

**ROSSLYN SKYLINE HEIGHT FORUM**

**HOSTED BY THE ROSSLYN RENAISSANCE**

**MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2010**

**MODERATED BY:**

**BRUNO FRESCHI OC, FRAIC AIA RCA**

**FEATURED PANELISTS:**

**VICTOR DOVER, DOVER, KOHL & PARTNERS**

**IVAN HARBOUR, ROGERS STIRK HARBOUR + PARTNERS**

**ANTHONY MARKESE, PICKARD CHILTON**

**MARK STRAUSS, FXFOWLE ARCHITECTS**

**JEFFREY TUMLIN, NELSON\NYGAARD CONSULTING  
ASSOCIATES**

MS. CECILIA CASSIDY: (In progress) – welcome you all. I’m Cecilia Cassidy. I’m executive director of Rosslyn Renaissance and we are hosting this forum this evening. Rosslyn Renaissance is the host and this event is sponsored by our terrific property members here in Rosslyn, the JBG Companies, Monday Properties, and Vornado/Charles E. Smith. They have done a wonderful job putting together this panel.

And before we begin, I wanted to welcome our County Board members who are here this evening: Chairman Jay Fissette, Chris Zimmerman, Mary Hynes, Walter Tejada. Thank you so much for joining us this evening. And – is Barbara here? She’s not here. Okay. Thank – thank you for coming this evening.

We are holding this session at the behest of the Planning Commission’s Long Range Planning Committee, which is chaired by Nancy Hunt – who’s in the middle over here. The Long Range Planning Committee has undertaken the Rosslyn Heights study and the end product of the study is to be a Heights plan for Rosslyn that will guide current and future development. In order to expand the discussion about what the Skyline should look like, about what our community can be in the future, we have brought together our distinguished panel for this evening’s forum.

Our moderator is actually a knight in shining armor. Bruno Freschi is – was knighted by the Canadian government – one of only a few architects given the Order of Canada, the highest individual honor awarded by Canada. We worked with Bruno a few years ago. He used to work here in Rosslyn for Cannon Design, and we are going to be able to upgrade the Rosslyn Sector Plan. We have worked with Bruno to develop a plan to do that. But then he moved back to Vancouver, where he comes from, where he is a fellow of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada. He’s also a member of the American Institute of Architects and one of North America’s most honored architects, practicing both in North America and Europe.

He was the master planner for the – for the 1986 World Exposition in Vancouver, British Columbia. He served as the dean of the School of Architecture at SUNY, Buffalo. And he is back in Vancouver now working on a hundred-year plan for Vancouver. We said our 20-year plan for Rosslyn is a little out of date, so I don’t know how he can do a 100-year plan. We were doing a two-minute plan downstairs at dinner to try to get up here, so Bruno kind of, you know, covers the gamut here, but I want to welcome him and you all, and I think that we will have a wonderfully enlightened evening tonight.

So thank you all for coming and I’ll hand it over to Bruno. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BRUNO FRESCHI: Now, I hope you can hear me.

Thank you. Cecilia it is a great, privilege to be invited to come back and to speak to everybody here on this very auspicious subject – the great city of Rosslyn.

I want to welcome everybody, the panel and the audience, to a discussion, and I want to explain to you how I want to run it tonight. I hope you'll bear with me and I hope it will bear fruit for you. Firstly, I have to make a mandatory announcement – the craziness of turning off all the gadgets. Whatever they are. Nothing disturbs everybody more than one of those things going off.

Second thing, you will have seen in the handout the biographies of the participants and I'm going to briefly introduce the participants and I want you to look at those because it was very important to explain the breadth of experience in my calculation. We probably have 200 years of wisdom here tonight. So we've got to maximize the exposure. (Laughter.) We'll have more of those, I'm sure.

The forum – we have two and a half hours, and so the forum really – the way to structure this is really to have each of the speakers – four here and one live but virtual – which you will see on the screen – going through their presentations to you, and I may interrupt and give questions. But only I can do that. (Laughter.) This is the single privilege I have then you can criticize me too. The idea is to have the individuals read their presentations and to allow us – myself and the five participants – to interrogate the subject matter. And it's my job to do that, to try to keep that conversation although I don't think I'll have any problem because there's just been very provocative things said already.

Then – that will be half of the time in the evening; the second half will be to, seamlessly, I hope, transition back to you, the audience. And I'll call upon you to also join in the discussion. Now, again, I'm going to ask everybody to please refer to those six goals that are stated. The reason I made a plain vision for that is for better time, focus – focus on the subject, the skyline, including related subjects to that.

And secondly and finally, I have to – and I promised to do a wrap-up of the evening – and I may miss subjects and issues and favorite points that people have and it will be important to get those so I'm going to offer you my e-mail and you will send me if you have a burning desire to have your point made.

All this will be recorded, so we will have access to those recordings. So we should get all the discussion and get key points. I would ask you there are only two mics available for questions from the audience and I would ask you to state your name, just so that we can keep a record of this. As a system, this has worked very well. There's a small enough infield and outfield – that's how we refer these two areas. It should work – it should work very well.

I've asked our speakers to restrain themselves and do their presentations within a five-minute room. That may sound impossible, but I've been working with three-minute windows and it is possible. And we've had some discussions about that – it seems like it will be – people will hold close to that. That's to create maximum amount of time for discussion later. In essence, there'll be about 50 presentations plus discussion, about 50-

70 minutes here at the front – in the infield kind of about 50, 60 minutes for you in the audience to participate. And we obviously started late, so I'm assuming we've some flexibility there – (inaudible).

The six goals are virtually – which is going to be the structure of the wrap-up tonight – are, one, massing and height of buildings and all variant; effects of height on architectural and footprint; appropriate density in transit-oriented development; skyline variety; ground plane and place-making. And I know the speakers have all touched on all of these already. Again, I'm asking you to remain focused on those six goals where we hope to get some conclusions on these items.

(Inaudible) – is to start things going that there are already many subjects that we've touched upon by the speakers. I really want to hear them. I will remain brief, but I will use my time in the interrogative phase or – (inaudible) – phase with the conversations to introduce subject matter. And, in my book, anything is possible.

You've heard mentioned by Cecilia, the 100-year plan. And that really is not a joke. It was a 100-year plan 100 years ago and we're still working on that, as they are in Chicago. And it's time for another – it's not a plan, it's a vision of the future. So anything is possible. In research for that, one, opening those story in 100 B.C. – 100 B.C., there were many people in what we called Rome today. They had a chariot problem – the private chariot. To us, of course, that's the car. They banned private chariots in downtown Rome 100 B.C. Think where we've come from then to now.

So really, anything is possible. So with that, I'd like to open to the speakers and we are going to begin with kind of a pattern here in the – Victor Dover. I will briefly introduce Victor, if I can find my notes.

Victor Dover of Dover, Kohl of Coral Gables, Florida. He's the principal-in-charge there, practice focuses on the creation and restoration of real neighborhoods and to bases from sound communities. He's an expert on livable and sustainable communities and cited as the country's best urban designer and architect. Imagine the series of books. I won't mention the whole litany of projects, et cetera – but mention the book, "Community by Design," and "Sustainable Urbanism." More importantly, he helped found the Form-Based Codes Institute – which – (inaudible) – and the National Charrette Institute – two think-tanks which is an appropriate place for this subject. So Victor, you're first up.

MR. VICTOR DOVER: Thanks, Bruno.

Everybody knows Rosslyn that's in urban design or planning or architecture probably has a love/hate relationship with it. They love the R-B Corridor because of the success – the smart growth success of concentrated density near transit. They also probably use it as an example on their slide shows about, at least the Rosslyn not too long ago as the example of density without urbanity, all the livable city pleasures that you want to have when you get that concentration to a purse.

So if the goal of the Rosslyn of the near tomorrow, 20-years or 100-years, two years is to get those city footers. To have density with urbanity through the next generation of redevelopment. You have to confront not just the bases of the building which we know you have been talking about a lot but also how long it's going to gather in a set, an ensemble and how to work, you know, as a whole, and including their height and their tops.

So the problem, the paradox of the modern metropolis is the high rise and the high rise neighborhood. On one hand, we love their inspirational quality. They make landmarks, that silhouette of a skyline plays into us instinctively. We love the way they consolidate retail demand and they work for transit, the long views they afford. These are things we love about them. We don't really love the – (whipping vortex winds of the base.

We worry about the next building after and what happen next because if you've seen the series, one after another of really bland buildings, we worry that the next building we get will be a really great big really, bland building. And that is ultimately at the end of all of the handwringing and consternation that goes into planning and regulating for these big buildings.

So as I've talked about that, in preparation for today, I've picked up from my desk the cover of *Preservation* magazine. Now, think about that. The picture of what the National Trust for Historic Preservation says, "We need to be careful to cultivate and preserve about our most livable cities." And look what they show. They show in the silhouette the skyline that is bottled.

Now, this is recalibrating your assumptions. If there was a time when we assumed we could get big buildings and tall buildings that were, in fact, very pleasing and had sculpted tops and were big but good. And so, the architectural demand is not just about how many floors, how many feet but about what's the quality and what are the ways that the buildings meet the sky.

So, all of sudden, instead of dealing with just density or floor area or ratios, the parking counts or something like that, you're dealing about compositional idea, a civic art idea. And we don't talk about compositional enough – at the scale of a neighborhood or the city, but we should. I tend to think that the compositional idea you see in a picture like this is one which there is a datum of the average buildings and there are the exceptions, where the slender parts of the city grow taller, and some of them have special pieces that are allowed to go higher still for purposes of making landmarks or making marquee statements on the skyline.

It's reasonable to think that that compositional idea has been much discussed here with Rosslyn's background briefing book. It's also a practical one, because with the idea that the tallest buildings are given a place close to the transit center and there is some sort of methodical tapering down to buildings around it. You get the idea that the tallest,

highest floors of the topmost buildings will have views over the slightly terraced down, shorter buildings in the outer rank. So it seems like a practical idea for preserving value. You sell that long view many times instead of only once. That seems a logical thing to consider.

So we – there are misgivings in our love/hate relationship with the tall buildings. We know they will be there because of certain highly desirable places. It's inevitable, and you've been dealing with this compositional idea. We saw the study, images, series like it that were seen recently. And you can see that thread from '92, '95, '97, 2000, very explicit by 2002, 2007 about the tapering of the top from the top of the tent pole, shorter at the edge of the tent which leaves us a lot of questions. How tall is the height maximum at the edge? That's unclear as far as we can tell. It probably needs to be incorporated. What's the shape of this thing? Is it more like a cone or more like a dome or more like a tent with a ridge? It's uncertain.

And what if there's more than one rule? What if it's possible for elements of buildings to pierce the basic volume height maximum with slimmer elements – slimmer components, penthouse ferrets, penthouse, habitable spaces. There's a precedent for that. And taller still for the – (inaudible). And then last how do you incorporate this interesting topography in the rule. Why are we regulating from the ground-up instead of from the top-down? But if the skyline is, in fact, the important subject.

There is a precedent for this kind of discussions. If you look back to 1916 when New York adopted a whole set of rules that confused a generation of architects and developers, it had to be explained. The 1916 rules about the massing of buildings to preserve light and air in the streets – were explained by Hugh Ferriss a whole series of drawings. And you could see here how a basic regulated volume and is reinterpreted eventually as a building form.

And all those buildings you see in Manhattan from 1916 to 1964 or so, were affected by this rule, because basically the great American skyscrapers, including those like the Empire State Building that were built in the Depression, were regulated by this concept that elements of buildings could go higher than the main body of the building if they were slimmer. And step back.

Now, the examples of buildings – aren't just the tallest buildings in Manhattan where you see this employed with a San Remo here, Emery Roth's masterpiece on Central Park West. There's a pedestal, there's a tower and there's a top. In fact, here there's a penthouse with habitable floors, which means it's an economic justification for building, and then there's a turret for pinnacle or spire which is not inhabited, paints, mechanical equipment and what-have-you that is taller still. So there's not one regulation in effect right there. There are several. I wondered about that.

So it's an idea of composition. If you go back into literature which we regularly do in architecture, right, we should but we rarely do and you can get this book John Beverly Robinson's Columbia text – I'll Google free books, right, tells you exactly what

this – what you're looking for. When you have a number of buildings rising directly one above the other, about one highest central building, like Arizona the Mont Saint Michel he was basically saying this is an idea that you can employ in the civic art design of the whole neighborhood. And why not?

In other words, why don't we do city planning three-dimensional instead of just two-dimensional? A productive thing to consider. And also, deals with things that in our gut we know about cities, we see examples all over the place.

So that summary of the four things: what's the end-type; what's the shape; what's the topmost rule that you can go higher; and how do we incorporate the topography?

I would argue that in the past, Rosslyn real estate was sold like a generic commodity and the price per square foot – this square foot is just like that square foot. But, in the future, you'll be selling this floor as unique from that floor and this corner office is different from that one. This address with the turret and the tower, the signature elements but we remember differently from that address. You get the idea? That's the phase you have coming.

Now, if you look at those – like the Oliver Cromwell building apartment buildings – there's a great example here, you can see that terracing of the form taking place, the whole thing is laid out for you. There is a main body in the building. There is a middle and there is a top. And that's a reflection of regulations and the world doesn't come to an end from having them.

Last, I'll say about the idea of regulating this way, it's not about modern precedent as well. Many transitory development areas are followed this way, especially New York City. This one's from the edge city in Miami, Tysons Corner of Miami, kind of. And they threw out the old rules and replaced it with a form-based code that has exactly this kind of concept in it. And they're just getting started compared to Rosslyn.

But if you look into more recent buildings in a picture like this one, you can actually see that regulated profile where the topmost pieces in the penthouse, five or so floors, are on, you know, bigger than 25 percent of the largest floor below. So there's variety in that and going that high is the option – some developers do it and some developers don't.

Last comment, I would say here is that the great enemy of reinvestment is uncertainty. You have to guess about what one might be able to do, then the depth is now stacked in favor of the largest developer rolling the dice in the biggest way. So instead of having 450 \$2 million gambles, you're going to have one \$900 million gamble at a time if someone tries to make it through a system without knowing what they ultimately will be allowed to do.

So a great gift to the developers, especially those on the edge, would be to say to them, we've figured it out. We actually know, we can tell you in advance and you can

plan for what the volumes of your buildings might in fact be, instead of have a guessing game (year in by year in ?) or month by month.

Thank you.

MR. FRESCHI: Thank you. A little over five – (laughs).

We bring you Ivan, senior director of Rogers Stirk Harbour and Partners. They're involved in a design-led practice of the future I've been told as – (inaudible) – practice. He is a leader in very complex projects. But his larger complex projects are led by a thorough questioning of design based on the – (inaudible) – biocontext, public realm, legibility, flexibility, sustainability and team work. Those are wonderful criteria. We'll overlook for the interest of you people in the audience here is the office building on 300 New Jersey and 1201 K Street offices, the local examples of the work.

Ivan, over to you.

MR. IVAN HARBOUR: Thank you. I don't think I'll manage to get this quite down to five minutes, but I'll try my best.

To me, community heights are pretty emotional subject and we're facing a number of projects any one time is practical. You know, to me, the target – (inaudible) – size, big, representative eco or green, but certainly can't be seen in isolation to good place-making and civic responsibility.

Now, we do believe that the compact city is really the only sustainable form for the future, building on brown field land, a scene with clearly defined edges. And maybe in this context, you know, height is appropriate to create density that contributes to a sort of critical mass of activity and will not rely on or increase the number of car journeys. You know, cities are places for people to meet and exchange and you don't meet people in cars. I think tightness of land, putting pressure on that land is what leads to vibrancy, let the car become an inconvenience on your daily life, then you're really on the way there. (Laughter.)

I don't think you've ever heard complaints about spaces that are too little, too tight. There are often complaints about spaces that are too big or windswept. Rosslyn has the scale of a compact city it's a 5 minute walk around a – focused upon a significant mass transit transport hub. I mean, it's also got natural constraints in the topography in that scope.

And then in a compact city with these clear limits, you can contrast density with open space and you can build more in an open space with less impact. And I would suggest, you know, the skyline forum here is being scheduled might not necessarily be in as described. You could, for example, say, that the topography might be driven by environmental impact and by orientation, for example, rather than the content of tapering to – through its perimeters.

I think mix of use, the scale and grain are really more important than height per se, the human scale, character and rhythm of buildings, their proportion and beauty which – whether it's related to skyscrapers or groundscrapers. You know, the first 25 meters or 100 ft. , 80 – 90 ft. of a building are the bit that really matter – (inaudible). You think about buildings that we enjoy through time, they have this scale that breaks down building into scale.

Now, the buildings I see in Rosslyn, in a way, fit in a scale currently which is an open scale. It's neither the height of trees nor does it have the – (inaudible) – of spires and points. It's that middle scale that's as wide as it is high. It's a very inconvenient scale to deal with, probably the most difficult. Yet, if you start and put together a mixed development, you can bring in other scales. You could – and together you can encourage a host of standard – (inaudible), you know, shared resources, whether it's sharing car parks, whether it's sharing – (inaudible) – system. I think broad standard development has big advantages. It's the onus on developers to think beyond the normal central boundaries. You know, they could accomplish old school for public realm as well.

Now, I don't believe in zoning. And I think that, you know, there is a reluctance, certainly around the world to develop residential in office areas and, quite frankly, for most part, it's because there's a worry a future neighborhood will restrict future redevelopment, you know, bringing residents into places causes future issues. There's also a reluctance to develop mixed residential communities – (inaudible) – you know, things that have a balanced community through various spheres, security, or just simple – (inaudible).

In London, we obligate up to 50 percent of the Cornwall house construction by number on – how can you build on the same side or in the same postcode. Students, for example, you know, university towns are always popular and that's because students are always around and they contribute to the life of any city.

I think most importantly and the point I'd really like to make is that key to us is design. You know, design has to be contextual, design should feel – it should be neighborly, it has to deal with neighbors. It has to be considerate public realm and that works alongside – it has to be – has positive contribution, it has to be environmentally responsive.

In all cases, whether the buildings are high or low, the environmental impact on anything that we do must not degrade that public realm. The currency of the public realm between public and private respect the historic conditions and – (inaudible) – and heritage buildings and places. You know, London, for example, its tall buildings are essentially are prescribed through formal view corridors the legal line for in which we must design.

Basically, height does have to be mitigated by measures that ensure that environmental conditions at ground level are conducive to good and well-functioning

ground plan. And that's what really very important design comes in. You know, density really can only be achieved in a sort of human, positive way through this good design. And thus, you know, design quality, absolute critical in allowing, I think, tall, dense development.

Sydney, for example, in Australia, it's obvious they have design excellence and there they allow a 10 percent incentive in terms of FAR over the maximum. But you can conclude if you're a small scale competition, it introduces anything that really approaches the development because there's a carrot at the end that compel generally a better answer.

In the UK, we have no FAR limit. We have no part of it, but in all cases, we need to prove that our bureaucratic process, quality of design. Now, that sounds great. Actually, it is a bit of a nightmare. It probably comes down to price objective. But the great interest in this ban between regulation and ability to make their case. Tokyo, at the moment, any limit is solely prescribed scientifically through broken science and somewhat has to adjoin buildings over a typical year and that, of course, leads to another tighter environment.

It's interesting looking at these cities and all their skylines, they're all different. They're not necessarily more effective than the other. But – and they all reach their conclusion, that halfway managed skyline in very different ways.

In London, we have – you know, we have a building of that's – (inaudible) – in the '50s or '60s, we need to build between 150-200 percent increase in floor area ratio in order to make it actually to incentivize that redevelopment. And if you're doing this, clearly design comes incredibly important, the specifications are a must, really. But the height isn't the inevitable. You know, Barcelona – one of the – (inaudible) – cities in Europe really has its – (inaudible) – stories. I mean, they have the occasional town, but essentially it's a low lying city.

I think there's – there are proponents against the simplistic height control. I think fixing heights, and by that I mean my own small experience – mixed of curiosity – this concept of fixing heights in such a simplistic way, I think, drives eventually poor quality space standards because it pushes developers to squeeze as much in and the concept of volume becomes secondary compared to the quality of space you've created.

You know, when we all think about buildings and spaces we enjoy, I think they have the sort of scale and sense of place and volume. It is better than the basic, better than the average. It's also a long-term thing. This is a sustainability argument, a flexibility argument to the future. You know, buildings of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century in UK were very flexible because I think they have good volume.

You know, fixed height applied to the penthouse, I think you need to question the part of penthouse, although I tried to in Washington, D.C. If you don't have a plant, can you not put something else up there? I went to visit the Chrysler Building. It was an exclusive view of the - and I was so excited. The minute I arrived, we found that the only

thing under that amazing skyline was actually a piece of structure containing absolutely nothing. I was quite shocked.

I think the skyline isn't really about building tops actually. I don't think it's about spire. I think quality of architecture is what it's about and quality of architecture is recognizable irrespective of that style.

That's – well, probably a bit more five minutes.

MR. FRESCHI: Close. It wasn't too far. We'll catch up.

Anthony Markese, principal, was a leader in Cesar Pelli's firm lecturer, teacher and designer. Local work, the examples of his work: 900 New York Avenue, ePower Line, which sounds like a TV show – is a state of the art emergency response unit for DC. And, of course, we did work on Reagan Washington National Airport.

Tony, over to you.

MR. ANTHONY MARKESE: Thank you very much, Bruno.

So Allison, you're going do view my slides, correct?

I think with the – there's a kind of series of common themes that are beginning to develop as we provide our presentations to, one, we've heard reference to is the idea of quality architecture, the skyscape scraper, skyline. I think you've heard also us talk about the scale and volume of Rosslyn and how that is a compositional issue. And I think I'd like to focus purely on a kind of an architect's view of the skyline and the concept of it being a sort of a complex three-dimensional problem.

Go ahead, Allison.

So it's as some of their presentations have, have alluded to, it's more than just superposition of a dome shape or a tent shape, it's really working with a form in three-dimension. It's working with the complexities of the growth of a city. We've heard reference to the concept of quality architecture being a big component of a nebulous skyline. We also have to be aware that as we think about the skyline as a composition, it has to respond to market forces. It also has to respond to the plan and (section ?) area that you're working with within the city. So I'd like to focus on those issues as I speak about skylines.

Next slide, please.

Here's an image of kind of four memorable cities: Boston, Chicago, New York and San Francisco. The common theme or the point that I'd like to make about is – is – sorry about that – is that each of these has their own shape and form. And really what defines them is their texture, the very nature and, of course, the idea that each one

contains – I'm very sorry about that – each one contains a few memorable buildings within them.

Next slide, please.

Let's talk a little bit about Rosslyn, in particular. There is a series of challenges and opportunities within Rosslyn's skyline. First of all, the scale of the (CO ?) district is quite compact and what that means is that each new opportunity for modifying the skyline has that much more pressure on it. It's defined by the eastern edge of the overall city forms, so again that limits the extent of opportunity and limits the extent of the mass that one can play with.

Probably the biggest issue or the biggest limiter in Rosslyn are the heights. First, the 300-foot height that's established by the zoning, but also beyond that, the 470-foot limit that's established by the FAA. So in the end, you're left with operating on a kind of very limited vertical plane that you can shape and you can control. We've heard talk about how Rosslyn is isolated by a series of roadways and that also has an impact on how the city meets the ground. And then also you've got to think about the skyline of Rosslyn in the round. It's visible from Washington, D.C. It's also visible from the west. That image changes as your perspective of the city changes.

Next slide, please.

I have a couple of different slides here. Here's in the downtown Rosslyn area. This is D.C. Georgetown. You see there, the roadways which isolate it. You also see that the massing has pushed to the eastern edge.

Next slide. An alternate view, showing some of the same issues – the roadways and massing to the east. There's a sense that it's at the end of the line and again, what that does in terms of shaping the form is it limits the physical size. You also have kind of frame views into the city which create opportunities to kind of view the landscape, to view the cityscape from a prescribed angle.

Next slide, please.

One other observation about the CO district is – actually, if you begin to look at it, over 50 percent of the parcels are still developers. So there is a lot of potential within Rosslyn. All of the slides you see in color, the blue and yellow are sites that are open. You can start to get a sense that in the near future, the complexion of Rosslyn will change drastically. So it's an opportune time to talk about cityscape and skyline.

Next, please.

Just a view of the skyline again, and I think one of your immediate impressions is near the height limits there's a sort of a plateau, there's a bit of a change, but it's fairly level and, in my view, requires more vibrance, more verticality, more density.

Next image. That's also reinforced from the kind of eye-level view where it plateaus out even more. And even more so from the views – next slide – from the south, where the city tends to level off quite a bit. I think there're lots of opportunity for additional height and additional density.

Next slide. So if you start to compare the scale and the density of Rosslyn to much larger cities, you realize that most cities have a lot more height and density to a similar planned area.

Next slide. Here's Rosslyn. Here's the CO.

Next slide, please. There's that same scale superimposed on the mall, about 80 acres. And you could see how it fits within a portion of the mall. So again, a very condensed area. You know, the Washington Monument is 555 feet high. So that's actually taller than any building that could be built in Rosslyn.

Now, if you look at the issue of density in the next slide – superimposed on those cities, you could see across the board in most of the downtown areas, San Francisco, the Loop in Chicago, the financial district in Boston, all of those cities have a much higher density, much higher FAR. You're looking at, you know, FARs in the 20s and the 25s. So again, for a similar planning area, those cities are handling much more density.

And then you see that same slide in three-dimension view. And you really expect to get a sense of that density superimposed on that scale. This is a cross-section through Rosslyn across Wilson Boulevard, looking north. Can you see the topography there on the lower edge? You see the 300-foot line there and then above that you see the 470 superimposed. And that's really, I believe, the opportunity in terms of thinking about the future. That zone there which represents anywhere from 130 down to zero, is that area which you can operate on, that area where you can provide additional density, additional height in return for a quality and perhaps high performance buildings.

Next slide.

So if Rosslyn is going to attract tenants from D.C., if it's going to compete on a much larger stage, if you are going to achieve this idea of a first-class urban center, I think you have to allow for views and height to draw tenants from D.C. You need that. You know, of course you need a compelling pedestrian experience. We've heard a lot about that prior to me.

Most importantly, in the future, as you begin to develop buildings, in the next 10, 15 years, you need to create an environment and a condition that allows architects to create high performance buildings, green buildings. And what that typically means is a larger floor to floor, more natural light, more daylight, more flexibility in how we design the floor plates, and I think there's a growing tendency to smaller and smaller floor plates more on the European model. And that's going to put even further pressure on the height

limits, because as those plates get smaller and developers want to maximize their FAR, it's going to continue to run up against that height limit.

Finally, how you build a rents that support the quality architecture that we've heard talking about? Again, that's through providing views, as for providing flexibility in floor plates that work.

Next slide, please. Here's some examples of tower tops. How would buildings meet the sky in terms of sculpting the skyline is very important. I think it's critical, as some of the earlier panelists have indicated, it's critical that those tower tops have meaning, that they have programs phases – sky gardens, rooftop elements, conference rooms, in this case, a special plug, conference rooms, or there's opportunity to shape those tops, so when the skyline is viewed from a distance, it has a more pleasant composition and it has meaning. The hardest most difficult problem we face with right now is the skyline is just sheered off because developers are building right up to that max. There's nothing left in terms of the FAR or in terms of the program to kind of help the buildings meet the sky. I think that's an issue we're going have to address.

The final slide – a couple of images of buildings, both of them high performance buildings again. A notion about what could happen at the ground level in terms of raising the building up, again that puts pressure on the height limit, you get gardens and more operational base. The idea of being able to shape the tops and alter or play with the compositions between two buildings to get that kind of stepped silhouette, as you see there, and again the idea of a top that has more than just an empty space, more than just a plant, a garden or something that can be occupied.

Thank you very much.

MR. FRESCHI: Thank you.

Next, Mark Strauss. Mark is a senior partner in FXFOWLE Architects and – (inaudible) – Urban Studio he now runs. He was president of the AIA NY Chapter and probably whose task it was to define the principles for the rebuilding in Lower Manhattan following the destruction of 9/11. He's a teacher, lecturer, numerous awards, most recently urban architecture in urban building design.

Mark?

MR. MARK STRAUSS: Thank you.

As mentioned, I'm co-director of the Urban Studio at FXFOWLE, and one of the projects that we're probably best known for is our Four Times Square building, which was considered the first green skyscraper and set the standard for the whole LEED certification standards. And one of the interesting thing that we discovered and part of our core values is that design's important and sustainability is important. But you really can't have sustainability if you're not urban and a number of people have stated that

earlier, and being urban means really getting people out of the automobile, creating a compact environment which promotes walkability and connectivity. And this is something that's very much a part of our efforts.

And if you – and as a consequence when we design tall buildings, when we design skyscrapers, the Reuters building on the left, we're conscious of what's happening at the ground in order to really think about how to create active urban environments where it's not only about the activity, the retail, but it's also about the connectivity to surrounding buildings and looking to create an ensemble where buildings really work together to create that kind of environment.

On the planning side, it was mentioned that we just won a world architecture award for the best urban design project of 2010. We were involved with this city regenerative plan effort in Copenhagen and where we created a project that looks to connect infrastructure, extend waterways and weave open space.

And one of the things that we learnt from our work overseas – and looking at waterfront environments around the world – is that the most vibrant waterfront environments are not the ones where you have this sort of static waterfront edge with art plan, a low zone following that – you know, three or four stories, a secondary zone and then a high-rise in the distance. The most vibrant waterfront environments are where the water comes into the land, the land comes out to the water and the buildings themselves have that sort of yin yang that create this active environment that people really enjoy being a part of. And you see a lot of that in Scandinavia.

And the other thing that's important to us is – and to myself – is when I was president of the AIA, I created a theme called “Architecture is Public Policy.” And the issues that I was looking at was the recognition that architects and planners need to partner with community and they need to partner with public officials. And there needs to be more dialogue such as – occasion such as this where there's an opportunity for public officials who may not be trained in architectural planning to appreciate what is necessary to make good places and good designs.

So architects, when I was promoting this effect, it was “Architecture is Public Policy: Listening, Learning and Leading,” it was listening where the idea was we also need to be more appreciative of community concerns and understanding where they're derived from. We need to learn that we also can't be afraid to lead and we need partners on the political side in terms of having public leaders who support and appreciate good design who are also going to wave the flag.

And this is me with Tommy Jefferson who was our fellow Virginian for you all. Now, he was the first architect president and really sort of promoted policy issues throughout America. And this was – for me, it was important to make a reference that architects need to be more involved in the political realm.

And as a way for me to get my feet wet, it was also mentioned I helped to put this group together called “New York New Visions” after the events of 9/11. And one of the interesting things about that I also think is relevant to the discussion here is that we put together a group that included 20 different organizations. It wasn’t just the AIA, it was the APA, the America’s – the landscape architects, the planners, regional planning – and the idea was that we recognized that we were going to be heard. And if we were going to create principal story building in Lower Manhattan, we needed to speak with one voice, and to speak with clarity. So we were able to create guiding principles – our principles were later adopted by the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation. And it allowed us to really sort of influence the notions of place, of connections, diverse uses, balanced growth, cultural resources and ensure environmental quality.

And I think that that’s something that we can bring – those kinds of lessons that in terms of coming together as a group where you’re speaking with one voice, I think is also important in Rosslyn. And one other interesting aspect of this area is Louis Mumford, a celebrated planner, said that even before cities are a place to fix residents, it began as a meeting place to which people periodically return. The magnet comes before the container. And it’s important to understand what are the magnets that brought people to this place? And initially, this was an initially a backwater advert about the pawn shops and the brothels and the breweries. But it was really about this sort of industrial service area for the D.C. Metro area.

And what ended up happening is that the magnets were the introduction of a highway system initially which really created an opportunity to think about Rosslyn not so much as an urban center but it was really about inter-change. It was related to the sort of inter-change that existed at the highway and these buildings were designed so that you come in to your apartment garage, come up into the building and what – none of these buildings were designed to interact or connect with one another – and it’s only been with the introduction of the transit system that there has been concern about how do we create a pedestrian environment, how do we get people out of these buildings and connect at transit.

And we as planners and architects, we look at – we love to sort of talk about the multi-levels of Rosslyn and the bridges and the tunnels and the underground roadways and above grade roadways. And what it ends up doing is that it took people off the street and we appreciate that now there’s realization that we’ve got to get people back to the street and be thinking about what’s happening on the ground.

And when you look at Rosslyn today, you see all the tall buildings, but we still really haven’t solved the sort of ground plane issues. And I don’t think we can talk about height unless we’re also talking about issues relating to ground. And so when I think – when I see the sort of dome plan, the tent plan, it’s – to me, this seems very static, that you know, you’re filling this in but again it’s not really solving the concerns of issues that exist in Rosslyn.

So – and I also think it’s not about creating towers and going up – you know, with regard to wherever you want them to be. It’s – I just – and if I’m speaking in a stilted way, I just came from Asia yesterday and I flew in from Dubai – and what’s interesting to me about experiencing Asia is, again, there’re all these isolated buildings. This is not dissimilar from Rosslyn in the ‘60s, where you have a highway culture, you come into your building via automobile, you go up and there’s no connection between building elements.

And I think that maybe a paradigm for Rosslyn might be looking at Sixtus V in Rome and Sixtus recognized that there were going to be major areas of public interaction mostly around religious institutional areas but also public spaces and local neighborhoods. And what he envisioned was that there would be a connective environment that would be created that encourages the connection between these places.

And not only were there connections, but at each place there was a space, a major space that was created and the towers are the Obelisk were the markers that defined those places. And it seems to me that when we rethink Rosslyn, especially a way where people are talking with one another and the development community at Renaissance, Rosslyn has organized the development community to talk with the public officials and the architects who are involved to speak with one voice, then maybe there’s an opportunity not to think about these isolated nodes of development but begin to think about connectivity between these buildings where the towers aren’t about an umbrella coming down to the waterway, to the edges, but the towers are defined so that they are actually related to a connected environment that can exist between each of these areas.

So you start creating more connectivity and they serve these markers to sort of guide your way, so that as you speak with one voice in Rosslyn, you forget about the Dubai and the ‘60s condition that existed here once before and you start thinking about how to connect the dots and create a place which are marked by tower elements that define your path, but also it’s about what’s happening at the ground with the public spaces and the connection between development sites.

MR. FRESCHI: Thank you.

Fifth is Jeffrey Tumlin. Jeff, Jeff is a principal Nelson\Nygaard. He has a pretty broad 15-year multimodal transportation and planning experience and background. The goal, he states, is to minimize the impacts of growth. We all are growth conscious – his is to minimize the impacts of growth. He’s had a variety of experience in transportation corridors, including in San Francisco, Dallas, Vancouver and Seattle and Washington, D.C. – (inaudible), locally in the D.C. area he has worked on studies from Shady Grove, Rhode Island Avenue and Tacoma Power stations. His experience includes studies in transportation master plans, transportation and management plans, outreach and consensus building in communities, including here in Arlington, Virginia.

Go ahead, Jeff.

MR. JEFFREY TUMLIN: Thanks, Bruno.

So I am not an architect. I am a transportation planner. But I'm here – I care a lot about the way they conform, the way they could form impacts of human behavior, particularly the way we get around. I'm also from San Francisco and like Arlington, San Francisco really likes a lot of public process, and we spend a lot of time talking about very, very fine details and try to control them, and our efforts in controlling them have been somewhat successful efforts.

And so when this conversation I've been involved in over the last couple of years is the shape of downtown San Francisco skyline. That is San Francisco's Market Street jobs core and they were wanting to continue expanding the San Francisco economy. But most of the neighborhoods, really everything north of the jobs core in San Francisco is essentially frozen in resin, there are historical neighborhoods that will not change ever. And so to the extent that San Francisco is going to be expanding its jobs core, it's expanding into the south into what we call the Transbay District. And to think of the scale, that is all of Rosslyn in the scale of San Francisco.

So San Francisco's been thinking about the shape of its skyline for a long time. It was a lot of conversation of it the '70s and '80s – a lot of it about sculpting the skyline largely to accentuate topography. But the topography accentuation aspect was really just a marketing slogan. The real cause between wanting to accentuate the skyline was getting accurate picture of this thing which is being able to sell the long view many, many times. So by not blocking views from individual properties, you create a lot of real estate value. So San Francisco's shaping of its skyline was more driven by real estate values than it was by sculpting.

And the next round of shaping the skyline is driven by similar reasons and so the new shape the downtown skyline is about like that – with the Transbay District rising far above, moving the center of the downtown to suburb. And raising the heights of Ricon Hill. And the marketing again is all about sculpting but the real reason behind it is capturing enough value from increased heights in the Transbay District in order to be able to fund for rail extension into downtown San Francisco.

And a ton of new infrastructure and it is no coincidence that the center point of the height in this diagram is the new Transbay Terminal building and its train lines. And the publicly-owned land underneath the former Embarcadero freeway. So the strategy here is recognizing that the public owns the potential for height and it's only going to sell that height to the private sector if they can get the right amount of public benefits in return. And that's what the shape of the new skyline will look like in the next real estate cycle.

Here in Rosslyn, we have the celebration of the blank wall. (Laughter.) And a lot of that comes from the history of this place being – the Tysons Corner, before it was Tysons Corner and trying to reinvent itself as walkable, open place around transit. So there's a lot of transition that needs to happen in order to make places like that or like the

incredible welcoming experience you get coming through from the metro station where please go look up or you might get hit in the head by falling chunks of concrete, or the tremendous assets that are immediately adjacent to us, one that you can't get to. You can see it but you can't get there. (Laughter.)

And the lengths that Rosslyn has gone to to create public spaces – (laughter) – this is a plaza – somebody probably a density bonus with this – there are flocks in the Rosslyn Renaissance probably they went to great effort to fund this beautiful flower pot with daffodils and violets. It's – you know, it's a great effort trying to create public space, but of course, this is no place that anyone would want to linger in.

And so interventions that are creating active public spaces are things like that the taco trucks that people are trying to get rid of, even though they are some of the most active places in Rosslyn. And this effort at trying to go halfway in between the sort of suburban setbacks of a Tysons Corner and an urban vitality of a Boston or New York or San Francisco, Rosslyn is a sort of halfway in-between place.

The other thing that we see about Rosslyn is that, again, it's tiny. It is six south of market San Francisco blocks. The entirety of Rosslyn is within an easy 500 walk of metro station. And this leads to a whole set of conclusions or the four key conditions I come to and thinking of.

One is that from an environmental or traffic management perspective, if that's all we care about, we would want to maximize height and density on every single parcel in Rosslyn because if it doesn't already, Rosslyn has the lowest vehicle trip generation rate in the entire Commonwealth of Virginia. This is a great place to develop from an environmental or regional traffic management perspective. But community character considerations we'll say, no, we're not going to max that out, so that's the thing that you really want to focus on is what is the right look and feel for this place.

Lesson number two is that, you know, given the FAA height restrictions and the height of the existing buildings, there's not an awful lot to play with. You know, you don't have a lot of room to come up with elaborate sculptural patterns. It is a small place and it's already mainly built-out you're not going to be able to create the drama of a Manhattan or a San Francisco skyline because there's not enough there.

Number three and probably the most important, again, is that as the public, you own the height here and that is something that you can grant to private developers to create value for them but make sure that you're capturing the value of that, that there's a public return on that investment and that you translate that value into better public infrastructure, better public realm, better quality of home spaces.

And finally involved and really perhaps most importantly of all – and both Mark and Ivan alluded to this – exactly what's going out there at 300 feet really doesn't matter. The most important thing in any city is what's happening at the first 30 feet. And so, to a certain degree, we wonder if you have the process backwards, if instead of asking what

should the shape of the skyline be, shouldn't we be asking what is the shape of the public realm in the first 30 feet and then figure out how much skyline you need to sell the developers in order to raise the funds that are needed in order to create what you want on the ground level.

(Applause.)

MR. FRESCHI: Thank you.

They stop too close to the time limit. With our remaining time, I'll keep this portion free so that I can get to broader questions from you, the audience. I have to say a few things – (inaudible) – everything that some things have jumped out fairly clear in this conversation. One, is that shaping the skyline whatever your belief is dome, tent, Dubai and spire – concepts of shape may be obsolete. I just got that and I'm happy to hear your – (inaudible).

The second thing about shape is (inverted ?) repeated – repeatedly denied is that Rosslyn is very small and packed place right now, that if I were you, I would worry about the fact that these 88 acres that are real are going to have to expand so what do you do about that? That cones envision I believe have embedded now two significant cones along Ft. Myer and down – the diagonal one down Wilson. That if I come from a city that – and I was party to some of you are already researching this, unfortunately, to establish the idea of this vision.

And some of my graduate students became planners, got into City Hall and picked these cones, in fact – (inaudible) – picture, you see the entire downtown of Vancouver is blanketed by cones which effectively has cut off the height of buildings which will not last. So the cones have been too arbitrarily – (inaudible) – because there was a lack of discussion about privilege. What is the privilege view or place of privilege for the (view ?) cone. If it's used, you end up with an – (inaudible).

You've heard discussion and many have brought the discussion down to that bottom 30 to 100 feet which we all know is critical in terms of ground plane. And although height was disassociated with the ground plane, you speakers have brought it together. I want to add one phrase to that and that is to get to the concept of the street other than the concept for the automobile – I could remind you of Rome we've started to refer to the street as a social contact. In other words, whatever is going on on the street and however been done with, that it is each building a social contact. So there's something to do with what people are doing at the street level has become very, very significant.

I'd ask for a local set of responses to those comments and then I'd like to come back to introduce your comments within that. Anybody?

MR. DOVER: The idea of shaping the skyline is obsolete was not unanimous.

MR. FRESCHI: Not quite unanimous. (Laughter.)

Yes?

MR. DOVER: One thing I think is going is that there's been talk about keeping Rosslyn competitive with other office markets or hotel markets or what-have-yous. But there's also a very internal competition and these are buildings that are competing with each other, not just with the links and ties with or buildings in the district and buildings also around the R-B Corridor and that's – that ought to be one of the motivations for the next round of architecture to sell the quality and to sell the sculpted view and the sculpted landmark quality. You're not just competing with outlying places, or non-members of the Rosslyn Renaissance Club here. There's competition within it and we ought to admit that and encourage it.

MR. FRESCHI: Anybody else take that one?

MR. MARKESE: Well, the comment about composition or superimposed form as being obsolete, I think that the statement is true that it wasn't unanimous, but I think one of the statements that was unanimous is that there's really not much there to play with, if there was more to play with, i.e. San Francisco Transbay, it may be a more germane discussion.

But then I think all of us feel very strongly that what's left after the 300 or after the FAA doesn't leave much for meaningful sculpting or meaningful value. And I think one of the reasons that even the panelists is unwilling to deal with just – (inaudible) – and talk about the ground plane is that, you know, they realize that the two kind of go hand in hand. And that if you're going to operate at one level, you also have to operate on another level.

MR. FRESCHI: Would you – would you like to speak to your connections? So I thought – sorry to address that subject. (Inaudible) – connections. Yeah, that was Mark, yeah. (Laughter.)

MR. STRAUSS: Personally, I think there is an opportunity here – the opportunity – it's I find it a pleasure to be in a room where a development community – and I guess it's the credit goes to Renaissance Rosslyn, the major players are all in the same room together and they seem to be talking with one another. And to have that opportunity to reshape this place in a joint way, I think is in everybody's best interest.

And in order for it to really work though, I think in order to get away from, you know, '60s Rosslyn and issues of what I saw in Asia of how everybody doing their isolated project and nobody thinking of how they might connect at the street. I think what I will propose is that all the architects for the various developers who are working with one another actually have a workshop together and start talking about how they can connect their projects and really create more synergy between them and so that the whole is greater than the sum of the individual parts.

In order for that to happen, there might be that – you know, you say that we only want a certain number of buildings to be really tall but as tall as they can be and everybody gets a couple of them. And you figure out – and those become the markers, so that you then create some sort of line of movement like Sixtus VI where there's some actual relationship between these locations, and if there's also something happening at the ground that creates some spaces that really begins to create this nebula that works together in the sky and creates a compelling skyline environment, or limit a compelling skyline because we all agree that there isn't enough room once you get above – at the top end.

But you also start thinking then about what is that connective environment that happens at the ground and how you can create more synergy and more connections between the various redevelopment sites.

MR. FRESCHI: Wondering whether – yeah. (Laughter.) (Inaudible.)

MR. HARBOUR: Is that me?

MR. FRESCHI: Yes.

MR. HARBOUR: I don't know where I figure in your place now, it's obviously – (inaudible). I think with the – you know, certification is the key. You need to stick within these very clear boundaries that exist in Rosslyn, and actually the content of creating a three-dimensional master plan which actually may cross existing ownership boundaries which requires negotiation. It is probably the critical thing to get people to talk together and allow everyone to benefit.

And that master plan, I think, has to be seen not just in the context of reaching this absolutely height in which it is defined by the aviation authority that's there, but also neighbors that's across the water and other environmental concerns in – (inaudible). It is so important that the impact of tall structures does not impact on the public realm, so sunlight and mitigation of wind the making of places is crucial for that. So I would really be an advocate of the concept of three-dimensional master plan in all its complexities.

I'd also been advocate for incentivizing – again, I come back to good design because in the end you can only create a three-dimensional master plan together with good design and that, you know, we shouldn't be afraid of being realistic about allowing incentives to make this thing work. I've worked in Beirut and it's fascinating. They are restoring the center of Beirut and all around the building center they have they're only able to build their buildings up 50 stories. Of course, there a government was organized – (inaudible) – actual – (inaudible) – will keep the historic core. There has to be a methodology in talking across boundaries, I think, for the greater good of the place.

MR. FRESCHI: Okay. So it wasn't unanimous. It was that American three-dimensional concept still here.

So may I ask another general question and that is: Given the – given growth, which is anticipated, given the small footprint of the city you know I've always suggested that you will have to expand build the next, very soon you're going to see a 50 percent increase in population whether you like it or not, whether you legislate or not, it will creep in. That will force the boundary consideration, doesn't force anything else.

Is there – (inaudible) – three-dimensional envelope for Rosslyn to absorb much more and to indeed achieve some of the design excellence as we've talked about? The idea that – (inaudible) – is, in fact, is a dome or a tent, whatever to achieve that within the limits of the existing height constraints and the pressure for growth.

I'm turning that over. We all agree – is vital critically. I think we all agree with that. So this is line with densification as a sustainable concept.

MR. TUMLIN: I think other challenges we're facing in Rosslyn is fundamentally constrained on all side, so it can't grow out. They're not going to be demolishing beautiful Arlington neighborhoods and unless somebody comes up with an awful lot of money and can deal with the federal agencies, we're not going to be expanding out over the highways.

So it's landlocked and we've got an FAA restriction, you know, might – maybe have some future flexibilities some day as we change technologies but who knows it's speculative. So you know I think there is a finite box that Rosslyn fits in and for the purposes of this planning exercise, I think it's fine to play within that box and to assume that the remaining regional growth pressures are going to go some place else that we are going to creating, you know, new Rosslyns – or not new Rosslyns but something better.

And I think that's been the whole idea of much of long-range planning that Arlington has been doing and that Fairfax County for example, starting to wake up and realize that they have a role to play there as well.

MR. FRESCHI: So you can say that in fact, within the section that – (inaudible) – Tony, that there is this approximate how many feet of play in the top-end, the envelope due to constraints and regulations within that to achieve the quality and the legibility that we've all talked about here tonight. Is that – is there any kind of thought that's possible?

MR. DOVER: Well, the legibility that's been under attack a lot is down lower and there's no shortage of open space. The figured ground map that Tony showed earlier on, I mean, (inaudible) – showed just how much loss of space there is between buildings down below, excessively wide streets and perfunctory plazas that aren't contributing.

So now you have open space but it's not useful because it's not been meaningfully shaped or you have things like the park that's across the street that no one knows is there because of the terracing and the walls around it and the expectation that you're going to go onto – (inaudible) – precast panel expose aggregate bridge and walk

up and you come down below you get over there you know, transportation planners are fond of pointing out that the overhead bridge's primary purpose is to provide shade for pedestrians that insist on crossing down below. (Laughter.) (Inaudible.)

So I think there's actually a lot of room to grow in Rosslyn. I also know there's a lot of room to grow on Columbia Pike where there's a new street car line planned. And there's a lot – there are a lot of places within Arlington County to grow in addition to the constraint Rosslyn, so I am relatively unconvinced that you need to expand the area for tall and supertall buildings in Rosslyn when there's so much unrealized potential within those other close-in communities in the county.

Tony said something this afternoon before we started. I'm going to quote you, probably, incorrectly, but it – it was about this view of the tops of buildings, background materials how it was pointed out that it's often mentioned about their goal of preserving the panoramic views from the top of the observation deck at Central Place.

And what Tony said was if you go to the top 30 Rock and you look south, or you look in the right direction, you look – you will see the Empire State Building and the Chrysler Building so on popping up into that view. Well, that's a fundamental compositional idea, that you don't just have the foreground of the railing and the background of the long view – in this case across the river, but you have a middle ground as well and you can improve the middle ground by having things come into your – into one's field of vision.

MR. TUMLIN: Assuming it's not a big refrigerator box.

MR. DOVER: That's right, yeah. And so I think the quest is for those buildings which do go up to be individual in the way that – all the architectures have described. And I'm willing to make the argument that individuality comes – that there's a basic grammar for that in architecture, it is slenderness and verticality, that boxy forms or forms that appear to have been cut off, you know, the horizontal line don't tell to lend that but – and rather slenderizing the forms does do it.

And that's an idea that all in 5,000 years of history of city-building demonstrates to us in individual buildings and in whole neighborhoods. And my friend – (inaudible) – said certain propositions once thoroughly tested can be assumed to be true. You don't continually try to eat by sticking your fork in your ear. And I think he's right, that we ought to be using that slenderness to get that individuality and the meaningful tops.

MR. FRESCHI: And you believe that's possible in the existing model?

MR. DOVER: I do, probably because I believe that a lot of the lower slim buildings that will be redeveloped are not just obsolete because of the amount of square footage that they have in them, but they are obsolete because of their very design and

they'll be replaced and due to their age and their inadequate design, not just due to their height.

MR. MARKESE: And I would say I'm directly in line with Victor and Jeffrey in that it may be we're still focused on the short-term. We're not looking at the 100 years but in the next 25 years dealing with that which is inherent in Rosslyn is the problem and that to expand that basic 88-acre form beyond is actually going in the wrong direction and that to continue to encourage density which is probably more important than the skyline form.

MR. DOVER: (Inaudible.) (Laughter.)

MR. STRAUSS: (Inaudible.)

MR. MARKESE: States are going to – you know, within that form that's given and stick within that proximity to transit. I don't see the metro adding, you know, another station in close proximity to the one that's there now. So work within that and to Ivan's point, you know, have that be the most powerful thing it can be in that in that cube or in that box and try to find a way to reward quality of architecture because in the end if you could have quality architecture, that's going to speak powerfully than one's perception of what a graceful skyline form is.

MR. STRAUSS: And I would add also quality public spaces because I think that again it's what's happening on the ground, the people are going to remember and want to be a part of and we have to think about connecting public spaces as well as connecting the activity centers of the buildings.

MR. MARKESE: So that's where I might differ from you a bit and that was this idea that one can create a series of axial corridors and I think given the scale of Rosslyn as opposed to Washington or Paris, that broad axialvistas aren't necessarily in the cards.

MR. STRAUSS: Well, it might just be working with the existing grid. I mean – and that maybe it's not about adding a new diagonal, a new – new streets or pedestrian – networks, but it might just be about making – really thinking about how to make those streets, more pedestrian-friendly and thinking about in certain locations, creating something at the ends of those streets that really become markers that attract you.

MR. TUMLIN: And I think, Mark, that's actually – that's exactly what I was thinking of in terms of thinking of the axial nature of Rosslyn. It's too small to think in terms of, you know, an arch you know, seven miles later another big something or another.

But one of the greatest problems with Rosslyn is the sheer randomness of the – walking down any street, like every single street, it changes its cross-section and sometimes directionality and all the materials and the light fixtures and the way the buildings meet the street on every block. There's no sense of continuity as you're

walking down the street. You never know when you've found the center of Rosslyn because there's not one. Buildings – there's not a single building that has a clear front to it. You know, buildings – in fact, many buildings are all backs, you know, like every single side is a back because there's a blank wall that sort of parking garage facing you as you're walking up as a pedestrian.

So what I want to see in Rosslyn is the first thing is a public realm plan for every single street and do not just the block face of one building and make that developer change, you know, the 15 feet of sidewalk in front of the building but force the developers to work together – force all the developers to work together to create consistent public realm plan from one end of Rosslyn to the other for each street, and to fund the implementation of that through changing the zoning and incentivizing height or whatever it is you need to do in order to create value and then capture that value.

You know, and those become the – (axials ?) – and that you use the detail in the ground plane to use public art and you use, you know, café tables and taco stands and, you know, all little tools, you know, the small places for public performances in order to make Rosslyn memorable.

(Laughter.)

MR. HARBOUR: There certainly seems to be a lot of blacktop available and you know, it looks to me as if, I think, you know, this is a bit typical of most cities developed post-war that's actually topped-out the amount of space available built to unbuilt, it will be the unbuilt space that dominates. And I think that there is plenty of intentional, if that's possible, to work within the totality rather than being confined necessarily by the back of sidewalk dimension to develop maybe North America's equivalent to the Italian hill town even, and where in fact – the fact that it doesn't have the right concrete, you may find its advantage.

But perhaps to orient or to see the future of this piece of city as something which isn't based around a multi-lane highway as a concrete but more – a walking place which it can be. I mean, it's as we've said it's only – it's five minutes from the metro to the edge. I think it has great possibility, a great position in its natural environment to be densified.

And, as I said, plenty of open space at the moment appears to be left there are a few cars where, again, you don't meet-and-greet cars.

MR. FRESCHI: Mark, (inaudible). I think there is, I will go back to the first proposition. I may have spoken too broadly perhaps as a consensus that while we do speak of three-dimensional shaping with quality to the issue of architectural quality both in public space and buildings within the small footprint in Rosslyn and respecting the fact that the point has been made, that there's a great deal of, in fact, space for development within that 88 acres, both as in blacktop and an undeveloped Rosslyn and developed Rosslyn buildings.

(Inaudible) – idea that – if I were to put to each of you: What about the shape? What about the general shape? Which we see in the diagram form – (inaudible) – in the briefing materials we’ve received and on the slides tonight. Let me say shape isn’t what, what are we talking about? If we can narrowly focus on that one question. What is it we mean by that? Is it, in fact, a formal composition as we understand if one said dome, dome-shaped, or any other that we care to choose? Is it? Is it question of a shape, or is it an openm varying skyline that come about through the conditions of time and place – (inaudible), whatever? I’d ask each of you.

MR. DOVER: Would you like me to go first?

MR. FRESCHI: Go ahead. (Laughs.)

MR. DOVER: Well, I’m the one who insisted that we marked out on the record that it wasn’t unanimous, because I actually believe that the uncertainty, which is my final point, can’t be overcome without individual property owners having some idea of what they’re going to be able to do. They have to be able to turn their architects loose to do the most creative solution, but then they’d enter the operating of a political campaign and an extended community conversation via the Arlington way.

Coming down on the end with something we don’t know what that – with that said, does leave a lot of opportunity to negotiate additional public benefits in the way that Jeffrey described, extracting one promise and then another and another one meeting or hearing at a time. But it also gives the developer an incentive to propose the boxiest, baddest most FAR maximizing starter point proposal, knowing that when they go through that pipeline process it’s going to be carved and trimmed and taken away from and chewed at as they go.

And so wouldn’t it be far simpler to make it very clear from the beginning – we have an idea and the governing idea is that there’s a general tapering from the tallest point down toward the edges we know what the height of the edge is – that seems to be in the clear now. And that shape can be quite flat, it doesn’t have to be super steep in order to achieve the objective, particularly if you think of it as a multi-layered thing where everybody gets to go to X. Those who make a slender portion can go to Y, and those who want to put penthouse or a turret or a pinnacle or spire beyond, can go to Z.

If we do that, then you can make it clear from the beginning what people are doing from the pipe. Then go through the whole process, negotiate all the other aspects, if necessary, to maximize the public benefits but at least this question about height wouldn’t be left to guess at.

MR. FRESCHI: So centering the height?

MR. DOVER: Actually, if it start at what is deemed to be the top which probably is the observation deck and then extend a very simple geometric shape which you could

put into a computer model everybody can find depending on where they are, what their piercing point is. And again, I think a fairly flat shape would be good. That might say to people at the edge who are worried about losing in this whole deal – and let me start off from a higher point than they once thought there if we're going to be able to get. So that will be a win for them. That's one way to get at it.

The dome is more naturally occurring, pyramidal kind of form than a tent or a pyramid would be, I think, in a situation – the economic extend concentrically through the metro station and the central place.

MR. STRAUSS: I actually disagree with that. I don't necessarily feel that we have to slope down even if it's gradual to the edges. I'd rather find another reason for defining what the height of – in certain areas should be. And maybe it's – you know, just as going back to classical city building – the tallest elements were, you know, the steeples in the community or the gateway arches or things like that.

Maybe there's a – if a cultural component is provided, maybe that then becomes the – creates the opportunity for a building to go higher and that, in a sense, also creates a marker that signifies that activity. And – but for one thing that's of interest to me is that the edge is having those visibility, especially the edge facing the river. And as a consequence, having a few markers along the edge that are really visible that allow some height, I think, will create a more interesting expression for the urban center as a whole. And I wouldn't mind seeing some tall elements. I think the worst thing is something that is very static and I'd much rather see something that allows some variety and activity that find the rationale for creating where that variety and rationale should be.

MR. MARKESE: I'll try to be very succinct and brief.

MR. FRESCHI: Right.

MR. MARKESE: I think the superimposition of any form is a mistake. I think it's losing focus on what's important. I think that constraints on the volume of Rosslyn are tight enough as it is and to further reduce that, or further complicate that by imposing a form is going in the wrong direction. I think the emphasis should be on finding a way to reward quality or sustainability or a gift back to the city, to the public is the way that the skyline should be defined.

MR. TUMLIN: I had to do a diagram. So currently, Rosslyn is a collection of giant refrigerator boxes that are set on top of parking garages, right? So we have – from the street, you see the brick wall of a parking garage or something that's cause, there are the architects here don't know how to deal with topography unlike in my city which has a lot more topography than we'd figure out you can still have a lively street front and a slope. So widely-spaced refrigerator boxes, lots of open space. Lots and lots of open space in Rosslyn, very little of it do you – does anyone actually want to linger in.

So – and also big dimensions between streets, so things are pretty spread out. So the alternative view of that is taking sort of the same thing but instead of having refrigerator boxes, you have buildings that have a podium to them, you know, substantial enough to hold the street maybe as tall as the street is wide, or you know, plus or minus 50 percent – as in and then a tower above that. Put the buildings a little bit closer together and create useful, you know, substantial, useful open spaces or small open spaces that have a really good sense of enclosure to them that people want to linger in. So not all open space is good. There is a lot of open space here in Rosslyn that actually subtracts value. It's worse than having it be a building.

And then, you know, connect it to its natural assets like Roosevelt Island. So from my perspective, I'm not an architect. I don't care what the skyline is shaped like. You should shape the skyline however it is needed in order to create enough value that people will demolish the really bad buildings and replace them with better buildings, and to shape the city more like this than like this (indicating drawings). So figure out what kind of place it is that you want and then figure out what's necessary to make the economy work to deliver that place.

MR. DOVER: Did you consciously make the one closest to the river the tallest?

MR. TUMLIN: I was – I was sort of respecting the FAA height limit.  
(Laughter.)

MR. STRAUSS: You're going up to a single plane.

MR. TUMLIN: I was going up to a single plane because I don't really know.

MR. HARBOUR: It's my turn?

MR. FRESCHI: Yes, go ahead.

MR. HARBOUR: I'm drawing a diagram as well. (Laughter.) I mean, I – I think this is already a compact piece of city and I think my feel, you know, the form comes from the right discussion and where the upper limit is the civil aviation authority. But as an outsider, if someone just asked me, well, what's your gut feel as to where form will go and I have to say this is just, as an outsider I'm not saying one things more important than another, but you've got the National Mall with the monuments at the end and – (inaudible) – and – (inaudible) – we do something like that – (inaudible). (Laughter.)

My gut feel would be – my gut feel would be that if you were to do anything, to respect that which is national and international, it should somehow equate from that form and even – (inaudible) – something that might help get work – (inaudible) – something that's, I think, maybe more related to the environment and therefore, (inaudible) – adapt to your street level – (inaudible) – necessarily – (inaudible) – subtle symmetrical – (inaudible) – form of to respond more to the environmental considerations of – than being a full statement.

(Laughter.)

MR. FRESCHI: Nonetheless – nonetheless, it is a forum.

MR. HARBOUR: (Inaudible) – it's talking to the market beyond the locality.  
(Laughter.)

MR. FRESCHI: Okay. (Inaudible) – because the other one –

MR. HARBOUR: (Inaudible.)

MR. FRESCHI: The other piece of this issue of shape is that – (inaudible) – place, a place of context – (inaudible) – behind – (inaudible) – there'll be more domes or tents or triangles or whatever. So in terms of the general context is whatever shaping attempts occur would they survive in the long run? In the general context, the development corridor here, perhaps you've touched the drawing last and I'm going to shift this to the architect.

MR. DOVER: Well, earlier I had said instead of thinking of a single height limitation that you might think of it in layers and you can pierce from one given as of right height to another if you're slendering developing elements that go up to a maximum percentage of the biggest floor below or to a maximum dimension, or to outside the view corridors or – (inaudible) – combination of them.

If you go through another level still higher if you're – if you were doing so in the special tops, the sculpted tops at the penthouse or penthouse's spire. And that's what I mean by X, Y, Z. In fact, that's what Jeffrey drew was that idea. Now, he took the editorial license in drawing the tallest – or nearly tallest building at the water's edge and that would be a subject, I'm sure, of harsh debate.

I think the idea that – well, we should be planning for what we consider the ideal in giving their best advice, but I do believe that sweeping the slate clean and saying from now on we're not going superimpose any forms because that's a mistake is an unlikely to succeed proposition. First of all, we care a lot about property rights and people want to know what their rights are and they may – they wonder from among here – that's a problem. And then in addition, we have deeply concerns surrounding communities that want to know what the – what's going to be their – and they're going to insist that some form be superimposed, whether it's a flat one or a domed one or one that's shaped like the Eiffel Tower.

So – and they'll never accept the idea of eliminating requirements. So – and other requirements. They are to be form giving. Used to be clouded in abstraction and cloaked in just FAR and parking requirements and so on. Thankfully, the movement now is to make them more explicit, think that's helpful.

MR. FRESCHI: Well, that seems to be one of the central there are other, many, many other points – ground plane notwithstanding. (Laughter.) Okay. Before I switch to the audience –

MR. HARBOUR: Sorry, this is – this is the other – your – (inaudible) – fantastic – (inaudible) – quite clear to me that one, if I may bring this up – not very well – but one other thing – I was trying to say one of the things I am dead against is the idea that you start to regulate things such as setback height, shoulder height. This is the beginning of restricting and development so that eventually the envelope gets breached in all cases.

And I think in that respect while I was trying to say, look, there's a better answer here for this particular site and I would reinforce if you have those sort of rules, they should be guided by should be debatable with design being allowed to be discussed that might allow something different to happen, something more interesting whether it's a key building point, for example, or key marker within the city core, otherwise you risk another type of monotony.

MR. FRESCHI: Good point. So guidelines, not rules. More said than done, right? (Laughs.) After all that's said and done.

You must – hopefully, you're anxious to say something. So I'd like to now shift this over. I think you've got a pretty clear set of positions, shift this over to the audience and which I call the outfield and you come in and you play ball with us in the infield and ask your questions, or give us your position – (inaudible).

MS. CASSIDY: I'll say people's names, Brian Harner was on Rosslyn's urban design committee and now he is on the Planning Commission.

Q: Hi. Thanks very much for this great discussion and bringing to light all these points; a whole bunch of things, like you said. One thing, I think that to try to weave some commonality between some of the very segments of the panels there, I think following up on what Jeffrey said somewhat the key thing we're looking for here is a system of order and that just as we have our completely lack in the system of order at a ground plane with a randomized grid, et cetera, we also – no system of order is carrying through to the skyline.

And I – for essentially a lot of the arguments are boiling down to different systems of ordering for the skyline, whether it's based on environmental conditions and sun angles or they're based upon some sort of dome shape or a pre-determined shape, et cetera. And so I think that, you know, from a very sophisticated standpoint, you could start to create multiple systems of ordering and that we better have at least one system of ordering at some point to make some coherence of the skyline.

Just very quickly, the second thing is I think that if you really start looking at the skyline, we shouldn't give up hope and say that we're too constrained, or that it's – that we're not – we don't have enough flexibility, we don't have enough height to make a

difference, because some of the greatest cities that have ever been built across the world were built exactly because they have significant constraints. So I just like you to address those two conditions about systems of ordering and constraints.

MR. TUMLIN: Let me take the first answer versus – (inaudible) – although I have just stated that I don't care what your skyline looks like. That's not completely true. I fully agree that it must have a system of order. What I fear though is that you're working at it backwards.

And what we learned in San Francisco for both of its very finely detailed systems of ordering was that the system didn't come first. It was in response to basically real estate value captured. So the first system of ordering was in response to residents' concerns that they were losing their views as San Francisco was developing and so allowing taller heights higher up ensured that every single person at least had some view. And then the system of ordering was put into place in order to put that into practice.

The new system of ordering looked at a program of public benefits that needed to be financed and calculated, you know, went through a proforma exercise to figure out how much additional development capacity needed and then created through the additional height in order to spin off value that could be captured in order to fund those public benefits. And that was run on a parcel by parcel basis.

So looking at land ownership, looking at tower spacing, looking at views, looking at soft sites, looking at what was – what were the horrible buildings that we needed to get rid of and replace, all the way down to the parcel level, it was a horrible, horrible, horrible, horrible fight. But the resulting shape and system of ordering of the roads, not form. You know, what should the skyline look like but rather what are we trying to achieve and how do we get that end result. So height is the means, not the ends.

Q: I'm Stan \_\_\_\_\_, a member of the Rosslyn BID Board, but more importantly, I'm president of the adjacent civic association known as \_\_\_\_\_. A word I didn't hear tonight, maybe I did hear it. I'm sorry, but somebody said so. I just like to say that I've agreed with everything that's been said by those on the panel and disagreed with much of what you said.

One of the things that I disagreed with is a constant reference to Rosslyn as a city. Unless there is a secessionist movement I haven't hear about it's part of Arlington County, it's surrounded by a residential area on two sides and the nation's capital and the river on the other two sides. It's a unique community. It can't be compared to New York or Vancouver or Seattle or any other city which is ten or 20 or 30 times the size of it. You've made reference to that tonight. But I hope it could be looked at in a unique way, rather than just putting it in as part of a pattern of urban development.

People come to the nation's capital and millions come every year from all over the world to look at historical monuments and the seat of the government such it is of the

United States. I don't think they look over here and say, oh, that's a terrible skyline. They may look over – they may look over and enjoy it.

And I agree we have to make a better skyline and I approve of any of the suggestion, particularly the multidimensional factor that was mentioned. I also would like to go back to my original point about the residents. There were some references to the community and the community could be the development community here, but I think it should be a larger community of residents and how they feel about increase in heights and density in an area that they use to transit particularly.

Thank you.

MR. HARBOUR: (Inaudible.)

MR. FRESCHI: Go ahead.

MR. HARBOUR: A city for me is the content of citizen – (inaudible) – city as a reference to the fact it's a place of meeting and I think what's actually crucial is that to develop this little compact city, if I can use the term, or village or town, it's important, really, so important that we consider mix. The mix is what gives you vitality and that broad mix, it also gives you in terms of architecture, different scale so you don't get a repetition – with just the big commercial buildings segregated from the small scale. Weave all that together and you get all of the things that we enjoy about those places around the world that really work for people and are attractive.

And I think the end ambition should be that it is an amazing spot and if I was to go to Washington, D.C., I would want to get on the metro line and come here, think that ambition that you should all have.

MS. CASSIDY: Can I just introduce Peter Fallon of the Transportation Commission.

Q: Thanks, Cecilia.

Some of the speakers have referred using the cities such as Boston, New York or San Francisco, for example, and you talked about heights and context the environment and place-making. I'm sitting here thinking, looking at the dark river here, our the window here, and it's probably the closest urban area in Arlington as far as proximity river, okay? You know, we cannot get to it, the river front, the waterfront in all of Arlington is under federal control and has been since I've known.

How would you propose we take advantage of that and leverage that in the same context of heights? I mean, do we accept we simply cannot get to the river and we can just put high buildings to block it and the privileged few will have the views in the city? Is there some way otherwise of bringing the sense of place? Cause that's another unique

asset of Rosslyn. And I don't think we have another part of Arlington at least from the riverside.

MR. MARKESE: Well, you know, it's interesting. But I think that question is on all of our minds in some of the discussions we had in preparation for this evening. I think many of us focused on the issue that the river is separate and cut off from the city center. I think you could have a whole separate panel and discussion to deal with that issue. We came here to speak about height and the scale on the cityscape. But I think in my presentation and I think in some of the other presentations you saw many allusions to the fact that we thought it was kind of rich potential in reaching out to the river.

I think we all acknowledge that there is an interstate and several federal agencies involved. But certainly if you could conquer that problem, Rosslyn would be a much richer place.

MR. TUMLIN: And while Rosslyn is absolutely unique, I think there is a lot that we could learn from other cities and one is this example is San Francisco which the National Park service controls the entire western edge of the city and about half of the northern edge of the city. And has been a fantastic partner with the city of San Francisco in terms of increasing access to the San Francisco waterfront and dealing with some major obstacle like the drive freeway that connects the city to the Golden Gate Bridge. It's being completely rebuilt and lowered with the Presidio of San Francisco, a National Park, extended out over it instead of the Presidio meets the water for the first time in over 50 years.

I think in this administration now will be the perfect time to restart the conversation with the National Park Service about being able to take advantage of the Rosslyn waterfront. I look out in the windows here and I see, you know, that you can rent a kayak over in Georgetown, you know, why can't I walk.

VARIOUS : Don't get us started. (Laughter.)

(Crosstalk.)

MR. DOVER: But other cities like Boston, New York, Battery Park – lots of examples.

MR. STRAUSS: I mean, the one thing that we're learning in New York is the fact that – the notion that these park land is free of anything that have some economic value is not necessarily the right way to go and we've been exploring the notion of adding, like, restaurants and cafes to some that's been very popular in a couple of parks called the Shake Shack, and even Bryant Park has a wonderful restaurant that has a great terrace on top.

And I think the more that we can interconnect our open space with economic activity and cultural activity to make people want to participate and use these things and

find some ways to create these sort of economic bridges the community itself, I think that's how you create life and activity that really supports an urban environment. And whether or not this is a city, remember it is an urban environment and we have to be cognizant of that.

MR. MARKESE: I've done some work in the city of Chicago. One of the interesting aspects there is that they allow FAR bonus points for developing the riverfront to and continuing upland connecting along the edge of the river. So I guess from that standpoint, there is – could a link to the discussion today to somehow reaching out to the river and make it happen.

MR. DOVER: So rebalancing the values has taken place on every piece of motorway in the country – some faster than others. And this one is particularly troubling – troublesome in its geometry but not impossible to resolve. And it was designed with only one value in mind which was, you know, “happy motoring,” and the Rosslyn that you're describing, the Arlington County that you've been describing was about something more balanced in which the needs of the motoring public are balanced against all of those other needs and over time, you will grow your way to the water's edge. I'm absolutely confident. It would be expensive so that the point of that is that to get it to happen you need a lot of lucrative income-producing activity to justify it.

And I look at Rosslyn I see no need to start extending over highways and so on to get room to build yet, because you have so much, lost space in the already sort of settled footprint of the place. But there will come a time, as you've said, when you'll need more space to build. And instead of creeping up the corridor, one might think hard about rebalancing the values that led to the shape of the federal edge.

MR. FRESCHI: One comment on that, Rosslyn is one of the 5,200 cities, villages or towns – whatever you want to call it, urban center if you will, in the world which is trying to reconnect to the water's edge. Virtually, every city in the world of course has a lake or a river or the ocean or something a sea - process is well-documented and how we're going back to trying to find those connections. There must be something in that to go back to the career principle of the straight line and the flat edges of the water's edge to be getting over to transportation and to find that area where I can tell you in Tacoma, another very small, very compact empty little town which is under pressure of Seattle growth and we reached to the water and the solution, their idea was the water and its uses residential and a mix of cultural facilities both from the main street and the water's edge. The solution there was.

MS. CASSIDY: I know there's a question over here. (Inaudible.)

MS. CASSIDY: This is Inta Malis, another planning commissioner. Not just another planning commissioner.

Q: Not just another planning commissioner, a planning commissioner who lives on Columbia Pike and is a disciple of the form-based codes. I'm very interested in what we have to say on this subject. Back to the system of ordering, one of the things that we've already done up to now in ordering and I think you're familiar it, Rosslyn to the extent you've been briefed, is that we identified Central Place as a center and, in fact, we created an observation deck on top of it and we said we value the views from this observation deck. Is this, in your opinion, a value that we should continue to protect, or have – should we be rethinking this in the context of reordering the skyline?

MR. DOVER: I'll start.

MR. FRESCHI: Okay.

MR. DOVER: There's an old book, a Zen-like read called "The Power of Limits," and it floats around architectural schools, studios and is considered contraband, because it's not popular to talk about limits but limits are very, very good discipline-giving order-giving thing. And learning to work within them means you don't have, you've pinned some of the variables down in the very complex equation as that is in architectural time.

And I – so here's the case of whether or not to apply height, to give height, a decision that actually make up your mind about some things so that – all those other variables still in play or at least one of them has been pinned down. And I think that's – that would be useful to designers, instead of guessing. It doesn't mean the occasional designer won't pop up and say I have a better idea. And I want to make my case anywhere, you know, Arlington is the kind of place that has a process for that, right?

And so that will be done. It – the view from the observation deck will be unlike any other view offered in the region, and so it has a unique value and it will get more and more valuable over time if it's not spoiled. That doesn't – I personally don't believe that that means you have to omit a middle ground. I think you can have – you can have beautifully designed things intrude upon one's view and add to it. Just as we all – English garden design, if they had a lake or a pond, they can always work in an island, a tree on it, a peninsula to create that thing that wasn't in the foreground and wasn't in the background but gave you the sense of the distance.

And so some buildings that rise up in a way that the Chrysler Building rises up in the view from 30 Rock won't hurt that. To have it completely walled off and no longer be meaningful would be a loss. To have some things rise because they go pass one plane to another with a great design would seem beneficial.

So I like the power of limits but I also think that there's this architectural reflex that says anything repeated is a problem that when you tell me anything, I'm supposed to do again that I already did once, or my neighbor did, that you're being fascist and formulaic and you're making everything monotonous and the same. And it's just false. If there's no repetition, there is no order. By having something in common with the

neighboring buildings, you can actually get continuity which is really beneficial, especially when the tops of these buildings we'll be expressing individuality like crazy.

(Phone rings.) That's not mine. (Laughter.)

So that's – I think you can have both the continuity and individuality if you if have some elements in common. It really isn't mine. It's vibrating.

MR. FRESCHI: It's mine. (Laughter.)

MR. DOVER: So much for having rules. (Laughter.) So there you go.

MR. FRESCHI: Ivan? Yes.

MR. HARBOUR: Architects, we contrary to popular belief, we love constraints, in fact, the more constraints the better. Problem-solving is what we're about. You know, we got a building in London which is constrained the view of St. Paul's and we....greenfield sith... and the backdrop of St. Paul's and it makes something special – (inaudible) – the answer is nothing. (Laughter.)

The subtle distinction between constraints and some of the big dictating imposition of original definition – well whatever it is I rail against. I have to say – I think this – (inaudible) – the Americanization of town planning in terms of the concept of setbacks and shoulder heights, both to me are dictatorial. What they do is they – they squash invention and I think it's about moving forward, very clear constraints that are very important and asking very clearly for an architecture that delivers quality at the ground level. And that has to be proven I think in a slightly more complex environment than simply following a sectional outline.

As I say, particularly in the UK, we have no rules. It makes it pretty difficult, but I think, overall, we probably have a response to become more inventive that achieve something that works, I think, very well at ground level.

MR. MARKESE: Can I add – I'll just add that I think there was a very specific question Ann had asked. Ivan, I don't think you've answered her question and that was: Is it okay to block the view of the observation deck? And I think it is okay. It certainly instances as long as it's done well and done with quality. I don't think you should adhere to a steadfast rule that says we've set this plane, we've set this observation deck and therefore nothing can impede that pier. I think that will be a mistake.

MR. STRAUSS: I agree with that and I think actually seeing another building is – from an observation deck also adds – could add some interest. But –

MR. MARKESE: Or some other people.

MR. STRAUSS: – or some other people. You know, this is baseball season again, and as a New Yorker, I'd like to quote Yogi Berra, the great manager and urban planner – (laughter) – who said that if you don't know where you're going, you may not get there.

And I would – I'm going to put this out again more succinctly, I would suggest that the developers who are working on sites in Rosslyn, get their architects to sit with one another and forget, in some cases, the plans that are already on the table and see what would happen if you start creating a dialog with a desired plans for the individual areas within these development sites, are thought about in connection with one another, and that you might then begin to think about some different ways of creating hierarchy and different ways about thinking about this place so you would create a more connected environment where what's happening at the ground is equally important as what happens at the tops of these buildings.

MS. CASSIDY: Okay. M.J., also, you're next.

Q: I recognize that tonight the assignment was to talk about the built environment, to talk about heights and density, and mass and things like that, but I want to talk a little bit about sociology for a second. I think Ivan referred to it in the sense when we talked about – (inaudible) – and as anthropology – many of you have mentioned it as well, the notion that let's develop the ground level and then work on top of that afterward.

But I would like to hear you comment about actually thinking pro-actively about the nature of the people that will be in the community, what they will be doing there, are they working, living, playing, shopping, so forth and so on, and how that relates to the kinds of built environment you actually plan for and design for.

MR. DOVER: Yes. (Laughter.) General Agreement on that.

MR. FRESCHI: (Inaudible.) Go ahead.

MR. HARBOUR: It's a bit you know, live, work, leisure, learn. All these things have to happen in one place. We know that environments where that does take place are very successful and there's pride in the community. And I think it's actually when you start to zone, that's the beginning of problems and – (laughter) there's this kind of space is, that kind of space is and all of a sudden your comeback city only had certain parts that you can be in certain time and yet it's a compact city or village and it should be all that all the time.

MR. FRESCHI: I believe we saw, we modeled downstairs. In fact, and that means mixed use, in this buildings including residential within the corridor are in fact being proposed and I'm not sure if they're being improved but thinking is in place for that.

MR. TUMLIN: Mark mentioned Thomas Jefferson earlier, and I will be misquoting Jefferson to say that one of the things that he recognized is at the root of democracy is an investment in place, that to be investing in place were willing to endure some sacrifice to make that place better to hold on to it, to protect it and it also means that we recognize that our own interests are interdependent with other people's interests, that we recognize that our neighbor also is invested in this place as well and together we need to work in order to see its future through.

And it's one of the reasons why I'm so focused on the first 30 feet in the public realm, it's because when architecture and space are merely a commodity, then you're creating throwaway places and your having people disinvested from space and not realizing that they have something in common with their neighbors and that they need to limit their own desires in order for us all to succeed better and that great public spaces are not just nice but they're the foundation of our democracy.

MS. CASSIDY: We have another question over here.

Q: Hi. My name is Mary J. Schmeltzer-Hofstra and I'm a citizen, resident and I live in Riverplace which is in a corner zone – (inaudible). And I often – well, I wonder what about the edges of the city, what about the transition? I think of – where I live, I think it would be fabulous if it were completely mixed use and tapered to the park, so that people – the traffic would be normalized. As it is, it's abrupted, it's abruptly cut off.

One of the things – while everything Jeffrey said really resonates with me, because I think of myself primarily as a pedestrian and I'm interested in riding across the street so slowing traffic down. I'm interested in whatever it's possible to walk two blocks or if I have to walk around – that kind of thing. And that – that's very hard to address because you have to do that jointly, it has to be done in a plan.

Anyway, but in terms of working, we have these little boxes, zoning requirements – I'm in a residential area and – but I could see this being mixed, art and commercial and residential. How do you do that? I mean, is that even possible to – because we're a particular box, we're a particular color. How do you deal with these transitions?

MR. FRESCHI: Anybody want to take – (inaudible)?

MR. DOVER: When Ivan talked about when you begin to zone, you begin to have problems, what he meant was the zoning by a functional purpose into a single zone. So as other commercial or office space, the zone of institutional use of the zone, residential zone, industrial and so on. And I believe he's absolutely right. It doesn't mean not to have regulations, but that means not to think that the city's so simplistic that you can break all these apart like that.

So one of the things that you have is the ability to unleash the market – natural market forces that gravitate toward mixing land uses. There are some things that have militated against it in our financing system and in bad habits. But most of the developers

active now – that are doing contemporary projects are actually quite sophisticated about this compared to ten years ago or 20 years ago. And they want the mixed use and they come asking to do it.

If you have not built in artificial constraints in the form of ridiculous parking requirements, for example, or the like – you can get the natural kind of market balancing into what communities normally are. They're coming together – all those uses for convenience and commerce and safety and conviviality, that they don't do it when artificially constrained, or artificially subsidized in the all motoring, all the time setup from a transportation point of view, also subsidize the creation of zones without – beyond what regulation did.

So I think you're actually on the cusp of unlocking natural market reasons to do it. President of Sumitomo Bank not long ago said that he prefers to loan money on mixed use projects and that, of course, everyone listened up because they've all heard about the difficulty of financing mixed use. And what he said was interesting. He said all developers are cowboys and cowgirls. And they come in, they say, my project is this and it's going to be a homerun.

But, in fact, the president of the bank went on to say, he knows that in fact some part of the market is always stronger than some other part – private sector development are better financed and a chunk that includes mixed means that when they come back in, limping back into the banker's office and say, I need to renegotiate, I need more time to pay, et cetera, et cetera, at least some part of their project is generating income streams instead of having them roll the dice on just one thing and one thing only and going down hard.

So that was a banker's perspective on why mixed use provides resilience. And so I think what we're experiencing right now and it's kind of recovering from amnesia about mixed use in this country is that natural cities are mixed use, or can be.

MR. FRESCHI: Indeed, it should be said that, it's made with the opposite – well, mixed use was and always was the nature of urbanism, we may have imposed this modern idea of zoning to get to certainly which is a very principally overstated – (inaudible).

MR. DOVER: Wrong kind.

MR. FRESCHI: It might have been the wrong kind. It's a different kind of zoning, it's a performance zoning rather than a land use zone. It has been done virtually everywhere.

MS. CASSIDY: I think we might have time for maybe a couple other questions and I wonder if I could take the prerogative to ask at least one of them.

To ask Ivan about three-dimensional planning. If you could explain that a little bit more in terms of what that concept is and how that could be used here.

MR. HARBOUR: I mean, three-dimensional planning essentially is clearly considering both body as well as the occupation of a particular site and its percentage. It's working, of course, in three-dimensions and what that means is that city is addressing the issues of neighbors in a clearer way, so it's looking at the cause and effect of making decisions in its – in reality. It's not hiding behind a pattern on plan.

And it's something we've been advocating for many, many years and it's taken up to a certain degree and particularly around the notion of, you know, key views as part of a planning process. You know, we have here a system where you have to prove what your building will look like from certain key points which are negotiated with the planning authority. And in a bigger scale obviously is look at the impact from a distance and, of course, all of this is very credible in an environment where we can generate 3-D models in a very straightforward and rapid manner.

I think it is essential when you build to scale because a lot of the concerns about building to scale are impact on neighbors, particularly problem neighbors, and that's, of course, understandable. And I think without using a taller – (inaudible) – in three-dimensions, you are more convinced those sort of stakeholders in the process of getting something that's – will have a positive impact.

I think it's – the concept of doing this and getting all the participants involved in that is also very important and in some manner, it must be a process that doesn't involve the, you know – in a particular way reducing the value of certain plots of land – (inaudible) – so there needs to be some mechanism that allows and all those participants to profit in an equal way. And no disadvantage of one or the other. So it's essentially as described three-dimensional planning.

MS. CASSIDY: And another question over here.

Q: My name is – (inaudible). I'm an architect. And I think that I appreciate all the comments from the Board. One thing that I have a question on our theme is really the notion of density and bonus type quality. You mentioned a couple of times in terms of graduating from X, Y to Z. And I think having worked in San Francisco and gone through the architectural review process which I found was very successful, I want your thoughts in terms what kind of public-private process do you see that would be more or less ideal when there's another entity defining what quality is relative to architecture the architect planned.

MR. DOVER: To clarify, I didn't suggest that you pierce them from level to the next based on an arbitrary, subjective quality judgment but rather based on slenderness that you are becoming – your profile in your building is actually getting slimmer as it goes up. The idea that only quality buildings should be allowed to go up was suggested by others among my colleagues and I wrote down in my notes: "Who decides?"

MR. MARKESE: Who does decide? (Laughter.)

MR. TUMLIN: Who decides?

MR. DOVER: The applicant's architect?

MR. : (Inaudible). Somebody.

MR. MARKESE: I think San Francisco definitely – (inaudible).

MR. TUMLIN: Yeah, it hasn't for a while cause the growth has been so small. So San Francisco has an annual cap of amount of square footage of commercial growth that is allowed in the city. And if the cap is exceeded, a beauty contest results – (laughter) – and developers have to submit their plans and it's competitive and the – you know, the prettiest design wins and the results of that during the boom years, the '80s was pointy a big step up in design on the good end, on the less good end a lot of really boring buildings with pretty party hats on top.

So there are aspects of it that were successful and there are aspects of it that were not so successful. So the right model depends largely, I think, on the nature of how critical decisions are made in the local community, the competence of staff and the public's judgment about the ongoing quality consistency among the officials.

So in San Francisco, we changed our government structure every four years. We will reinvent government who were frustrated by whatever the previous government was doing. So if you were a technocrat, you would argue for the highly competent staff approach where you basically delegate as much decision-making as possible to a highly professional well-paid staff that can't be fired very easily, or consultants. (Laughter.) I know. As a consultant, I do not recommend that path of action. So that's one model.

Another model is the very democratic model which says that, you know, power of the people that people we know what kind of neighborhoods we want to have, that we're a better judge than these technocrats. You appoint a lot of neighborhood folks who care about the community. And in San Francisco, there is an example of that in one neighborhood Burlow Heights actually has a neighborhood design review committee that has tremendous support.

If you're doing an addition to single family home, you've got to go before your neighbors to have control over every little detail, including the interiors of your addition. That process has, as you can imagine, advantages and disadvantages. The neighborhood feels really, really empowered and it is no longer showing up and screaming at every community hearing because it's that screaming is now internalized to that neighborhood (laughter) – and everyone can go on, right? That's one approach.

You know, another approach is the design review board that is comprised of appointed professionals, so you can set requirements to say people need to have these skills and then hopefully that's – I don't think I've ever heard a design review panel as good as the one that I've been sitting in. So architects, you need to make – if you're going to have that approach, you're going to make sure that your architects are also urbanists and understand urban space like the rest of the people that I'm sitting here with because usually I'm yelling at the architects, so –

MR. FRESCHI: If I could just expand on that. As Vancouver's case was moving away from zoning a little bit, performance of the towers and, in fact, much like this diagram evolved into a podium you see here and a tower form. One of the innovations my friend Larry \_\_\_\_\_ was the planner at the time brought together was what he called the collegium and this was coming back to – and Mark explained I think, getting the development community to sit down together so you have a site – there's a developer who are adjacent developers – (inaudible) – some of his staff and the various affected neighbors and they would work on a problem together to try to resolve, in fact, a three-dimensional resolution rather than a formula on how to achieve it.

Now, that – I don't know – something like 85 towers or something that's being built on the exposition ground of the World's Fair. Now, those same developers are saying we're bored. It looks like an asparagus patch. (Laughter.) The people that live in the podium which is a street centered residential component – now we have an excuse, we have performance zone, we have the collegiums going, we also have border and somebody raised that point earlier that is there are fewer and fewer surprises in this rather beautiful urban setting.

It's not to say it's all bad, but I'm saying it can work but I'll introduce one last concept which I tried to introduce this in Tacoma and that is – (inaudible) – that the plans tend to get boring - rules tend to be necessarily but stifling. And so, we sponsored competitions for themes which have been historically true in all cities, that is, the gazebo, if you will, in Tacoma's case it was a bridge to nowhere. I think it just flew off into space but a magnificent truss of construction and design by some Russians.

Windchimes, which are today going to be converted to windmills, that is horizontal windmills for energy production. So many of the things that we are calling useless follies have, in fact, now become useful follies. But the follies start to introduce just as the historical sculptural piece might introduce or the Obelisk to go back to Rome again, they introduced elements of follies introduced those elements to try to lighten up a bit of the urban.

MR. MARKESE: I think it's a really tough question and I think you've seen tonight some of the debate about how much regulation there is and when you get to the issue of quality, as you said, who defines that quality. And I think there's a portion of it that's intangible that most of us can recognize a good building versus a bad building, which you know gets to the esthetic part of it. And I'm not sure what the answer is.

But I think a part of the answer is it's going to become more and more important as time goes on – the energy performance or the environmental quality of the building and the way that architects achieve that is through the envelope and I think there's a direct link between a quality envelope and quality architecture. So I think that's part of it. I also think that there's been some discussion tonight about the virtues of mixed use sites and mixed use projects, but I think if there's a way to reword that within the system, that would be a very positive thing.

But you also have to leave room for the creative idea that Ivan hinted at so that, you know, to me a starting place and a logical starting place for the next 20 or 30 years has to get at in some part the performance of the building.

MS. CASSIDY: I think we have one very last question and it's going to be extremely succinct. Tom – (inaudible) – (laughter). Okay. Now you know what kind of community we have – everybody understands the styles of, you know, our participants. So Tom is going to do a Twitter question. Is that it? A hundred and forty characters? So try it, Tom.

Q: (Inaudible.) I don't think – the most exciting thing I sort of fixated on tonight the possibility of living life – living and working in the middle ground, the middle view which is a way of dealing with getting height in a compact, you know, straight area. I know that when I'm in New York – and I've, you know, the fascinating book and I'm fascinate with, with penthouses and greenery at high levels.

What's the state of the art direction of the architecture as you're talking about this quality, performance, and all this stuff? What's the – what can life be like living in this – in the world of middle ground where you're not looking at the buildings you're looking at people, looking at nature? It already is nature if you're on a canyon looking out.

MS. CASSIDY: That was the last question.

MR. DOVER: (Inaudible.)

MR. MARKESE: Or we can't leave. (Laughter.) Someone try, please.

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I mean, one of the things that we can explore and – is the sort of – the removal of barriers between inside and out even restoring the notion of the sort of living curtainwalls and how green it can be, and it can be integrated with building systems. And I think that the more we can be exploring the notions of greenroofs the notions of creating a landscape that's more integrated with the building environment, the more connected our urban centers, the greener they become and creates opportunities for interaction between open space and the building elements.

And you know, having just been to India and China, Dubai, I see a lot, especially in India, and China a lot of activity of looking at how in that climate and those environments, the outside is integrated inside, especially with so many architects

endorsing such things, people like that. (Laughter.) And I would explore – I would like to suggest that more of that could be explored here, especially in some of the isolated open space that we should be looking at how to interconnect that with the community itself.

MR. HARBOUR: Can I say something? Sorry, I can hardly hear your microphones. But I heard the question, but a young girl who worked around – (inaudible) – has worked in the States in various places, you talked about the concept of distance and distance you can begin to identify and understand the expressions and that's the sort of point of contact that somebody makes the city work whether you're on ground plane or whether you're up high.

Incidentally, the distance you use reaches in the order of 20 to 24 meters is the distance prescribed between terrace houses by the Victorians in London. It's the distance by which you can't quite make out the detail of a naked or semi-naked person. (laughter) – Therefore, we like being close but not too close. (Laughter and applause.)

MS. CASSIDY: I apologize to anybody who had additional questions. I think Bruno wanted to accept e-mails – comments. Okay.

MR. FRESCHI: You've heard mentioned figured grounds, that is, buildings to ground understood in this very rich position the figured ground drawings which is a hell of a lot to do with that first 30 feet we talked about. I think this question that's going to ask is about figure of this three-dimensional thinking that you've heard propositioned tonight is about being able to create models or diagrams or drawings that give you figure to figure explanation and that could include people, of course, as well as buildings, as Mark indicated in his presentation they've been experimenting with this and many others. So that's the last comment that I can make.

I said I was going to try to wrap up. I wouldn't dare. (Laughter.) I think the discussion's been far too rich. I've made notes. This has been recorded. I would suggest to you that if you have a comment that you want to make and I'll give my e-mail out and you e-mail me that comment. That will force you to be succinct in the writing and I will try to prepare a wrap-up of tonight and give it to you. And perhaps that will be of public use.

With that, I really would like to thank everybody. It was a very, very, very ambitious, very, very big subject to take on and we literally prepare goal statements and I think it was important that I think a special thank you to the whole panel who were able to expose to you the complexity of what we're talking about, maybe not the answers – of course, with each think, we have the answer. But generally, the complexity of the problem and in fact, perhaps revealed some direction in each of you. So again, thank you to the panel and thank you to all of you.

I thought the tail-end of the discussion was very informed unlike a lot of public sessions that I have attended. This one sounded very, very informed. So I congratulate

each of you for that. And as I said, I will attempt a written wrap up of this so please do email me if you have something you want to include or feel perhaps you missed and didn't have time for the questions as it is now 10 o'clock.

(END)