

Docket Item #10
Planning Commission Public Hearing
January 6, 2026

Consideration of approval of the Planning Commission minutes of the Public Hearing meeting of
November 6, 2025.

*** * * M I N U T E S * * ***

ALEXANDRIA PLANNING COMMISSION

November 6, 2025 7:00 P.M.

Council Chamber

301 King Street, City Hall Alexandria, Virginia

Members Present:

Melissa McMahon, Chair
Stephen Koenig, Vice Chair
David Brown
Vivian Ramirez
Robert Dubé
Holly Lennihan
Jody Manor

Members Absent: None

Staff Present:

Paul Stoddard	Department of Planning & Zoning
Kendra Jacobs	Department of Planning & Zoning
Christina Zechman Brown	Office of the City Attorney
Catherine McDonald	Department of Planning & Zoning
Sam Shelby	Department of Planning & Zoning
Tony LaColla	Department of Planning & Zoning
Ann Horowitz	Department of Planning & Zoning
Lanning Blaser	Department of Planning & Zoning
Robert Kerns	Department of Planning & Zoning
Alexa Powell	Department of Planning & Zoning
Maya Contreras	Department of Planning & Zoning
Margaret Cooper	Department of Planning & Zoning
Nathan Randall	Department of Planning & Zoning
Abigail Harwell	Department of Planning & Zoning
Dirk Geratz	Department of Planning & Zoning
Kenneth Turscak	Department of Planning & Zoning

#1. CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Public Hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. All members were present.

Chair McMahon read the following instructions:

“If you wish to speak on a Docket Item and have not already signed up to do so, please fill out a Speaker Form online by following the “Sign Up to Speak” hyperlink present on the cover page of this evening’s Public Hearing Docket or in person by filling out a hardcopy speaker form, which can be found on either materials tables (located immediately outside the Chambers or at the back of the Chambers), and providing it to Ms. Jacobs, who has her hand raised.

Please note, comments from the public are limited to 3 minutes per speaker, with the exception of applicants and their representation. To make your public comment through the Zoom application, please click on the "Raise Hand" button located on the Zoom taskbar once you hear your name called upon to make your statement, in order to let staff know it is you who needs to be unmuted in order to make your public comment.

To make your public comment if you are dialing into tonight’s meeting via phone, please press *9 to execute the “Raise Hand” function once you hear your name called upon to make your statement, followed by *6 to toggle the unmute function. To make your public comment in person, please come up to either podium located at the front of the Chambers when you hear your name called upon to make your statement. Before starting your public comment, please first identify yourself by first and last name.

The City encourages and welcomes public comments from all residents on Planning Commission matters. In keeping with that principle, and with the principle of inclusiveness, this is a reminder of the shared expectation that the content and tenor of public comments always be civil and respectful. Thank you for honoring those principles. A reminder to all, including Commissioners, staff, and speakers in the Chambers to please speak clearly into the microphone to ensure all are able to hear in a clear manner.”

Chair McMahon asked if there were any changes to the Docket. Ms. Jacobs announced that there were no changes to the docket.

Item #4 was removed from the Consent Calendar.

CONSENT CALENDAR

- #2** Subdivision #2025-00005
3102 Wilson Avenue
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for a Subdivision to re-subdivide an existing lot into two lots; zoned R-2-5/ Residential.
Applicant: Classic Cottages, LLC

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve Subdivision #2025-00005 on the Consent Calendar.

- #3** Subdivision #2025-00007
103 E Monroe Avenue
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for a Subdivision to re-subdivide an existing lot into two lots; zoned R-2-5/ Residential.
Applicant: CCI Fund 1 LLC

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve Subdivision #2025-00007 on the Consent Calendar.

- #4** Special Use Permit #2025-00052
1625 Prince Street
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for a Special Use Permit for a parking reduction with a modification to the minimum side yard setback requirements for the conversion of an existing office building to a multi-unit residential dwelling; zoned OCH/ Office Commercial High.
Applicant: 1625 Prince Street LLC represented by Robert Brant, Attorney

SPEAKERS

Mark McNutt, resident of 1600 Prince Street, remains opposed to the request due to concerns about on and off-street parking.

Robert Brant, the attorney representing 1625 Prince Street LLC, spoke in support of the request and answered additional questions from the Commission.

DISCUSSION

The Planning Commission generally discussed and inquired about nearby on-street parking, residential parking permits, and the floodplain parking restrictions. Staff explained that most of the nearby, on-street parking is metered and that no residential parking permit district currently exists in the area. The floodplain requirements generally prohibit residential parking beneath the base flood elevation. Nonresidential parking, subject to additional floodproofing measures, may be permitted beneath the base flood elevation.

Commissioner Brown also asked the applicant to consider future parking arrangements with other owners within the office condominium complex.

Chair McMahon acknowledged the memo provided to the Planning Commission and confirmed with staff that the only request before the Planning Commission and City Council is the parking reduction Special Use Permit. Chair McMahon and Commissioner Dubé expressed support for the parking reduction request.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to close the Public Hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Special Use Permit #2025-00052. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

New Business

- #5 Special Use Permit #2025-00042
1000 Cameron Street
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for a Special Use Permit to add outdoor seating and expand the hours of operation at a restaurant (amending SUP #2022-00009); zoned CD/Commercial Downtown.
Applicant: Dany Lopez represented by Karen Becker, Agent

SPEAKERS

Madison Welch, 1006 Cameron Street, spoke in opposition of the request. He cited condition violations with trash, live entertainment, and supply deliveries. He also expressed concern with his ability to use the easement area and disagreed with the staff comparison to other outdoor dining areas near residents.

Amy Melia, 619 NE 87 St. Miami, representing the owners of 1006 Cameron Street, spoke in opposition to the request. She asked the Commission to consider deferring their SUP consideration due to the pending easement lawsuit She expressed that the increased capacity of outdoor dining seats and extra hours could lead to more SUP condition violations.

John Becker, 806 Green Street, spoke in support of the request. He stated that restaurants and small businesses such as La Pluma create a positive for community fabric that allows for walkability. He mentioned that many of the violations received could be considered minor new business growing pains. He added that noise complaints had not resulted from the existing business operations.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S Lee, spoke in opposition to the request. Although she mentioned that all conditions had been resolved at the time of docketing, she asked that the Commission defer the request until the applicant can prove condition compliance.

Karen Becker, 806 Green Street, architect and representative for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. She noted the character of the applicants as being wholesome, genuine, and kind. She shared that vibrancy and diversity are what make Alexandria unique, and La Pluma contributes to these qualities.

Iliana Melendez Lopez, 1000 Cameron Street, and the applicant's business partner noted that city staff have visited the site and had often found no violations in response to complaints. She apologized for any past violations, adding that they had no intention of causing problems and have made every effort to resolve the matters. She stated she applied to T&ES for a loading zone along N. Patrick Street, which should help alleviate the delivery concerns. She has also been working with her vendors to deliver within the designated

hours. Ms. Lopez added that a complaint about outdoor parties is a running club gathering prior to a run and not a party. She expressed her desire to maintain a business in the community as a positive neighborhood amenity.

DISCUSSION

Chair McMahon expressed support for the application. She recognized that amended conditions #14 and #18 were to mitigate the current issues with trash storage and supply deliveries. The Chair shared that the SUP request supported a mixed-use and walkable commercial district, where residences and businesses could harmoniously coexist.

Commissioner Brown asked staff about the process if continued violations were found. Staff replied that it would meet with the applicant to develop a formal plan to mitigate any impacts of the violations. If compliance was still not possible, the SUP would be docketed. He asked the applicant's business partner if the easement area was within the applicant's fenced outdoor dining area and the applicant confirmed that it was not. Commissioner Brown stated that the easement had no bearing on the request for 12 additional seats and that the court was the appropriate venue to evaluate the easement.

Commissioner Lennihan asked for clarification on the relevancy of the easement on the SUP request and staff confirmed the SUP uses were not located in the easement area and the question of the easement restrictions was a private property matter.

Commissioner Manor confirmed with staff that the outdoor dining time was similar with other restaurants nearby. He asked the applicant business partner how many times per trash is collected and the number of trash receptacles on site. The applicant answered that trash collection occurred three times a week between 8:45 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. She mentioned they take boxes off-site and the trash bins are only used for trash.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to close the Public Hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Lennihan, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the request, subject to amendments to Conditions #14 and #18 and to all applicable codes, ordinances, and staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6-1, with Commissioner Manor opposed.

14. **CONDITION AMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** Trash and garbage shall be stored inside or in sealed containers that do not allow odors to escape, invasion by animals, or leaking. No trash or debris shall be allowed to accumulate outside of those containers. The applicant shall use additional trash receptacles when the amount of trash or debris does not allow for the sealing of existing containers. Outdoor containers shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Directors of Planning & Zoning and Transportation & Environmental Services, including replacing damaged lids and repairing/replacing damaged dumpsters. ~~(P&Z)(T&ES)(SUP#2022-00009)~~ (PC)

18. **CONDITION AMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** Supply deliveries, loading, and unloading activities shall not occur between the hours of 11:00pm and 7:00am. The applicant shall submit a plan no later than December 19, 2025 that ensures vendors do not deliver during restricted hours, the plan is subject to approval of the director of planning and zoning. ~~(T&ES)(SUP#2022-00009)~~-(PC)

#6 Special Use Permit #2025-00048
Development Special Use Permit #2025-10015
2051 Jamieson Avenue - Jamieson/Carlyle Block B
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for (A): Special Use Permit to convert an existing office to multi-unit residential dwelling use, increase building height to 146 feet, an increase in floor area with the provision of affordable housing units, and various amendments to the Carlyle Block B “ Design Guidelines” (amending SUP #2024-00063); and (B) a Development Special Use Permit and Site Plan for a change in use from office to multi-unit residential dwelling (with optional first-floor retail) and increases in floor area and building height, with modifications and a Special Use Permit request for a mechanical penthouse exceeding 15 feet in height (amending Development Site Plan #2002-0014); zoned CDD #1/Coordinated Development District #1.
Applicant: Red Fox Development LLC, represented by Kenneth Wire, Wire Gill LLP, Attorney

SPEAKERS

Ron Stehman, neighbor, expressed concerns about the project on behalf of 40 other affected neighbors. He raised concerns about increased traffic and believed that painting the existing red brick to be white is incongruous with the rest of the Carlyle neighborhood. He stated that the building height should be lower for a more precise consistency with the rest of the neighborhood and that the floor area increase is too high.

Kristen McCormack, neighbor, expressed concerns about the increased building height, structural integrity of the building with the new addition, and changing the color of the building from red to white.

Charles Paul, Alexandria property owner and former Carlyle-Eisenhower East Design Review Board (DRB) member, spoke in support of the project. He cited three reasons for his strong support: 1) that the project would provide more housing to help alleviate a housing crisis, 2) reduce the number of empty buildings in the area and increase neighborhood activity, and 3) the property owner has the right to change the color of the building.

Jason Wombacher, neighbor, expressed concern about the increased building height. He stated that he purchased his home specifically for its views of the US Capitol, but that view would be blocked with the current proposal.

Ken Wire, attorney representing the applicant, spoke in support of the project. He acknowledged concerns about altered views expressed by neighbors and pointed out that the design team pushed the façade back in some instances to help address that concern. He noted that the project is a good location for additional density given its proximity to Metro and that the building has more parking than needed given that it is an office-to-residential conversion. He also detailed the applicant’s discussions with the Carlyle-Eisenhower East Design Review Board (DRB) regarding building color, particularly the team’s responsiveness to comments about the color of the new addition.

DISCUSSION

Chair McMahon asked staff about the revised conditions (#68 regarding potential noise mitigation and new #115 concerning accessibility) contained in the November 6, 2025 memo to the Planning Commission. Staff explained that noise conditions are regularly included to mitigate the potential that high exterior noise levels could disturb future residents in their homes. In this case, the applicant expressed concern about the strict application of this requirement (in the event the noise

study determined the sound levels exceeded the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) standard) due to the potential cost of installing new windows with adequate soundproofing. In response, staff provided the Planning Commission with revised language to prioritize the use of alternative means of noise mitigation to preserve the building envelope particularly the existing windows. The new condition also increases flexibility in the event the applicant is unable to fully meet the noise standard using alternative measures and it is determined no other cost-effective measures are possible. If such a determination is reached by P&Z, the condition would require disclosure to all effected tenants as part of lease agreements.

Commissioner Dubé requested clarification on applying the noise standard. Staff shared that the standard condition only applied to residential projects and indicated the condition is based on HUD requirements for federal projects, which uses a standard for external noise heard inside a building at a maximum of 45 decibels.

Condition #115 was added in response to Commission concerns about accessibility for office to residential conversion projects. Staff clarified that while the Virginia Statewide Building Code does require upgrades during renovations it does not apply the same accessibility standards as new construction. The new condition would ensure that the applicant achieves the same level of accessibility in the common areas of the renovated portion as would be expected in new construction.

Vice Chair Koenig asked the applicant if they agreed to the revised conditions. The applicant confirmed their agreement.

Vice Chair Koenig expressed support for the project, including the added conditions, describing them as a balanced approach that addresses both noise and accessibility without compromising project viability. Overall, he praised the project's design quality, the conversion of the empty office building, the provision of needed affordable housing, and emphasized its importance to the area's ongoing evolution.

Commissioner Ramirez also supported the project, noting that current market trends and the post-COVID shift toward remote work have created new opportunities for adaptive reuse of office buildings. She also thought the applicant's design choice to paint the building was an exciting departure and that the difference could provide some visual interest by breaking up the monotony of the red brick in the neighborhood.

Chair McMahon was also supportive of the proposal. She shared that, unlike Old Town where painting brick and increasing height are more tightly controlled because of the Historic District regulations, the Carlyle neighborhood does not have the same restrictions. She also noted that the proposal's design, being different from other red brick buildings nearby, may be a positive feature in that it could serve as a landmark in the future. While she acknowledged resident's concern about potential view loss, she noted that protection from such impacts cannot be guaranteed. She also highlighted that this proposal was grounded in sound planning principles like preserving the existing open space, providing additional residences near transit, and overall consistency with community objectives. For these reasons, she could not oppose the project based solely on loss of neighboring views.

Commissioner Brown expressed support for the project. He shared his initial concern about how the proposed height compares to neighboring buildings and about the height to setback ratio requirement. However, he concluded that the requested modifications would have little visibility to the public. Commissioner Brown also stated that a precise height transition, as suggested by one of the public speakers, is not strictly necessary. He added that the applicant's efforts to introduce setbacks and refine design details also addressed these issues. He stated that the project was compatible with the neighborhood given the surrounding uses and that there would be no change to the bulk at ground level.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to close the Public Hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of DSUP#2025-10015 and SUP#2025-00048, with revisions to Condition #68 regarding noise mitigation measures and the addition of new Condition #115 regarding building accessibility consistent with the staff memo dated November 6, 2025, and subject to all other conditions, code requirements, and ordinances. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

68. **CONDITION AMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** If the noise study identified noise impacted areas, the applicant shall:

- a. conduct a Evaluate the building shell analysis performance of the new and existing building envelope (façade, roof, windows, doors, etc.), identifying ways to minimize noise and vibration exposure to future residents using either design changes or noise control measures and with the goal of achieving HUD standards for interior noise for residential units while maintaining the existing building envelope, especially the windows, where possible;
- b. Submit the results of the building shell analysis evaluation and the noise commitment letter for review and approval of the Director of Transportation & Environmental Services prior to Final Site Plan release; and
- c. Disclose as a part of each tenant's lease that the building has not met HUD standards for interior noise, if, following the process noted in subsections (a) and (b) above, the building is unable to achieve said standards. (P&Z) (T&ES) (PC)*

115. **CONDITION ADDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** Renovation of common areas inside the existing building and building ingress and egress be designed and constructed to meet accessibility requirements for new construction as prescribed in the Virginia Statewide Building Code to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Zoning. (P&Z)

#7 Development Special Use Permit #2025-10007

4880 Mark Center Drive

Public Hearing and consideration of a request for a Development Special Use Permit and Site Plan to construct a multi-unit residential dwelling and a Special Use Permit request for a parking reduction; zoned CDD #4/ Coordinated Development District.

Applicant: Bozzuto Development Company represented by M. Catharine Puskar, Attorney

SPEAKERS

M. Catharine Puskar, attorney for the applicant, spoke in support of the project. She noted that the team met with all the adjacent neighbors, including Washington Headquarters, NOVA Parks and the City's General Services team. She noted they are in talks with NOVA Parks regarding a potential future amendment to Condition 3a.i. related to a future access easement, and they hope to have it resolved prior to the City Council meeting.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Manor asked for clarification on the total number of spaces proposed for the parking reduction, which staff confirmed is 99 spaces. Ms. Puskar, attorney for the project, later pointed out there are an additional 24 tandem spaces. While they may not count towards the total, they can support households that want to maintain two vehicles.

Commissioner Brown noted the significant grade change that exists at the site and asked how the new building would change stormwater runoff and how that may impact the Preserve. He also asked whether significant amounts of fill would need to be brought in to mitigate the grade. Ms. Puskar, attorney for the project, stated that the project is utilizing the grade change to build parking into the hillside, and that significant fill will not be required.

Commissioner Dube shared his support for the project. He said he had spoken with staff and the applicant regarding the potential challenges associated with a single private road for access to the new building and the existing Del Pepper Community Resource Center, and that he is satisfied any issues can be mitigated.

Chair McMahon noted her support of the project and that it is a good location for housing, given the proximity to the Mark Center Transit Facility, Ferdinand T. Day elementary school and the Preserve. She looks forward to resolution of the confusion regarding the affordable housing contribution, as detailed in the AHAAC letter. She expressed concern regarding the impact of the tree loss on the ecology of the area and noted the area where trees would be preserved is not as robust as it could be. She expressed concern about light spillover impacting the wildlife in the preserve and appreciated the amended condition language. She requested that careful mitigation efforts are considered for street lighting during the final site plan process to protect dark skies.

Commissioner Brown asked about the status of the nearby Rutherford multi-unit development, approved in 2023. Staff shared that it is in Final Site Plan review, however, the current market conditions have slowed its trajectory, and it may need an extension.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Brown, the Planning Commission voted to close the Public Hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Lennihan, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Development Special Use Permit #2025-10007, as amended. The motion carried on a vote 6-0 with Commissioner Ramirez recusing herself.

- 6. CONDITION AMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION:** Provide a lighting plan prior to Final Site Plan release, unless otherwise identified below, to verify that lighting meets the City’s Design and Construction Standards. The plan shall be to the satisfaction of the Directors of P&Z, T&ES, Code, and the Climate Action Officer of OCA and shall include: (P&Z) (T&ES) (OCA) (Code) **(PC)** *
- a. Photometric calculations must extend from proposed building face(s) to property line and from property line to the opposite side(s) of all adjacent streets and/or 20 feet beyond the property line on all adjacent properties and rights-of-way.
 - b. All site lights designed to meet City of Alexandria photometric standards shall have photovoltaic switches.
 - c. The location of conduit routing between site lighting fixtures to avoid conflicts with street trees.
 - d. A minimum of 5.0-foot candle-maintained lighting for underground/ structured parking garages. When unoccupied, the lighting may turn off and on using motion sensors. Without motion sensor lighting, unoccupied lighting levels may be no less than 1.5-foot candles. **
 - e. Light fixtures for the ~~open canopies and underground/structured~~ parking garage, **including the entrances,** shall be recessed into the ceiling, **screened or otherwise adjusted to minimize light spillover** for any areas visible from the public right-of-way **and the Winkler Botanical Preserve.** * **

#8 Master Plan Amendment #2025-00003
Zoning Text Amendment #2025-00006
Coordinated Development District Concept Plan #2025-00002
601 E Glebe Road, 2601 & 2901 Main Line Boulevard, and 2900 Potomac Avenue – Potomac Yard
Public Hearing and consideration of a request for: (A) Amendment to the Potomac Yard/Potomac Greens Small Area Plan chapter of the Master Plan to set minimum and maximum densities for residential, retail, office, hotel, and continuum of care in CDD#10, (B) Initiation and consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment to Section 5-602(A) of the Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum amount of allowable residential units, decrease the maximum amount of allowable office space, and establish a mix of uses for the remaining density in CDD#10, and (C) Coordinated Development District (CDD) Concept Design Plan amendment to establish a change in uses and density for Landbay G, Blocks G, B and E, and Landbay H; zoned CDD#10/
Coordinated Development District #10.
Applicant: MTV Holdco, L.L.C., represented by M. Catharine Puskar, Attorney

SPEAKERS

Melissa Kuennen, 525 Montgomery Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendments. She noted her concerns about each of the sites, including how close the affordable building site is to the north, less retail along Potomac Avenue on Blocks B and E being less than what the CDD originally called for, thought there was little greenspace on Landbay H and lack of density.

Steven Palmer, 1320 19th St NW, Washington, D.C., representing a nonprofit affordable housing advocacy organization, was supportive of the project, noting the need for high density housing allowing for more affordable options.

Alex Goyette, 111 S. Jordan St, supports the affordable housing and overall increase of new housing.

Rev. Juli Wilson-Black, 3846 King St, representing the Virginians Organized for Interfaith and Community Engagement (VOICE), supports the amendments for increasing affordable housing. Stated that Potomac Yard is where the City should build homes for families.

Marsha Rhea, 918 Juniper Pl, representing VOICE, is supportive of the affordable housing proposal. She thought that the process needs to be more streamlined and the Master Plans less prescriptive to lessen costs for affordable housing developers.

Christophen Knight, 737 Swann Ave, advocated for Landbay H to be part of the Potomac Yard Homeowners Association so there could be a shared responsibility of open space maintenance.

Dara Shen, 2900 Main Line Blvd, spoke about concerns regarding parking and traffic impacts, would like to see more retail and walkability, and the location of the new town green next to the high traffic on Potomac Avenue.

Sean Welch, 3030 Potomac Ave, representing the American Physical Therapy Association (APTA), says his organization was drawn to Potomac Yard for it's vibrant and inclusive community with transit and a mix of uses. He supports the proposal with the added housing and retail growth.

Becca Dedert, 2307 11th St N, Arlington, representing the Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in support of the amendments with affordable housing and market-rate housing. She advocates for walkable, bikeable communities. While she would have liked to have seen more height and density, she recognized that there are market realities and supports the efforts being made to construct affordable housing.

Marcea Trick, 3510 Gunston Rd, representing VOICE, supports the proposals for family-sized and affordable housing. She lives in Park Fairfax, where it is multigenerational, diverse and walkable, and she would like to see more areas like that in the City.

Cathy Puskar, representing the applicant, made a presentation in support of the amendment requests. She spoke to the diversity of housing being proposed. She provided background information about the evolution of Potomac Yard over the years, noting that there is over 277,000 square feet of additional bonus density that has been built, and the proposals are reasonable for the current market conditions. She also spoke to the Potomac Yard Homeowners Associations' concerns, noting that the new project sites will be contributing to the special tax district that pays for the Metro station, while the existing neighborhoods were exempted at their request, and that the new developments will be maintaining all new open spaces.

DISCUSSION

Chair McMahan expressed support for the application. She noted that the master plan amendments are successfully updating the language to remove unnecessary specificity and updates language to note the existing presence of the Metro station and clarify that the community's vision of supporting transit-oriented development. The proposed Small Area Plan and CDD amendments create a bundle of density that is inclusive of various land uses, and sets a minimum density to a

support walkable, vibrant mixed-use community. The Chair had concerns with the specificity of the CDD plan drawings, in particular the specificity of the townhouse layout and building footprints, when this is not as important as the density numbers. She is supportive of the conditions to allow flexibility for increased density and adjustments to building footprints.

Further, the Chair spoke about the differences between what is desirable to the Commission and what is being proposed. The proposal is not an unreasonable use within the Master Plan and there is a legitimate planning purpose for looking at near, medium and long-term planning. She did note that if remaining density in CDD #10 is not used, that there's an opportunity to shift the density to North Potomac Yard (CDD #19). The community is asking for progress over perfection. The density approach across the three sites is reasonable. Without the proposal, the City would not be able to get the level of affordable housing we are seeing at the speed the applicants are proposing. She believes the requests are consistent with the Small Area Plan principles and continued neighborhood progress, consistent with the City's overall goals and objective of Master Plan.

Vice Chair Koenig said originally, he was supportive of the Master Plan amendment but not of the CDD Concept plan. Vice Chair Koenig noted that Potomac Yard has been a decades long community engagement process and has been successful. The original plans had lower density, as the Metro station was not happening. But when the Metro station was built, he saw the need for greater density than the lower density townhouses on Landbay H. Vice Chair Koenig noted that the Landbay G, Blocks B and E create a mega-block that should have broken into two buildings with the central pathway. Coupled with the townhouses of Landbay H, the proposals are less pedestrian friendly and do not contribute to a walkable neighborhood. However, Vice Chair Koenig found that Chair McMahon's comments brought clarity to the discussion and he would be inclined to vote in favor of the CDD Concept plan.

Commissioner Lennihan stated she would have liked to have seen more density on Landbay H, advocating for a multi-unit residential building and more affordable housing. She liked the availability of the additional density that could be used in the future but wished it was being used with this project. Commissioner Lennihan concluded that she would support the amendments, although she continues to struggle with the proposed low density when there is still density available.

Commissioner Brown stated the proposals are a case of not wanting perfect to be the enemy of the good. For a long-term development process, they are down to the last three sites. While the proposal offers less density than allowed, he felt there was relaxed scrutiny when the applicant is willing to leave some economic advantage on the table, whereas more scrutiny is needed in cases where the applicant is maximizing density. If the density is not all used with the current projects, then it is still available if something falls through or possibly adding the remaining density to North Potomac Yard. Commissioner Brown expressed his support for the amendments.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to close the Public Hearing. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to initiate Master Plan Amendment #2025-00003. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Dubè, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Master Plan Amendment #2025-00003. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to initiate Zoning Text Amendment #2025-00006. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Lennihan, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Zoning Text Amendment #2025-00006. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of Coordinated Development District Concept Plan #2025-00002. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Ramirez recused herself.

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning & Zoning Director's Report

Planning Director Paul Stoddard summarized the Director's Report highlighting the Virtual Community Meetings, the Docket Look Ahead report, and improvements to the docket and staff report materials.

Commissioners' Reports, Comments & Questions

Commissioner Dube gave an update of the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority Working Group. He discussed the appointment of new ARHA board members.

Commissioner Manor stated that, recognizing the progress of meeting the goals of the Small Area Plan, the Waterfront Commission must now refocus and determine its mission moving forward.

MINUTES

- #9** Consideration of the minutes from the September 4, 2025 and October 9, 2025 Planning Commission Public Hearings.

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of September 4, 2025 Public Hearing as amended to correct the formatting for the list of members present. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0

On a motion by Vice Chair Koenig, seconded by Commissioner Manor, the Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2025 Public Hearing as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 7-0.

#10 ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:52 pm.