address concerns regarding the impact on existing developments to the east, we propose a relocation of the required park/green space area to the eastern border of Seminary Plaza, proximate to the future planned intersection of Library Lane and the planned street at the easternmost edge of the Seminary Plaza site. This location would border the existing lower density buildings across Library Lane, creating a buffer zone between them. This realignment would shift both height and density towards Kenmore Ave where taller heights are appropriate.

In addition, we encourage the City to consider implementing a variety of heights across Seminary Plaza and the adjacent office building site, in particular providing a higher maximum 110' height towards the portion of the site closest to I-395, and lateral tapering with a step down to 85' of building height closer to Seminary Road. A basic rendition of this idea is included below, identifying the proposed shift in the required park as well as tapering heights as discussed above.



Specific Figures

Figure 6: Bicycle Network Map identifies an existing bike facility extending from a new proposed on-road protected bike facility to the easternmost edge of Seminary Plaza. Given the discussion of building forms at Seminary Plaza, as well as a swap of certain area to consolidate access to Van Dorn, it would be helpful to recognize the possibility of significant changes to that existing bike facility.

Specific Recommendations

Below, we have identified several recommendations by their number in the Draft SAP, which we have provided comments on, in **bold**.

9. Maximum building heights will comply with the building heights depicted on Figure 3

(“Building Heights Map”). In addition, buildings in the Focus Area and Area 2 are eligible to request additional building height pursuant to all applicable provisions of Sec. 7-700 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment: Sec. 7-700 of the Zoning Ordinance has a hard limit of 25 feet of bonus height in exchange for the provision of CAUs. Despite previously comments from City during discussions and review of Lessard Design’s previously submitted massing study, it would not be possible to achieve the Owners’ desired maximum heights with the use of Sec. 7-700 exclusively. Owner requests additional flexibility in height, consistent with details below.

14. Residential development will provide 10% committed affordable housing or an amount consistent with City affordable housing contribution policies, regulations and procedures in effect at the time development is submitted for review, whichever is greater.

Comment: Alexandria West and Beauregard are both called out as “Emerging Submarkets” in the Update to Affordable Housing Contributions Policies and Procedures approved by City Council in December 2020, and amended in January 2021. Emerging Submarkets are required to provide 8% committed affordable housing. This 10% requirement is inconsistent with City Council’s approved guidance.

17. Pursuant to Section 7-700 of the Zoning Ordinance, bonus density above 30% is authorized in the Focus Area and Area 2 to encourage the production of additional affordable units.

Comment: Does the City have any concern that not including a specifically designated higher percentage increase would not meet the requirements of Sec. 7-700? The language of Sec. 7-703(A) with regards to bonus density for the provision of CAUs states: “Floor area ratio and density may not be increased pursuant to this section 7-700 by more than 30 percent of the floor area ratio and density otherwise permitted by this ordinance, unless a greater percentage increase is specifically designated in a small area plan chapter of the Master Plan.” (Emphasis added.) While the intent of the recommendation is clear, the SAP Draft does not designate a specific greater percentage increase.

27. Curb cuts, garage entrances, and similar functions are prohibited along designated bicycle facilities and along Beauregard Street, Seminary Road, Duke Street, and King Street. This does not apply to curb cuts needed for any planned streets.

Comment: This recommendation may fit in instances where there is a clear direction on future building elements, however in instances like Seminary Plaza where building functions and forms are not yet determined, some flexibility should be included. There are important factors to consider, including but not limited to visibility of elements such as a garage, that might conflict. We think language that identifies this as a priority but allows some flexibility for situations in which it is impossible to avoid the conflict (which will come

down to a discussion between the developers and Staff) would ensure this does not artificially restrict what can be done at a later date.

34. Development will provide all necessary transit facilities and improvements to mitigate the impact caused by the development.

Comment: Has the City identified any scope that will permit developers to determine what is and is not an “impact caused by the development”? This recommendation is rather vague, and depending on the success of City staff and others in estimating impacts caused by development, potentially leaves developments that move later in the life of the SAP potentially picking up costs not properly apportioned in earlier developments.

37. In addition to the publicly accessible open space required on Figure 8, all new multifamily buildings, excluding mixed-use/retail buildings, will provide a minimum of 20% of on-site ground-level open space. Mixed use/retail buildings, townhouses, and stacked townhouses will provide a minimum of 25% on-site open space, including both ground level and above grade open space.

Comment: Consider permitting non-mixed use development to locate this required on-site open space both at ground level and above grade. Given the requirements for creating parks (i.e. the 25,000 sf for the block where Seminary Plaza is located), this recommendation should make it clear that on-site open space is inclusive of space created towards that parks requirement.

We continue to appreciate City staff’s willingness to discuss and thoroughly consider the perspectives of the Owners among other stakeholders in drafting this important plan for the long term development of Seminary Plaza and the rest of Alexandria West. As always, we would be happy to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Mikulic

Steven Mikulic

Cc: Andra Schmitt, City of Alexandria
Jose Delcid, City of Alexandria
Douglas Erdman, Community Realty Co., Inc.
Luz Del Mar Rosado, Lessard Design



Kenneth W. Wire
kwire@wiregill.com
703-677-3129

March 29, 2024

Mr. Jeffrey Farner, Deputy Director
Development Division, P&Z
301 King Street, Room 2100
Alexandria, VA 22314

**Re: Alex West SAP
Newport Village**

Dear Mr. Farner,

Thank you for meeting with my client, UDR, on March 27, 2024 to review Staff's March 4th Alex West SAP recommendations for three Newport Village properties located along N. Beauregard Street and W. Braddock Road (the "Property").

As discussed, UDR is a long-term owner of the Property. Future development plans will consider needs of existing residents and potential future housing. Given these two objectives, and in consideration of site constraints include existing housing and extreme topography of the Property, the following changes to the draft Alex West SAP recommendations ("Draft Plan") will allow for potential housing on the Property:

1. **Include the recently-approved NV II development area in the pink "focus area."** The existing CRMU-H zoning district permits a 2.5 FAR and per DSUP #2023-10018, the approved development density is 2.3 FAR. The inconsistency of the Draft Plan and approved development may cause issues in financing development.
2. **For the balance of Property (excluding NVII), change the designation to the pink "focus area."** Currently, the Property is split between Area 2 and Area 3 which makes it difficult for UDR to plan in the future and implement the Draft Plan guidance. After further study, in order to maximize the preservation of existing housing and given the site constraints of resident amenities and extreme topography, focus area guidance will allow flexibility in future developments.
3. **Change height of the Property to 100'.** As written, the 45' height limit will require low-scale, land intensive development, which presents challenges to the goal of maximizing preservation of existing housing. For example, the approved NV II development is 95' in height and includes three levels of podium parking and five floors of wood construction, which is typical development in the current market. Greater height allows for less disturbance to existing housing on the Property.

4. **Reduce the 20,000 SF public park requirement for every 90,000 SF of developed land in Area 2.** In some instances, this requirement may cause existing buildings (approx. 5,000 – 10,000 SF for reference) to be demolished in order to provide open space. For example, the NV II development of 4.19 acres would have had to provide a one-acre public park with its DSUP development. Given the site constraints, existing residents, topography, security of residents, etc., a public park of this size could not be provided. Should the Property be considered a “focus area,” UDR will work with Staff to identify publicly-accessible open space on its Property, as it has done with NV II through the BRT and trail dedication, that balances benefits to the neighborhood with impacts to the existing community.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. A. W. W." with a horizontal line at the end.

Date Received: March 29, 2024

Dear Planning Staff,

This comment is made on behalf of Equity Residential, the owner of the Town Square at Mark Center residential community, more specifically referred to as parcels 019.03-01-09 (the "South Parcel") and 019.03-01-12 (the "North Parcel") (together referred to as the "Property"). We appreciate your time meeting with us and discussing the AlexWest planning process and draft recommendations. As discussed with you we have reviewed the draft plan and have several comments and concerns that we are submitting herein. We appreciate your consideration and incorporation of these items.

Open Space: The draft plan graphic identifies two open spaces on the Property; Park 15 (an 8,000-sf. pocket park) and Park 16 (a 45,000-sf. natural and conservation park). Open space will be provided on the Property in any redevelopment scenario, although the specific location of the open space will not be determined until the Property is redeveloped. Park 16 is accompanied by the note 'Maintain the area of steep slopes to enhance the entrance to the Winkler Preserve'; however, Park 16 is located in an area that has been constructed upon and currently contains a structure, and an intervening parcel (#029.03-01-06) exists between the South Parcel and the entrance to Winkler Preserve. The steep slopes that are referred to in this note are located on an adjacent parcel, outside of the South Parcel. Please remove this language from the draft plan.

It is uncertain where on the Property park spaces will be most suitable in the event of future development. While we acknowledge the City's initial interest in locating park space in the location currently designated as Park 16, there may be other locations within the Property that are more suitable for parks and this will not be known until the time of site planning and redevelopment. The draft plan graphic could be interpreted to require park space in this area; we do not agree with this locational requirement and request a notation be added to allow flexibility in the location of park space. Park 16 is also identified as a Natural and Conservation typology; the location of Park 16 does not contain many natural features – as it is built upon - so achieving this typology would require the creation of a natural area, rather than the conservation of an existing area. Again, while this park type could be appropriate this could also limit the development of other more appropriate park typologies on the Property, and the absence of existing features that warrant conservation increases the likelihood that the typology intent is misinterpreted during implementation.

Accordingly, we ask that you replace the note for Park 16 and Park 15 with language that reads 'Park Location to be Determined at Time of Site Plan and May Be Located Elsewhere on the Property' and modify the typology for Park 16 to 'TBD'.

Beauregard Connectivity: The draft plan does not show future access from the South Parcel to Beauregard Street; it is important that an option for a future right-in/right-out access to Beauregard be permitted to provide for adequate future connectivity.

Beauregard Connectivity: The draft plan does not show future access from the South Parcel to Beauregard Street; it is important that an option for a future right-in/right-out access to Beauregard be permitted to provide for adequate future connectivity.

Please adjust the graphic to illustrate an access from the South Parcel to Beauregard Street, and please add a note that reads 'Location of Future Access to be Determined at Time of Site Plan'.

North Parcel Planning: The draft plan does not contemplate how the North Parcel will be redeveloped in the future beyond its land use and density identification in the Neighborhood Development Table. The North Parcel should be planned in a similar fashion as other properties as to clarify that redevelopment of the North Parcel is contemplated, and concept level detail should include the option for new access along Beauregard Street.

Please add concept level detail to illustrate that redevelopment of the North Parcel is contemplated and add a note that reads 'Road Network for Future Development Scenario To Be Determined at Site Plan'. We have added a note to the North Parcel on the attached graphic and will work with you to create a concept level non-binding development pattern for the North Parcel.

Interparcel Connectivity: The draft plan illustrates a connection between the North Parcel and the South Parcel; we concur that the two parcels will have a vehicular connection in the future, although it cannot be foreseen exactly how this connection will occur and we request that staff add a note to underscore the necessary flexibility for the location of the connection.

Please add a note that reads 'Location of Street Connection to be Determined at Time of Development.'

Density: Given the Property's adjacency to Winkler Preserve, 395, and proximity to the planned Town Center, we believe that with adequate planning it is appropriate to apply the 150' height limit and a 4.0 FAR density to the Property. The increased height and density limits will provide the owner with necessary flexibility to respond to the unforeseen housing and market demands at the time of future development, and better equip the owner with the ability to provide affordable housing and open space on the Property. The 150' height limit exists for the adjacent sub-area 8a and extending this development pattern to the Property would provide a compatible built environment.

We have added a graphic with many of these suggestions added in order to assist your incorporation of these comments. We look forward to discussing and working further with you.

Aaron

Proposed Diagram

