Altus Realty Partners
4625 Old Dominion Drive, Suite 201
Arlington, VA 22207

March 17, 2010

Thank you for the opportunity to speak before you, for your time and consideration of this vitally important undertaking and for the opportunity to acknowledge the work of all those who have us led us to this point; particularly the visionary efforts of the Tysons Land Use Task Force.

I am Charles Kehler, a principal of Altus Realty Partners and an owner of 1991 Chain Bridge Road, located in the southwest corner of the intersection of routes 123 and 7. Some may better know the property as the old W. Bell & Co. catalogue showroom or more recently as the Sport & Health building. By way of background, my family moved to McLean in 1977 when the Dulles access road was nothing more than a swath through the trees and the only existing hotel on our arrival was the Tysons Holiday Inn. It is incredible to me what the intervening 33 years have brought to Tysons Corner and I am encouraged by what can be achieved in the next three decades under the proposed plan; provided, however, that it is done so with prudence and equity.

Prudence and equity in this process means applying good sense and fairness to the implementation of the plan. Quoting from the plan "The land use concept for Tysons links intensity to transit accessibility," which in this case is measured by distance to the metro stations in one eighth, one quarter and one half mile rings. The Plan includes a "Conceptual Intensity Map" (Map 4), which arbitrarily cuts these rings off short of the prescribed distance. This occurs most egregiously around the Tysons Central 7 Station, which is less than a ¼ mile from our site yet we are only ascribed Tier 3 intensity. It is essential that if the plan is to be viewed equitably and accepted by all constituents without action, that the density radii be applied by engineering principal and not artistic license of a "Conceptual Map."

The linkage of transportation accessibility and building intensity and height is an established tenant of urban planning and we only need to look to the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor for a successful example of this development model. Like the R-B corridor, the vision for Tysons is for "mixed-use, transit oriented neighborhoods." The plan defines these neighborhoods as each of the four TOD's within a ½ mile ring of the metro stations. In order to create an identity and unity within the neighborhood it is important to provide a mechanism for cohesive development between all of the tiers. The plan recognizes this importance, stipulating "to encourage cohesion of development between Tiers 1 and 2, additional intensity in Tier 2 (above that shown in Table 1 above) may be considered . . ." it fails, however, to recognize this need between Tiers 2 and 3. Denying such rights between Tiers 2 and 3 effectively segregates 80% of the TOD land area (Tier 3) in each neighborhood from that of the preferential core (Tiers 1 and 2). Only by applying the standards of the plan equally to each Tier can the vision of Tysons as four unified, transit oriented destinations be achieved.

Lastly this notion of equity needs to be applied to building height tiers as well. Height and intensity are inextricably linked. Without intensity, height can not be economically achieved. The plan text recognizes this linkage and states "building heights in Tysons will reflect the proposed intensity pattern". Nowhere in the plan text, however, is this linkage or application codified. Only in Map 10 Building Height Concept is this done across all of Tysons Corner and it is does so most inequitably. For example, a portion of our site is within the ¼ mile ring or Tier 2 intensity, yet Map 10 designates our site for Tier 3 height. The exact same condition exists on the parcels directly across Watson Street, which too is bifurcated by the ¼ mile ring. Unlike our site though, the entire area across Watson is designated for Tier 2 height on both sides of the ¼ mile ring. The implementation of the plan needs to be governed by quantitative rules measured by engineering principal and not artistic license of a "Conceptual Map."

I started with the notion of prudence and equity and it is where I will end. By its nature the beginning of this process was not fair. It created winners and losers, randomly chosen by the placement of the four metro stations. This sense of inequity has been compounded by the fact that people can not even agree on what the appropriate level of development intensity should be; let alone whether transportation modeling or proven planning theory should dictate development patterns. I am not here to litigate those issues. My aim is much more modest: only to ensure that the plan adopted as it relates to **intensity, cohesion and height** be implemented not with artistic license but by quantitative measures applied with common sense and equity. Perhaps then we can all start to share in the vision of what Tysons Corner will be thirty three years from now.

Thank you for your time.