



DRAFT
Zoning Bylaw Working Group

Date: May 8, 2020
Time: 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM
Location: Virtual Meeting

Minutes

Present: Pam Heidell, Charlie Kalauskas, Christian Klein, Jenny Raitt, Stephen Revilak, David Watson, Ralph Willmer, John Worden, Erin Zwirko.

Absent: Mike Byrne, Adam Chapdelaine.

Guests: Camilo Espitia, Eric Halvorsen, Emily Innes, Ryan Kiracofe, Don Seltzer.

Erin opened the meeting by reading the preamble to hosting a virtual meeting. She noted that the meeting was being recorded by one of the guests.

On the minutes, David clarified a statement that was attributed to him. Steve made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. John seconded the motion. All members in attendance approved the motion through a roll call vote, with the exception of Christian who abstained.

The representatives from RKG, Eric and Ryan, and Harriman, Emily and Camilo, began the presentation on zoning recommendations for the Industrial Zoning project. One of the significant recommendations made by Harriman is to increase the allowable height of buildings if there are community benefits provided. Eric noted that the increase in the allowable height is designed to provide space for flexible uses particularly on the first floor. He noted that the importance of adding verticality on small parcels which adds value to the parcels for future redevelopment. Camilo noted that the fiscal impact of the scenarios presented is presented.

Steve noted that the top line numbers presented illustrate the potential revenue impact in the test cases. He noted that residential cases provide revenue at four times the commercial cases. He asked if there are scenarios where the opposite is true. Ryan explained that residential properties are valued higher than commercial properties, and in Arlington the demand is on the residential side. The reverse is rare, and only where the value has been established on the commercial side through access, proximity to talent, and the other conditions that RKG has noted that create value on commercial properties.

Christian noted that Harriman completed a shadow study to supplement the discussion on the increased allowable height. He asked if it took into account topography. It does not. John expressed concern about the shadow studies and the potential resulting impact on the adjacent residential areas. He noted that not all of the industrial districts are the same, and therefore, one size fits all does not make sense. Eric responded to the questions about the preliminary shadow studies and noted that while he does not want to diminish the impact on residential areas, the potential impact is limited. He noted that this is part of the trade offs that will need to be considered. Emily added that the blocky solid buildings are for fit studies and do not represent what might or could be built on a site now or in the future. She noted that there is the potential to require a shadow study in exchange for increasing the allowable height, which is recommended through a special permit. David noted that a shadow study would be a beneficial tool for evaluating future redevelopment.

Camilo moved through the zoning recommendations. There was discussion about the proximity to the lot line and that there may be need for more space in front of a building. Camilo also thought that this could be handled on a case by case basis but the goal is to also improve the pedestrian realm and experience on the street. There may be cases where the business model needs more or less space in front of the building.

Camilo also noted that the recommendations include increasing the bike requirements and decreasing the parking requirements to take advantage of the Minuteman Bikepath. Christian noted that it appears there is a reduction in bike parking requirements. Camilo noted that it is not intended to be a decrease and they will relook at the recommendations. David noted that Harriman should not abandon the difference between short- and long-term bike parking, especially if there is a reduction in long-term bike parking.

Camilo provided an explanation of the parking and loading recommendations. Ralph noted that there is a requirement to use pervious pavement. He noted that it should be a requirement across the board. Emily noted that it is intended for parking or loading beyond the minimum requirements so that it is not financially onerous.

The discussion moved onto the development standards that are requirement to receive an increase to the allowable maximum height. John questioned how flex uses are different than mixed use. Emily noted that mixed use is multiple businesses, whereas flex use is 1 business that adjusts how the operations happen in a building. Steve noted that some businesses might not be able to support 25 percent of their power demand by solar and encouraged Harriman to rethink that requirement. Christian noted that he appreciates the list of requirements to achieve a greater height and agreed with Steve about the solar requirement. Charlie asked how flex space would be meet changing parking requirements, and that Harriman needs to think about how this would be addressed in an approval.

The group discussed options for public engagement. Harriman and RKG presented a possibility for virtual engagement where a presentation is viewed with a voiceover to frame the project and participants are asked to complete a follow up survey. While this isn't the same as a large in-person forum, it ensures that there is continual engagement. John noted that an in-person event is the best option, and suggested waiting. David noted that there are

opportunities for interim feedback. He noted that the presentation and video would have to provide as much context as possible as well as make it clear that this project is ongoing. In general, the members agreed to providing a virtual engagement opportunity.

Erin noted that she would follow up about next steps and future meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.