

TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE
AGENDA - 6/22/10
Interlineations in blue summarize discussion

Open Forum (5 minutes)

Dick Rogers: He and some others are meeting with the Fire Dep't next week if anyone has issues they'd like them to convey or inquire about.

Rob Hanna: He thinks we may want to suggest language on who should be the governing body for TCN (if not other spaces within the RCIG). Robert indicated that the governance issue in TCN is still being researched and there should be a report on that next week.

Administrative (5 minutes – review of future schedule and do we want a citizen (Kaplan/Rando) air rights presentation)

The co-chairs have discussed with Patty and Heidi a possible schedule that would have the Committee making its presentation to the TF at the July 27 meeting. The sense of the Committee is that we should shoot for a July 20 or July 27 Committee meeting at which a fulsome Committee draft report will be available for public comment; edits can be made at the July 27 Committee meeting and we'd be ready to go to the TF on the night of 27th. Getting the TF a final draft before that is likely a bridge too far, but the draft we circulate for public comment will be provided to the TF as well so it will have a fair insight into content in advance of the 27th.

On a Kaplan/Rando air rights presentation, the sense of the Committee was that Robert's response to Kathy Kaplan on this point captured the sense of the Committee. Joe indicated that he thinks MWAA might be finished soon on deciding what it would cost to build the requisite platform.

I. **Additional Edits to TCN Draft Report** (10 minutes)

- a. Discussion of any language Terri and Susan propose on the section entitled Additional Open Space
Pushed to next week to allow Terri and Susan additional time.

II. **Metro South Straw Man Exercise** (65 minutes)

The TF break-out maps were each shown. A Metro South straw man was then put on the screen that Robert and Rae had developed over the weekend to get the conversation moving – it sought to take from the TF break-out maps and the previous Committee discussions what were sensed to be the consensus starting points: an e-w connector through Metro South, perhaps the TCP connection, perhaps a ped connection from Metro to the JBG site across RP, and preservation of the first as open space. Some kind of connectivity to the kiss and ride is presumed, but that was left to the Committee to discuss.

John Landry then presented a straw man that Brookfield prepared based on the recent Committee discussions and internal Brookfield discussions. As per the attached, it:

- includes a grid throughout the Brookfield parcels that would be done in phases.
- Envisions this as an urban enclave, with building heights perhaps up to 250'.
- A 60:40 commercial:residential split is possible; if the Committee wants to go higher on the residential side Brookfield would be open to that but that implicates possible additional incentive and other development concerns. The TCN trigger idea is "interesting" but not sure how it would work or could be implemented here.
- The straw man seeks to address the storm water management (pond) issue by creating a new, larger pond within the forested area on the USGS site that could be part of an open space solution.
- The overall vision is a downtown Chicago mix but not a duplicate of TC. True mixed use with supporting retail. Don't see civic uses here or hotel (maybe hotel but JBG seems to have that covered fairly well).

Anthony Balestieri for Tishman commented that this vision seemed interesting and seemed to be consistent with the kinds of things Tishman could envision for its site. Heidi reinforced that we are not in any position to ensure open space, much less a stormwater solution, via the USGS lot. There was also talk that GSA may require some kind of buffer for that space for current or future uses. Bringing GSA into the process will be challenging (no one person or small group of people can speak for GSA on this), but Susan offered to try to get a GSA person at our next meeting who might be able to offer some insights.

There was extended discussion on the comm.:res mix issue. Joe reiterated his view that the key is a ratio of 4 sq. ft. of residential to 1 sq. ft. of commercial for new development if we are going to make up the "residential deficit" in and around TC. He thinks Ballston is something closer to 1:1 but in all events he feels we need to get closer to at least 4:1. At 2:1 he feels we will simply stay even with where we are. Mark Looney talked about the need for reducing the cost of providing residential. Two possibilities: look at parking requirements (see last meeting) and possibly think about how commercial owners can help with the public requirements so this is not all put on residential.

Heidi noted that the current Comp Plan provides a residential bonus if one wants to go to higher density. She also emphasized that we need to focus on the form of future development and the mix and what might be termed "livability" (parks, open space, civic uses) but be careful about being too specific.

Owners to the west on Metro South agreed to try to present some straw man ideas in two weeks. This might allow for revisiting Metro North (BP and Vornado specifically) at our next meeting.