

Clarendon Sector Plan Update

Community Comments from December 14, 2020 Online Engagement

Note: The following table includes a complete set of comments received by staff following the December 14, 2020 Online Engagement. Staff will be preparing a summary table of the main issues and concerns, along with staff responses as the process continues to move forward. Both documents may continue to be updated over time.

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
1	Anonymus	Transportation Commission	There is a lot going on here from a transportation perspective as far as locations of new streets & pedestrian connections (especially across the St Charles site) and this seems like a missed opportunity to update the Sector Plan street cross-sections to match the updated guidance in the MTP Bike Element (which envisions enhanced bike facilities on Wilson Blvd, Clarendon Blvd, 10th St, Highland St, & Washington Blvd all within the bounds of the sector plan. None of which the public has an avenue to weigh-in on through the current very focused online survey.
2	Anonymus	Washington Area Bicyclist Association	<p>I want to share some feedback on what I see as an obvious lack of consideration for transportation and specifically the bicycling network in this discussion.</p> <p>Arlington's Bicycle Element of the Transportation Master Plan identifies both Washington Blvd and 10th St. N for "enhanced bicycle facilities" in the area covered by the Clarendon Sector Plan. Enhanced Bicycle Facilities is defined in the plan as a low-stress bicycling facility that follows the specific facility selection criteria of Appendix C in the Bicycle Element. In this case, the preferred facility type for both Washington Blvd and 10th St. S is likely to be protected bike lanes. The Clarendon Sector Plan, including recommended street cross-sections, should be updated to reflect these requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, as this sector plan update is happening in the context of new development fronting 10th St, Fairfax Drive, and Washington Blvd, this is an opportune time to determine how these bicycle facilities will fit into the street and incorporate those facilities into the site plans. Now is the time to make these changes, so that developers help create the more livable streets and community atmosphere that the county's plans call for.</p>
3	Anonymus	Park & Recreation Commission	<p>In looking at the preliminary concepts the major concern is over the permanent loss of a relatively large park open space that has been part of the county's official plan for almost 15 years. The most recent county policy on this area is stated in the PSMP. PSMP, page 149, identifies the 10th Street Park space as the very first one listed as an opportunity for land acquisition and park development.</p> <p>We understand that the proposed location of the 10th Street Park is at the site where the Fire Department has (very effectively) stated its intention to keep the Fire Station #4 at its current location indefinitely. As a former JFAC member, I appreciate the need for such a crucial facility. But the basic need for more green, open space in this</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>heavily urbanized part of Arlington is already there. There are hundreds and hundreds of residential and hotel units being proposed. If the 10th St. space is lost permanently, for a park near the core of Clarendon, where will it be made up? If it is to be lost, we should expect sufficiently large community benefits to be provided that would allow for open space elsewhere. A model for this is the Rosslyn Sector Plan, where the updated language calls for private sector contributions to support open space goals.</p> <p>Related to this, if the original sector plan called for a 50,000 square foot park, why can't other sites within Clarendon, notably in the study area be designated by the county for open space--at least as an intended policy? Why can't the revised sector plan require that the proposed projects provide other open space opportunities? The small rectangular area pictured along Irving Street is a promising step, though until it is depicted, might appear to be a throwaway, leftover space that is convenient for planning. There are additional tertiary streets being proposed for the subject area. Can these be designed such as with shared use characteristics to provide public space benefits?</p> <p>In the least, new language should be added to the Sector Plan that calls for private sector funds through the site plan process to fund (completely) the Fairfax Drive open space improvements. Perhaps one alternative would be a contribution to county land/park acquisition funding.</p> <p>On the configuration of the St. Charles building, the preference of the county has been to avoid "superblock" buildings and to encourage ease of pedestrian circulation in our expanding urban sectors. A split building configuration between Washington Blvd. and the new street plaza on Fairfax Drive is what was called for in the sector plan. The fact that the 12th St. configuration has been changed does nothing to detract from the need for people to be able to move through and around Clarendon. A major theme and result from the Washington Blvd./Kirkwood Rd. Special GLUP project was the provision of pedestrian (and bicycle/vehicle) connectivity to break up that superblock. This superblock is a block away from that one.</p> <p>At the last meeting there were also statements made from the St. Charles applicant about the need for automobile access in the possible plaza area near the 10th St./Fairfax intersection. Such a layout would detract from the open space benefits of the plaza which is already going to be challenged by the location of the Metro line, double bicycle paths, vehicle access for the Wilson Blvd.-fronting businesses, and existing utilities. I realize there are various legitimate interests here. But some type of accommodation between these interests is called for. For example, you get the "solid" building design or the additional access/parking for the St. Charles building, but not both.</p> <p>A final thought. I am struck by the significant and suspiciously consistent proposals for most of the proposals to deviate from building setbacks proposed in the sector plan. I am wondering what has changed in urban design and architectural principles that would call for allowing these changes. Perhaps, this is just the precedent established by allowing setbacks for the Red Top building a few years ago. The decreased- and non-setbacks are obviously</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			financially beneficial for the applicants. We should expect that there be compensating community benefits for deviations allowed.
4	Anonymus	LRPC/ Urban Forestry Commission	<p>1. I remain unhappy about the elimination of the park. My sense is the staff did no search for alternative green space in the R-B corridor. And the study area appears underserved for green or park space. The county property currently available- even without the Verizon property - would seem to support a nice small park. I think as set forth the proposal is an abdication of a plan that's been around for over a decade.</p> <p>2. St. Charles Church's proposed development appears to create a canyon effect along Fairfax Drive. I don't have a problem with the proposed heights, but the lack of pedestrian or bike access through the property, coupled with stepback changes undercuts any streetscape life. Also, if the Church is requesting special parking consideration that complicates planning too and I would see that as a bargaining chip for better design to break up the massive block.</p> <p>3. The lack of adherence to step backs as set forth in the Sector Plan is troubling for several assemblages. I would like to see more plans for the streetscape and get more sense of how street life and bike access will work throughout the study area.</p> <p>4. The reconfiguration of 12th Street as proposed <u>is</u> a solution for East-West pedestrian and bike access to Fairfax Dr., but a weak one. An alternative might be to save expense and make the access at Clarendon circle safer and more attractive for peds and cyclists.</p> <p>5. I'm struck by the proposed increase in massing for the Bingham Center site. It's not clear to me that it makes sense in context and the step backs don't appear to reduce the sense of scale at least when viewed from the street perspective.</p> <p>6. Lastly, to end on a constructive note, the plans for a new 10th Rd. and service alley look like a winner to me.</p>
5	Anonymus	Resident- Lyon Park	<p>Please do not approve the proposed Clarendon corridor development's deviation from the Clarendon Sector Plan, including building heights, density, setbacks, step-backs, and open space.</p> <p>The Clarendon Sector Plan was formed based on an extensive, multi-month community process including all constituencies within Arlington County. This Plan should not be revised without following the same process and protocols.</p> <p>The proposed developments violate this plan on several dimensions. The proposal (Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo) show an increase in building height and building density, as well as reduced set-backs and step-backs, which increase building density even more. The Clarendon Sector plan already provides for substantially increased height and densities compared to the original Sector Plan.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>The proposal calls for adjustments to the plan's new streets without walkable, wide, retail-friendly sidewalks. The repositioning of a new 10th Road further increases density. The buildings already have much reduced setbacks and sidewalk widths, and no additional open space.</p> <p>The increased density and other changes proposed the developers are not accompanied by clear community benefits. There does not appear to be any open space or public space included in the proposed developments. There is no public performance space or defined outdoor public use space. It's unclear from the plans how additional vehicular traffic will be managed so that there is no impact on neighborhood minor streets such as North Irving Street.</p> <p>In summary, it is not appropriate to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, without a community process and without clear community benefits. Please do not approve this proposal until it complies with the Clarendon Sector Plan.</p>
6	Anonymus	Resident- N. Irving St.	<p>As decisions are made regarding what developers are allowed in this project, please remember to adhere to the well-established Clarendon Sector Plan, which was established to help maintain the character and livability of our neighborhoods.</p> <p>we want setbacks, we want to limit heights, we want tapers away from the street to allow more light, and want native trees - we DO NOT want a cement jungle with a dark cavernous feel at the edge of our community. The county should never lose sight of the fact that what happens here should always be about the residents, not the money.</p>
7	Anonymus	Resident- Lyon Park- N. Irving St.	<p>I am writing to protest the updates to the Clarendon sector plan that will greatly increase density, building height, and traffic to the existing plans. As far as I can tell, these revisions will provide no compensating community benefits, as, for example, in increased green space. To the contrary, they will likely greatly reduce the quality of life for those of us in the adjacent neighborhoods of Lyon Park and Ashton Heights. My neighbors and I do not object to new development, but the compromises already agreed to in the existing plan strike a good balance between development and respect for neighborhoods.</p>
8	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights- N. Lincoln St.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Clarendon Sector Plan was built based on a multi-month community process that included all constituencies in Arlington County, including three representatives (one was me) from Ashton Heights. There has been <u>no community process</u> to vet these changes, and there are <u>no proposed additional community benefits</u> in return for these changes 2. The approved Clarendon Sector Plan <u>ALREADY</u> contains <u>dramatic increases in height and density</u> for developers, compared to the original zoning for the area, in return for community benefits such as wider sidewalks, lighting, affordable housing, building design elements, step-backs, open space and set-backs (that create the urban village 'feel'). 3. The proposed changes are <u>not consistent with the goals of the community-wide Clarendon Sector Plan working group</u> and what they set out to achieve for the area. The Clarendon Sector Plan working group

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>tried to carefully weigh the inevitable re-development of the area with the desire to create a vital, activated, accessible urban village. The proposed changes create and URBAN CANYON, not an urban village, which is exactly what the Sector Plan was designed to avoid.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The <u>increases in height and density are particularly egregious</u>. In the area bordering 10th Street, the proposal is to increase the lowest heights from 55' to 85' (that's 3 stories!) and the highest heights from 110' to 128'. Remember, these heights don't include air conditioning rooms on the top floors or amenities like resident recreation areas, so the actual heights are even higher. 5. Step-backs and Set-backs (this is what reduces the impact of very large buildings, so that you don't feel like you are in a gray, unlit canyon) are greatly reduced/eliminated, contributing to an <u>urban canyon not urban village</u>. These important building design factors are really only decorative at this point and will not achieve the function that was intended. 6. The proposal <u>eliminates a vital pedestrian, residential and commercial link that ties the area together and creates a vital sense of place</u>. The proposal is to move a new 10th Road North closer to Washington Blvd. Why is this a problem? Because it eliminates the original purpose of the road – to be a vital pedestrian link between Wilson Blvd (and a new triangle public space there!) and N Hudson Street, connecting a new triangle public space on Wilson, the new development buildings and major park proposed at the Verizon site. The roadway as proposed is an after-thought – really more like an alleyway. "
9	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I write in response to the request for comments on development in the Clarendon Corridor. There is a Clarendon Sector Plan that was developed with extensive community input and concern for quality of life for all persons who must live and thrive in the Clarendon area. My understanding is that the new development is requesting deviation from height and density levels agreed to in the Clarendon Sector Plan. I write to register my opposition for granting additional height and density exceptions. Please follow what is set out in the Clarendon Sector Plan.</p> <p>I oppose granting additional height and density exceptions in building height along 10th Street and along the other streets involved in this development plan. I oppose granting smaller set-backs and smaller sidewalk widths. During this time of the COVID-19 pandemic I have spent a lot of time walking because that's about all that is possible to do. Current sidewalk standards in many places are too narrow for two adults to walk comfortably together. We should be seeking walkable sidewalks above all else.</p> <p>This development is going to take place in a very large swath of the neighborhood and will have great impact on the nature of the area. We need no further towering buildings or urban canyons. You've already allowed that to occur in many other places in Arlington. Open public and community space and park areas and the tree canopy ought to be priority issues.</p> <p>My final comment is that I do not appreciate the fact that you put this request for comments out at the holiday season December 21, 2020 to January 8, 2021 and that there was no real notice to anyone. I would not have known about the issue except that a neighbor brought it to my attention only last night.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>I would like to be informed about these matters. Posting the information quietly online during the holiday period is not a way to inform the neighborhood or to achieve real comment and feedback which ought to be your goals. Even with the pandemic, there are ways to truly engage the community that are safe for all participants.</p>
10	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>As a resident of Ashton Heights, where parking is already at a premium, I am opposed to the increases in building height and population density and the decreases in set-back and step-back rules that you are trying to sneak past us. The proposed Clendon Sector Plan is unacceptable and will change the character of the neighborhood. In fact, Clarendon will no longer be a neighborhood, but a Rosslyn or Crystal City business area. Please do not foist this upon us.</p>
11	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I am a resident of Arlington County and live in Ashton Heights. I am writing to you today to express my concern about the proposed development in the Clarendon corridor on and around N. Irving Street. It is my understanding that the proposal deviates from the approved Clarendon Sector Plan.</p> <p>I don't believe it's appropriate or necessary to deviate from a plan that was meticulously developed and included input from so many sectors and constituencies of Arlington County. In fact, why invite input and develop a plan if it's not subsequently followed? It reduces trust in our government, which does not serve the county or its residents now or in the long run.</p> <p>Specifically, the Clarendon Sector Plan was designed to ensure a balance between development and high quality of life for the community. It was not intended to create a mini Manhattan – an urban canyon of excessive building density and height.</p> <p>The proposed developments (Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo) show an increase in building height (from 110' to 128' and from 55' and 75' to 85') and building density, as well as reduced set-backs and step-backs, which increase building density even more. The Clarendon Sector plan already provides for substantially increased height and densities compared to the original Sector Plan. The repositioning of a new 10th Road increases density even more. The increased density and other benefits proposed by the developers is not accompanied by any community benefits, such as open space or other public space. And, the proposal isn't clear about how additional vehicular traffic will be managed, particularly the impact on North Irving Street, which already has too much traffic for a neighborhood street.</p> <p>I know that new considerations and factors can emerge once a plan is underway. However, making revisions without following the same process for engaging stakeholder input is inappropriate.</p> <p>I appreciate your time and consideration of my perspective. More importantly, I hope you will concur that it is not appropriate to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, without a community process and without clear community benefits.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
12	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	I would like to go on record as opposing the latest revision to the Clarendon Sector plan. I feel the additional overall height concessions and step down concessions are too extreme for the area. I'm not opposed to the proposed uses, but density seems to deviate from the original plan substantially. Also, I think 10th St is still a problem for pedestrians.
13	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>1. The Clarendon Sector Plan was built based on a multi-month community process that included all constituencies in Arlington County, including three representatives (one was me) from Ashton Heights. There has been no community process to vet these changes, and there are no proposed additional community benefits in return for these changes</p> <p>2. The approved Clarendon Sector Plan ALREADY contains dramatic increases in height and density for developers, compared to the original zoning for the area, in return for community benefits such as wider sidewalks, lighting, affordable housing, building design elements, step-backs, open space and set-backs (that create the urban village 'feel').</p> <p>3. The proposed changes are not consistent with the goals of the community-wide Clarendon Sector Plan working group and what they set out to achieve for the area. The Clarendon Sector Plan working group tried to carefully weigh the inevitable re-development of the area with the desire to create a vital, activated, accessible urban village. The proposed changes create and URBAN CANYON, not an urban village, which is exactly what the Sector Plan was designed to avoid.</p> <p>4. The increases in height and density are particularly egregious. In the area bordering 10th Street, the proposal is to increase the lowest heights from 55' to 85' (that's 3 stories!) and the highest heights from 110' to 128'. Remember, these heights don't include air conditioning rooms on the top floors or amenities like resident recreation areas, so the actual heights are even higher.</p> <p>5. Step-backs and Set-backs (this is what reduces the impact of very large buildings, so that you don't feel like you are in a gray, unlit canyon) are greatly reduced/eliminated, contributing to an urban canyon not urban village. These important building design factors are really only decorative at this point and will not achieve the function that was intended.</p> <p>6. The proposal eliminates a vital pedestrian, residential and commercial link that ties the area together and creates a vital sense of place. The proposal is to move a new 10th Road North closer to Washington Blvd. Why is this a problem? Because it eliminates the original purpose of the road – to be a vital pedestrian link between Wilson Blvd (and a new triangle public space there!) and N Hudson Street, connecting a new triangle public space on Wilson, the new development buildings and major park proposed at the Verizon site. The roadway as proposed is an after-thought – really more like an alleyway.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
14	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>Is there any consideration of how blocks on the south side of 10th street can be developed in coordination with the blocks north of 10th street in the study area? I thought that during the Sector Plan update, we had discussed potential arrangements for shared parking and/or transfer of height/density. This seemed important given the narrowness of the lots on the South side of 10th.</p> <p>I think that a hotel in Clarendon is a good thing and that location proposed is a good location for one. Given the prominent location and high visibility of that location I think particular scrutiny of the quality of architecture, materials and design is warranted. I say this not because I think a committee can do a better job than a good designer but because so many hotels are built these days with the shoddiest of banal architecture – probably due to the economics of hotels.</p> <p>There was a plan for a year-round market where the parking is on Fairfax Dr between the church and Northside – is this still in play?</p> <p>We must ensure that ALL ground floor frontages in this area (except on service alleys) include many, regularly spaced entrances and permeability to create a more interesting and safe street for pedestrians. Note these do not have to be retail but could also include residential individual entrances and service commercial business.</p>
15	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p><u>Community Process</u>- It seems like there has been a significant deviation in the process from what I think of as the “Arlington Way” to something else. In past processes, the affected neighborhoods were part of the essential committees that were responsible for planning out and negotiating, so that by the time a proposal was made, there was already collaboration and agreement. In the current process, the affected neighborhoods seem to have no more standing than any other member of the public. AHCA is not part of the LRPC or SPCR, so the essential negotiation and collaboration includes County staff, developers and interest groups/committees, but not the neighborhoods. I think it is incredibly unfortunate that those the most directly impacted have no standing in the actual planning and negotiation. I participated on many, many SPRCs and found the collaboration with County staff and all of the committees incredibly valuable to achieving an outcome that we all supported and I am concerned that this is not happening here.</p> <p>Clarendon Sector Plan Update</p> <p>The second comment is about the proposed changes to the Clarendon Sector Plan, which I strongly oppose for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Clarendon Sector Plan was built based on a multi-month community process that included all constituencies in Arlington County, including three representatives (one was me) from Ashton Heights. Per my comment above, there has been no community representation to determine what changes should be proposed.

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>(Soliciting “public comments” and presenting to the civic associations is not sufficient to constitute the Arlington Way).</p> <p>2. As far as I can tell, there are no additional community benefits in return for the changes.</p> <p>3. The approved Clarendon Sector Plan ALREADY contains dramatic increases in height and density for developers, compared to the original plan for the area, in return for community benefits such as wider sidewalks, lighting, affordable housing, building design elements, step-backs, open space and set-backs (that create the urban village ‘feel’).</p> <p>4. The proposed changes are not consistent with the goals of the community-wide Clarendon Sector Plan working group and what we set out to achieve for the area. The Clarendon Sector Plan working group tried to carefully weigh the inevitable re-development of the area with the desire to create a vital, activated, accessible urban village. The proposed changes create and URBAN CANYON, not an urban village, which is exactly what the Sector Plan was designed to avoid.</p> <p>5. The increases in height and density are particularly egregious. For example, in the area bordering 10th Street, the proposal is to increase the lowest heights from 55’ to 85’ (that’s 3 stories!) and the highest heights from 110’ to 128’. Remember, these heights don’t include air conditioning rooms on the top floors or amenities like resident recreation areas, so the actual heights are even higher.</p> <p>6. Step-backs and set-backs (this is what reduces the impact of very large buildings, so that you don’t feel like you are in a gray, unlit canyon) are greatly reduced/eliminated, contributing to an urban canyon not urban village. These important building design factors are really only decorative at this point and will not achieve the function that was intended.</p> <p>7. The proposal eliminates a vital pedestrian, residential and commercial link that ties the area together and creates a vital sense of place. The proposal is to move a new 10th Road North closer to Washington Blvd. Why is this a problem? Because it eliminates the original purpose of the road – to be a vital pedestrian link between Wilson Blvd (and a new triangle public space there!) and N Hudson Street, connecting a new triangle public space on Wilson, the new development buildings and major park proposed at the Verizon site. The roadway as proposed is an after-thought – really more like an alleyway.</p> <p>8. The proposed changes ignore a crucial element of the Sector Plan – a new park on the Verizon site. How will that vision be achieved, in the context of the proposed changes?</p>
16	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	It’s not appropriate for proposed development in the Clarendon corridor to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, including aspects such as building heights, density, setbacks, step-backs and open space. The Clarendon Sector Plan

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>was formed based on a multi-month community process including all constituencies within Arlington County. It was the intention of the committee to create a lively urban environment, but not an urban canyon, which is what is created by excessive building density and height.</p> <p>Revisions to the Sector Plan, unless they are the result of the same community process, are not appropriate. The proposed developments (Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo) show an increase in building height (from 110' to 128' and from 55' and 75' to 85') and building density, as well as reduced set-backs and step-backs, which increase building density even more. The Clarendon Sector plan already provides for substantially increased height and densities compared to the original Sector Plan. The buildings have much reduced set backs and even sidewalk widths, and no additional open space. The repositioning of a new 10th Road increases density even more. The increased density and other benefits proposed the developers is not accompanied by any community benefits. It's unclear from the plans how additional vehicular traffic will be managed so that there is no impact on neighborhood minor streets such as North Irving Street. There does not appear to be any open space or public space included in the proposed developments. It's hard to tell, but the open park space envisioned in the 10th Street/Washington Blvd area appears to be encroached on by the proposed development.</p> <p>In summary, it is not appropriate to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, without a community process and without clear community benefits.</p>
17	Anonymus	President-Ashton Heights CA	<p>I am writing as an individual to strongly object to various suggestions in the proposed Clarendon Sector Plan. Our community, Ashton Heights, that sits at the edge of 10th Street North, have some strong reservations and concerns about this Plan.</p> <p>Most want set backs, we want to limit heights, and we want tapers away from the street to allow more light, and want native trees - we DO NOT want a cement jungle with a dark cavernous feel at the edge of our residential community -- no way !!!!!</p> <p>The Clarendon Sector Plan Update proposes significant increases in building height and density, significant reductions in set-backs and step-backs, and "moving" a new 10th Road North that was intended as a vital link through the new area. Many are unclear what the community benefits proposed to accompany these changes.</p> <p>I am asking County staff and the County Board to reject changes to the Clarendon Sector Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Clarendon Sector Plan was built based on a multi-month community process that included all constituencies in Arlington County, including three representatives (including Joan Fitzgerald) from Ashton Heights. 2. The approved Clarendon Sector Plan ALREADY contains dramatic increases in height and density for developers, compared to the original zoning for the area, in return for community benefits such as wider sidewalks,

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>lighting, affordable housing, building design elements, step-backs, open space and set-backs (that create the urban village 'feel').</p> <p>3. The proposed changes are not consistent with the goals of the community-wide Clarendon Sector Plan working group and we want to be sure that the proposed changes DO NOT create an URBAN CANYON, but rather an urban village, which is exactly what the Sector Plan was designed to insure.</p> <p>4. The increases in height and density are particularly severe.. In the area bordering 10th Street, the proposal is to increase the lowest heights from 55' to 85' (that's 3 stories!) and the highest heights from 110' to 128'. Remember, these heights don't include air conditioning rooms on the top floors or amenities like resident recreation areas, so the actual heights are even higher.</p> <p>5. Step-backs and Set-backs (this is what reduces the impact of very large buildings, so that you don't feel like you are in a gray, unlit canyon) are greatly reduced/eliminated, contributing to an urban canyon not urban village. These important building design factors are really only decorative at this point and will not achieve the function that was intended.</p> <p>I am asking the Arlington staff and Arlington County Board to put this effort at bay for awhile for a more detailed dialogue.</p>
18	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I have been an Arlington resident, living in Ashton Heights since 1975. I have followed the development of the metro corridor and am writing to voice my concerns over the proposed deviations from the Clarendon Sector Plan development at the Joyce Motors, Silver Diner, St Charles, and Wells Fargo/Verizon properties. I do not agree with the proposed increased height and proposed decrease in setbacks in any of these projects. Please maintain open space at the ground level, and above. Please maintain light, and the possibility of planting trees and other greens. Please give people space to walk without bumping into each other. Just say no to the developers.</p>
19	Anonymus	Resident- Lyon Park	<p>It's not appropriate for proposed development in the Clarendon corridor to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, including aspects such as building heights, density, setbacks, step-backs and open space. The Clarendon Sector Plan was formed based on a multi-month community process including all constituencies within Arlington County. It was the intention of the committee to create a lively urban environment, but not an urban canyon, which is what is created by excessive building density and height.</p> <p>Revisions to the Sector Plan, unless they are the result of the same community process, are not appropriate. The proposed developments (Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo) show an increase in building height (from 110' to 128' and from 55' and 75' to 85') and building density, as well as reduced set-backs and step-backs, which increase building density even more. The Clarendon Sector plan already provides for substantially increased height and densities compared to the original Sector Plan. The buildings have much reduced set backs and even sidewalk widths, and no additional open space. The repositioning of a new 10th Road increases density even more. The</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>increased density and other benefits proposed the developers is not accompanied by any community benefits. It's unclear from the plans how additional vehicular traffic will be managed so that there is no impact on neighborhood minor streets such as North Irving Street. There does not appear to be any open space or public space included in the proposed developments. It's hard to tell, but the open park space envisioned in the 10th Street/Washington Blvd area appears to be encroached on by the proposed development.</p> <p>In summary, it is not appropriate to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, without a community process and without clear community benefits.</p>
20	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>Am writing you to urge rejection of The Clarendon Sector Plan Update. The plan proposes significant increases in building height and density, significant reductions in set-backs. This is counter to what has been proposed and approved in prior plan. And there do not appear to be any community benefits proposed to accompany these changes.</p>
21	Anonymus	Resident	<p>I submit these comments in response to news I just received about proposed developments, and "updates to the Clarendon Sector Plan," in the area of Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo, etc. I am a resident on North Irving Street living within a block or two of that development.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for proposed development in the Clarendon corridor to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, including aspects such as building heights, density, setbacks, step-backs and open space. The Clarendon Sector Plan was formed based on a multi-month community process including all constituencies within Arlington County. It was the intention of the committee to create a lively urban environment, but not an urban canyon, which is what is created by excessive building density and height.</p> <p>Revisions to the Sector Plan, unless they are the result of the same community process, are not appropriate. The proposed developments (Silver Diner, Joyce Motors, Wells Fargo) show an increase in building height (from 110' to 128'! and from 55' and 75' to 85') and building density, as well as reduced set-backs and step-backs, which increase building density even more. The Clarendon Sector plan already provides for substantially increased height and densities compared to the original Sector Plan. The buildings have much reduced set backs and even sidewalk widths, and no additional open space. The repositioning of a new 10th Road increases density even more. The increased density and other benefits proposed by the developers is not accompanied by any community benefits. It's unclear from the plans how additional vehicular traffic will be managed so that there is no impact on neighborhood minor streets such as North Irving Street. There does not appear to be any open space or public space included in the proposed developments. It's hard to tell, but the open park space envisioned in the 10th Street/Washington Blvd area appears to be encroached on by the proposed development.</p> <p>In summary, it is not appropriate to deviate from the Clarendon Sector Plan, without a community process and without clear community benefits.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
22	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>We have watched the video on the proposed deviations to the Clarendon Sector Plan and are very concerned about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the significantly reduced step backs on the Joyce Motors site facing 10th Street, • the elimination of step backs on the west side of North Irving Street, north of 10th Street, and • the elimination of step backs on the Irving Street side of the Silver Diner site, creating together a two block-long, nearly-solid facade from 10th Street to Washington Boulevard, and • the building on the Silver Diner site without the original step backs being next to an equally high building without step backs on the Wells Fargo site <p>These changes will reduce light and visual interest and turn Irving Street north of 10th Street into a canyon-like, dark street, especially if it sets a precedent for future development of the Verizon site.</p> <p>We do not support the requested deviation and ask that building height limits and step backs as they appeared in the Sector Plan be honored</p>
23	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>Today as you know is the deadline for commenting on three issues under the Sector Plan update study - these are: pedestrian access and bicycle facilities between Clarendon Circle and Kirkwood, and the case for preserving historic buildings on the North side of Wilson i.e. 'North Side Social' and 'TJ auto' (rather than widening Wilson Boulevard at that point). We are leaving these responses to be made by individual residents of Ashton Heights on the feedback section of the relevant County webpage Clarendon Sector Plan Update - Projects & Planning (arlingtonva.us), to be addressed by the deadline today.</p> <p>In the process we want to acknowledge the County's invitation to the AHCA to 'sit' on the LRPC for the purposes of the Clarendon Redevelopment project. We have so far 'sat' once - in November - to discuss the fire station and the Verizon communications center. We trust that we will receive specific invitations well in advance of all future LRPC meetings so that we can get organized in time to participate.</p> <p>We want to make a statement about a number of other key issues that arise from the most recent presentation by County staff, made available to the public on Clarendon Sector Plan Update: Process, Scope and Timeline - Projects & Planning (arlingtonva.us). These issues are likely to materialize as the LRPC's review of the Clarendon Sector Plan proceeds according to the timeline that has been shared, as well as when individual site plans are submitted to the County.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>As we have previously explained, members of the AH community have serious reservations about proposals or potential proposals by developers that appear to be under consideration and are already contained in one or more site plans that have been presented to the County for review.</p> <p>These are inter alia the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the increase in height of commercial buildings at the street front elevation and behind - to a maximum of 85 ft and 128 ft respectively, in 'downtown' Clarendon. 2. the profile of the buildings (i.e. setbacks, step-backs, tapers) that are critical in preserving light and perceived space, and in 'softening' the profile and appearance of buildings - to avoid the 'glass wall' or 'canyon' effect that is inconsistent with a concept such as an 'urban village' set out in the current Sector Plan.' (This seems to apply to the N.Irving street north of 10th street where setbacks seem to have been eliminated, to 10th street, and to others). 3. the transparency of the formulae for developer bonuses and 'density transfers' that may be (exceptionally) awarded in return for 'community benefits' provided by the developer, and their justification in specific projects. 4. the role of the realigned 10th road in 'tying together' the area between Hudson Street and Wilson Boulevard according to the current Sector Plan. 5. adequate arrangements for public space and 'greenway' within the redevelopment zone. <p>While it is too early to make definitive statements about the above, we would like to register the serious reservations of members of our community about moves to excessively relax code standards. We envisage that objections would be raised when projects that are clearly non-compliant with such standards are reviewed over the next few months.</p> <p>Having stated the above we accept that you are doing your best to navigate between conflicting interests and we look forward to the continued cooperation that we have achieved up to now.</p>
24	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>Although I have a number of specific comments, they can wait - my general comment is to oppose the proposed changes as premature and insufficiently justified.</p> <p>First, limiting the comment period from December 21 through January 8 effectively reduced the time for public review from three weeks to one week. In order to solicit broad and thoughtful comments, a new 3-week period should be announced.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			<p>Second, the materials available do not describe any obvious public benefit for the proposed changes. The individual developers will capture the benefits, but at a seeming cost of somewhat more dense development, potentially more traffic and congestion, parking challenges, more delivery and trash removal trucks, and reduced transitions into the residential areas. For such reasons, I do not see any reason to depart from the existing setback and height limitations.</p> <p>Also, the sector plan already envisioned increased commercial type development west and south of Clarendon Circle, which had already created a need for transition arrangements – they should not be eased further.</p> <p>I would also have liked to have seen the plans show planned bike lanes and taxi/uber stations to have some sense of how overall traffic might be impacted. And further clarity on parking might be useful.</p> <p>Finally, to my mind, the Pierce is a cautionary tale provided by the county’s serious failure to balance growth and Arlington community needs by approving the 27 story Pierce condominium on Wilson Blvd. The building looms far above the street (“highly elevated” lifestyle the ads say) with absolutely no effective setback from the street – the canyon effect at its worst. After this failure, the country needs to seriously reconsider whether new developments for Clarendon provide the setbacks and transitions needed.</p>
25	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I would like to express my concerns about the proposed plans to further develop areas around Clarendon, which would forever change our neighborhoods and perhaps set precedents for future 'exceptions' or changes to codes that conflict with the vision and plan for Arlington. I fear these proposed changes will only pave the way for investors and developers to push for even more development along the Rosslyn/Ballston corridor that would increase building height, decrease setback, and diminish green space.</p> <p>We do not need any more tall buildings in our neighborhoods for additional housing and commercial areas along this corridor. We need more small boutique businesses, green spaces and more expanses of open sky for a host of environmental, social and economic reasons. Along with many of my neighbors and other home owners in Ashton Heights, I do not want neighborhoods along the R-B corridor to resemble the commercial or urban highrise housing centers of Rosslyn, Ballston, Crystal City, Pentagon City, Bethesda, Chevy Chase or other similar areas that are void of character, natural light, sky and green spaces. Ballston has rapidly become an uninviting grid of cold dark wind tunnels lined with chain restaurants and stores. Individuals and businesses who seek this type of environment can find it elsewhere.</p> <p>Increasing density and height, and reducing setback or allowing more urban creep into green residential areas is not progress, it is the destruction of community. Arlington needs to preserve the elements of this corridor and history that make it unique, and uniquely appealing, and which serve to connect and strengthen community, neighborhoods, and neighbors.</p>

#	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
			The County also needs an appropriate process for citizen engagement (and appropriate weighting of homeowner and small business input and desires) on these decisions