

**Courthouse West Special General Land Use Plan (GLUP) Study**  
**Online Engagement Session Survey Responses**  
**Survey Period: December 14, 2021 – January 9, 2022**

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

[See short answers](#)

**2. Other considerations could inform the development and refinement of preliminary massing scenarios and/or recommendations for site improvements. What other areas of guidance should the study most strongly address? (Please rank the following options on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being most important and 10 being least)**

Consideration	Count				
	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Fourth Choice	Fifth Choice
Public space	103	51	33	42	35
Affordable housing	60	19	26	29	21
Access & loading	11	22	32	25	38
Parking	27	34	36	30	34
Streetscape, bicycle & pedestrian improvements	58	73	60	43	35
Transportation safety improvements	24	43	59	53	53
Stormwater improvements	20	19	29	37	48
Biophilic elements	18	30	30	36	35
Historic preservation	16	35	13	23	17
Public art	5	16	24	24	26

Consideration	Count				
	Sixth Choice	Seventh Choice	Eighth Choice	Ninth Choice	Tenth Choice
Public space	29	17	11	14	7
Affordable housing	24	20	30	25	88
Access & loading	56	46	47	51	14
Parking	20	32	34	39	56
Streetscape, bicycle & pedestrian improvements	26	10	14	16	7
Transportation safety improvements	31	39	23	13	4
Stormwater improvements	67	54	41	21	6
Biophilic elements	36	52	52	33	20
Historic preservation	22	34	39	62	81
Public art	31	38	51	68	59

Note: Due to a change in instructions to Question #2 while the survey was open, six of 348 survey responses to this question that were submitted before the change to the instructions were withheld and not included in the summary.

**3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)**

Option	Count
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	121
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	55
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	172

**4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

[See short answers](#)

**5. As height and transition guidance is developed, which area within the site should have the lowest heights to achieve effective transitions to adjacent areas? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)**

Option	Count
Wilson Boulevard frontage	109
Cleveland Street frontage	22
Clarendon Boulevard frontage	110
Danville Street frontage	29
None of the above	78

**6. What is your connection to this study? (Check all that apply)**

Option	Count
I live nearby – I own	219
I live nearby – I rent	76
I work nearby	59
I own a business nearby	13
I visit this area for retail, recreation, restaurants, public facilities, and/or other activities	180
None of the above	1

**7. What is your ZIP code?**

ZIP Code	Count
22201	240
22203	25
22207	17
22209	17
22204	15
22202	12
22205	11
22206	3
19143	1
20001	1
20019	1
20910	1
22042	1
22208	1
22213	1
33322	1

**8. What is your age? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)**

Option	Count
19 and under	2
20 - 29	49
30 - 39	76
40 - 49	90
50 - 59	62
60 - 69	45
70 - 79	19
80+	5

**9. Which of the following describes your race or ethnicity? (Check all that apply)**

Option	Count
White	210
Prefer not to respond or left blank	97
Asian	20
Hispanic or Latino	15
Other	15
Black or African American	7
Native American	3

**10. Do you represent a committee, commission, or other organization?**

Option	Count
No, I am commenting as an individual.	317
I am a member of another commission/committee.	13
I am representing a community organization.	9
Left blank.	6
I am an LRPC (Long Range Planning Committee) member.	3

## Responses to Question 1

1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)
No.
Align open space with other open space across side streets rather than across boulevards. Avoid placing open space in proximity to loading docks or dumpsters. Create opportunities for safe boulevard crossing at least every block. Avoid tall structures that invalidate previous tapers (e.g. the Navy League has a taper to the north that was made moot by the Hyatt.) Conversely, don't require a taper lower than the max height of the next block in that direction. (e.g. 45' towards Wilson, not 20')
I really like the first two bullet points. This neighborhood and Arlington overall need more housing and I'd love to have more neighbors (I live in the Charleston) supporting the businesses I love, some of which we have recently lost due to low traffic (Kino Coffee directly north of the block). The last bullet point and the tapering seem to conflict, we'd like to taper to the residential areas north and south but the bulk massing should align north south? Would be happy to see both eliminated.
The Guiding Principles should take into consideration the housing challenges we have in Arlington coupled with the reality that there are only a few areas in the County where density can reasonably go. Courthouse West is one of those locations and a taller, more dense building, will have the biggest impact on the housing supply issue.
Given Wilson and Clarendon Blvd's designation as "Primary Bicycling Corridors" in this area in the Bicycle Element of the MTP something like "Encourage active transportation through the construction of low-stress facilities on Wilson and Clarendon Boulevards"
We should be conscious to maximize the value of our investment in Metro by allowing as many people as possible to live within the quarter mile (and even half mile) radius.
Build 'em tall.
The 17-story building is too big given the character of the adjacent neighborhoods. I did not see any mention of ground floor retail - I do not think this site should be converted to a solely residential lot without the presence of ground floor retail to enhance the use of the neighborhood commercial corridor. It would also be nice to have more public use of the outdoor area.
The guiding principles appear OK on their face but based on the staff comments in massing scenarios (1-3) they clearly need elaboration. For example, the principle of tapering massing to surrounding residential areas yields comments on the massing scenarios that says scenario 3 has minimal tapering - but that is only because the overall building does not start at 17 stories like scenario 1. I think staff is well aware that the intent is not tapering for tapering sake but less height near the SFH.
None at this time.
Why are we encouraging on-site parking for development within Metro station areas?
Please what the area needs is housing for families that is not exorbitant in price. There are too many 1 bed apartments in the area. We need a lot more 2 bedroom apartments that would suit a family of 3 or 4.
The zoning for this area should not be allowed to become more dense or "high".
Walkability, if that's the correct term? Would be nice to have broader walkways (frontages?) surrounding any planned development
Cease and desist.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

No
N/A
A very important principle is the allowance for tall buildings at Metro centers, along the corridor, with stepped-down building heights between. This was intended and agreed-upon a long time ago. The proposed development is in conflict with this principle.
I think that it would be important to consider the relationship of any future development on the property to the Sanborn public art installation on Clarendon Blvd. immediately to the east. This consideration should be reflected in the scale and placement of any future structure and in the planning for a public art installation on the subject sitel
I do not have any additional principles- the provided ones are sufficient.
Yes. The principles are not based on reality. Any proposal needs to consider the costs on Arl Co annual budget AND capital improvements. Additionally the impacts on adjoins neighborhoods and properties needs to be quantified. The west capital court house study performs no impact assessment on th3 Arl Co budget, capital improvements, or adjoining neighborhoods. This is an example of how yo7 need to start over and drastically restructure the principles.
"Provide low-stress bike facilities on both Wilson and Clarendon Blvd adjacent to the site to fulfill their vision as Primary Bicycling Corridors in the Master Transportation Plan"
Nothing to add
The principles should maximize the importance of adding additional housing in locations that are well assessible to transportation and local amenities (like this site is).
The site is bordered by two major roadways and should not be required to accommodate transitions to the surrounding areas.
N/A
No
Higher density
Taller the better. More housing. Less parking.
Maximize the number of housing units, even if it means curtailing retail space. Much of the ground floor retail is empty because the area lacks sufficient density to support the existing levels of ground floor retail space. And remember that as we are facing a climate crisis, it's a travesty that there are many lots within 1/4 mile of metro stations that are restricted to single family houses. Think bigger.
Acknowledgement that the clarendon-wilson corridor is unique and can support higher density than other areas at a similar distance from the Metro.
Fewer cars! This is a fantastic oppportunity to remove the road between the whole foods and the vacant lot!
None
No
N/A
Protected bike lanes here are critical. This is smack in the middle of the RB corridor. Real PBLs, protected by concrete, not flexposts.
No
Increase the emphasis on biophilic design. It would be wonderful to have a low-energy use building with cascading vegetation or some such to add visual interest and minimize the blocky-ness of any new building there.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Emphasize housing
Allow for high density growth, unique additions to the neighborhood, affordable housing, while minimizing disruptions and impacts (eg parking, noise) to neighboring communities.
We need more affordable housing, with rental subsidies. Prioritize affordable housing over office space. Retail on the ground floor. And trees and grass.
Do more detailed analysis of the impact of the number of people living in new units under each scenario. Include impact on roads, stormwater treatment needs, shopping, schools, and overall quality of life, including lack of civic involvement from more renters.
Keeping in mind what the community wants, not just the developers.
The only thing I would add is maintaining or increasing the amount of green space and increasing the number of trees.
Requirement to provide parking at least 1.5 times the number of apartments plus separate spaces for businesses
Focus more on multimodal transportation and roadway safety
No
na
No suggestions
No, I find the existing guidelines thoughtful and comprehensive.
No
Allow development to continue with highrise buildings, as Metrorail access is very near that location.
Put stonger focus on parks, trees, anything but more congestion. Stop taking away Arlington's character... not much of it left at this point.
No
The Chamber supports additional density, especially in established bus and rail transit corridors, and land use policy and regulations that are flexible to attract investment in Arlington. The Courthouse West site is near the exact center of the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor. The site is within easy walking distance of transit, including the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and several bus lines that run along Wilson & Clarendon Blvd, and a high concentration of jobs, services, and retail.
Impact on County and APS finances (i.e., escalating property taxes)
None
Have uniform walkshed radius around transit stops upzoned for greatest density at transit stops and detached single unit housing outside the transit walkshed
The site should include a significant retail component and provide adequate free (or very low cost) short term parking for such establishments.
I think the guiding principles are great. Maybe include improvements to multi-modal connectivity at the site?
I think the primary focus should be on concentrating as much density in this prime location 1/4 mile from two metro stops. I also think there should be improvements noted for cyclists and pedestrians. The presentation omits the MTP's comments about this being a priority area for cycling and pedestrian improvements.
no additional comments
No further comment

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

I want to voice support and prioritization of pedestrian safety in the area. As it currently stands, cars, bikers, and scooters drive far too fast considering the already vast number of pedestrians crossing the streets around Whole Foods, particularly Clarendon Blvd to N Danville St. Adding additional residential units to the area, while a great use of space, will make it much more dangerous and ripe for fatal accidents so I think enhancing pedestrian safety should be one of the top priorities.

transportation improvements should be required to go with high density. Even if most new residents will not use motor vehicles, delivery services will so there should be enough capacity for that. If free market forces can be applied, such as a \$1 fee for short term parking (15 minutes), then such fees could eventually be passed along to the consumer even if indirectly. This requires flexibility in parking requirements to accomodate that. It should also lessen conflicts with pedestrians or bicyclists.

Limit the density to what is allowed now.

No

No suggestions

As population is up in Courthouse sector, you should think about more retail. Area lost the retail on courthouse to a hotel and lost some retail to county funded homeless shelter. Lost more to the upcoming big mixed use apartment building next to CVS. Think staff and commission should give more consideration to this. Unless you want us driving to ares that offer retail shopping like Ballston. What are you really offering with in 1/4 of Court Station for residence.

n/a

No

The building should conform to the heights of adjacent buildings (1-4 stories) and the current GLUP limit of 4 stories.

Less density. Infrastructure doesn't support even the current density. Now that the whole county has been built on everything drains into 4 mile run causing severe storm damage.

In addition to affordable housing providing affordable business leases to allow local businesses to operate FOB. Only the large corporate chains can operate at current lease rates.

A requirement for green roofs or green spaces within the build site.

N/A

none

No

No

Mandatory affordable housing and transportation improvements should be primary principles, rather than additional considerations

no

N/a

Noise from increased traffic and people. That area is busy enough already. Aesthetics - a 6 story building would be less offensive and more compatible with surrounding buildings.

None

Would like for Arlington to focus on shorter buildings--we should keep the landscape and focus on more green spaces--we have enough tall buildings which are not even yet being filled.

No

N/A

No additional feedback

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

The Guiding Plan Principles do not take into consideration the evolution of space use over time. Arlington has a glut of unused office and commercial space. Flexible spaces that can be modified for alternative uses needs to be part of the Guiding Planning Principles. What activities are occurring in the form of nearby businesses and pedestrian traffic that may govern the need for open space vs another mixed used building at absurd Orange Line corridor rents.

Add trees to the site, for climate and aesthetics. Encourage (incentive or mandate) some affordable housing units

I don't understand why parking would be a part of the guiding planning principles, except to say that if the developers of the lot would like to provide parking, they ought to do so underground, but really they shouldn't be required to do so (a huge percentage of the spaces in the garage in my building are perennially vacant). Tapering planning makes no sense without explicitly detailing the impacts of taller buildings on single family naves that the county is worried about.

No

Please keep maximum setback and wide sidewalks.

No

Public planning meeting to discuss what the neighborhood wants.

I would encourage keeping pedestrians in mind with good lighting and wide sidewalks. Also encourage green space.

And already on the list - but emphasizing reasonably priced housing.

Parking and disable access always seem to get the short end of the stick. Arlington is not all very physically fit 20 somethings.

N9

An additional elementary school must be added between Rosslyn and courthouse before further residential density is permitted. Already kids walking distance from Innovation school have been rezoned not one but 2 schools away, to Taylor, due to lack of any elementary serving Rosslyn to courthouse yet there's a huge number of residential units and highrises being continually added to this corridor.

No

Preserve some open space so that buildings provide some room to breathe, rather than filling in the entire block with building.

Na

Only retail, no apartments or condos. The infra structure of the area is becoming very congested.

Stop caving to developers and making the GLUP a farce.

Do not permit buildings that will dwarf the community and make traffic and parking even worse

No

Limitations to what is considered a metro-area capable of supporting high density housing. Just because a site is on Wilson Blvd, doesn't mean it should be zoned for high density if that doesn't fit in the surrounding streetscape.

box style buildings with retail on bottom and rental on top are all over the area and lack character; would like to see something designed that feels like it fits vs transforms the area

The existing principles are fine, just please keep in mind the local area. There are no 10+ buildings in the nearby blocks, and a 10+ beast would really stand out, especially considering the size of the block.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Impact on school enrollment and county resources. More housing is good but probably means more kids going to schools and increased metro/bus ridership. Also impact of rental units vs owner occupied especially when considering housing equity. Seems like there's been too few owner occupied residential units being created on the corridor and way too many rental units.

As little parking as possible! (Or less than that, even!)

This site is midway between two Metro stations and can handle major development, which it should. 17 stories should not be an issue. The site is smack dab in the middle of the R-B corridor and should reflect that with the housing and commercial outlets that reflect an urban character and support for surrounding institutions.

We need to stress affordable housing.

The building should be no taller than adjacent buildings.

Current heights of other buildings in the area - the Clarendon area has a lower profile when compared to Ballston and a higher building would fundamentally change the feel and look of the neighborhood and could cause other developments in the area inconsistent with the neighborhood feel.

Stronger considerations for green space and permeability, parking and infrastructure challenges, particularly on schools.

Housing. We need more of it on site for affordable/workforce housing and more of it to limit price increases elsewhere.

No

Ensure future tax receipts from site meets or exceeds long-term costs to tax-payer for infrastructure maintenance, repair and replacement.

As a young professional living in Arlington, VA since about 2016, I can safely say that the Clarendon/Courthouse area doesn't need another high-cost apartment complex charging \$2,000/month for a studio. The community, and this area in particular, would be well served to introduce some other form of housing. Whether focused on a portion of low-income residents, or a multi-family structure that welcomes families as opposed to 20-somethings, I think that either approach would be an optimal option.

Parking, not only is it expensive to park at your building, but there isn't great parking options around.

No additional principles

Should stay service commercial and C-2 to taper the building size to the surrounding residential size. The height should not go above the neighboring commercial building to the east.

N/a

None other than approving the applicant's request to change the use of the lot.

Increase density of non-car dependent housing options near options for non-car transportation (e.g. metro, bike lanes, bus lines, etc.)

less restrictive retail uses

None

No

Less parking and more bike lanes.

Increase density

not sure, we need to be get more creative. mixed use retail space is what the area needs the most. A development similar to Mosaic in Fairfax would work well.

None.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Make it easy and safely as possible for people to live and access this site on foot or bike.
The park/open space seems a bit small, especially if option 1 is selected. Do you have any shadow studies to show how neighboring properties or the park would be impacted? Please consider a pull off loading zone for food deliveries and car share services to prevent traffic disruptions on Clarendon and Wilson. Double parked vehicles are already a challenge on both roads, especially commercial trucks that won't use loading docks.
No
No.
Architectural merit. Require a statement building that breaks out of the standard or default residential design so common along the Orange line. Make a world-class, attention-getting design.
N/A
Remove parking minimums given the proximity to two metro stations. Development in this area should not lead to an increase in private car ownership within the metro corridor.
No
Whatever underground car parking is included in this building should include protected bike parking that is available to the public. The county is increasingly adding bike lanes, which I'm fine with, but they never add anywhere to park bikes that's more than on-street bike racks which can lead it to easily be stolen. Myself and my neighbors rarely use the bike lanes because they're not actually protected and there's nowhere to park your bike.
n/a
Please prioritize a space for dog owners upon opening this building. The new residents will have pets and it's incredibly important to ensure clean streets and enjoyable living.
I loved high rise living in pentagon city, but the lack of dog parks affected most residents view of the area. If you have a good dog park or space that supports dog-friendly catering then you will have low turnover and good economic growth.
Maximum density and net zero energy are most important along with discouraging car use. New buildings should provide easy access to the things people usually drive for. Transportation alternatives to cars should be encouraged and made safe. Building heights should taper in such a way that prioritizes rooftop solar and so should roof designs.
My only general thought is that more it's better to green light more housing rather than less.
I would not recommend any additions
I am against reduced parking requirements for planned apartments as was allowed in Red Top cab development.
The guiding principles really need to consider the demands that are with us now: there is a need for more elementary school space, there is a need for more family housing, and lots of empty commercial space. When considering the amounts of residential and commercial space, plan based upon what is needed. Clarendon does not need more little boutique shops that will close within two years. The residents need space and more than two bedrooms units should be available.
Add more housing
Facilitate walkability/car-free transport

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Step-downs in height, while something I once thought was a good "give" to adjacent communities, result in inefficient buildings and do little to appease neighborhoods. We need units, so let's let developers build them.

No

No

No - stick to the plan and scrap the amendments

The principles are well aligned, I think this site really needs to focus on maximizing affordable housing. Courthouse in particular is quite short on modern affordable housing options

No, for the most part; I generally am very supportive of the current Guiding Planning Principles. One minor concern in this case that the GPP do not address is the impact of traffic entering/exiting the site on the traffic flow on Wilson and Clarendon Blvd.

n/a

None

None

nothing further

There is already many apartment/condo units in the immediate area, which will bring down the value of the existing units. More retail and restaurant spaces are welcome.

Further refining what "affordable housing" truly means

The principles should reflect not only present resident, business, and visitor requirements and preferences but the anticipated needs of the community for the duration of the useful life of the planned structure. For a property in the orange line corridor, the principles should encourage development that will bridge Clarendon and Courthouse (similar to development bridging Virginia Sq and Clarendon), support local small businesses, and accommodate continued population growth in a dense footprint.

Primary - primary - focus should be on combating climate change. The easiest element is adding native trees to all new building sites. Make this mandatory

In general, building heights should be limited to immediate neighborhood preferences.

Encourage or mandate that all "luxury" apartment and mixed-use buildings must include some (5%?) affordable housing units.

No. If anything it should be cut back; adding more things to study just makes the process more expensive and makes development out of reach for smaller developers.

I agree with the Guiding Planning Principles.

More housing and less parking.

Loosen the zoning restrictions on the retail uses. allow any retail use on the ground level.

When density increases, what is the strain on local services, like schools? Will we need to add more trailers to schools to accommodate the additional students, if so, then the zoning should not increase in density.

We are also experiencing traffic and parking issues. We can not assume that dwellings can get by without 2 parking spaces per unit. The inclination to drive, aka, not use public transportation, has increased with COVID. Assume people who can afford a car or two will own cars.

I believe that this is a location that will have viable retail space and that should be maximized here

n/a

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

No, the Planning Principles look good.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Please provide protected, low stress cycling facilities to reflect the importance of Wilson and Clarendon as critical cycling corridors.

Prioritize people in planning .This includes serious consideration of a future pedestrianization of either Wilson or Clarendon Blvds from Clarendon to Rosslyn. Also, at a minimum, there should be low-stress bicycle facilities on both Clarendon and Wilson (in fact, Wilson Blvd. already has these near the recently opened Fire Station #10). The economic benefits of improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities is clear.

Focus on protected biking and deprioritize cars

Strong focus on density is important.

NO MORE HIGH RISES!!!! Thanks to all the construction and rezoning Arlington/Rosslyn is SATURATED with traffic, congestion, noise, hence a complete loss of peace and enjoyment of living in this county. STOP ALREADY! What about a low rise arts center with park (NOT with tennis/basketball courts) but a quiet place to sit and read. ENOUGH.

increase parks

As discussed in the Feb 2021 LRPC meeting, the development of the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor has evolved in some areas to be more of a spine of density with tapering to the neighborhoods north and south vs. purely a bullseye at each Metro station with tapering on all sides. This makes sense when considering the major public infrastructure in place along the spine and encouraging mixed use development and density along it. Furthermore reminding stakeholders that guidelines are not rules/laws is needed.

Where did north-south orientation come from? Tapering heights to the adjoining blocks is better if the tallest massing is aligned to Wilson and Clarendon.

Whole Foods parking lot is routinely congested. Danville is a busy exit point. The GLUP block offers overflow parking. Need more consideration of impacts on these uses. Where is the underground parking entrance? How to handle left turns off Danville to Wilson/Clarendon?

N/A

Maintain commitment to housing accessible to individuals employed across the range of business in the County and DC, not only the top tier.

There are so many high density buildings in Arlington, and residents receive nothing in return for the density, except HIGH TRAFFIC. The streets cannot be enlarged. Please STOP THE HIGH DENSITY, which also means NO MORE BUILDING TAPERING!!

With the COVID pandemic, why are buildings allowed to be developed now? There is a shift of people moving away from Arlington because of the high cost and employers allowing teleworking in cheaper suburbs. STOP BUILDING! THE DEVELOPERS RUIN OUR STREETS!

1. Consideration of the impact on increased car traffic must be considered. All new high density office or housing developments bring significant traffic increases despite being close to metro, buses, and other public transit.

2. Consideration of the impact on school population and districting. New housing brings new demand on schools.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Arlington should move beyond the bulls-eye concept in the Metro corridors. We have realized the extent of development under this approach, and the site in question will be seen by all involved (future residents and the broader community) as convenient to TWO Metro stations, not too far from any as the current GLUP treats it.

The overriding concern for the Guiding Planning Principles should be to allow residents to actually afford to live in the County. Accordingly, maximizing the supply of housing in the County must be the priority. Given the outsized demand for housing by current and future residents of the County, the only solution is to build much taller and much denser. It is best if done near the Metrorail stations, but given the recent proliferation of last-mile transit options, it should be done everywhere.

Other than adding affordable housing to the housing guideline, I believe these are appropriate.

I am opposed to breaking the county promise to limit tall building to “nodes” and avoid creating a “canyon effect” on major thoroughfares. The proposed heights of up to 17 stories are totally out of scale to the surrounding areas.

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place on the other side of N. Danville Street in the more recent Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses, including building height (55 feet near low density residential).

Create a ratio of density to green space.

I think that a 17 story building is frankly silly. Such a building would be so much taller than anything else. I think a 10 story building would also be strange given the height of the other buildings around the site. But I think the 17 story building is being offered as a straw man to try and get the county to compromise on a 10 story building. I don't think that the area can support (schools, parking, etc) even a 10 story building.

Make sure the RB corridor remains a vibrant heart of the community and provides the housing Arlington needs

What studies have been conducted on traffic and environmental impacts on surrounding areas? I don't see anything for a “high” build out

- Impacts of these proposed changes on adjoining parcels and adjoining blocks. Surrounding blocks are occupied by structures ranging from 1 to 5 stories tall. The proposed development could be 3 times taller than its neighbors.
- Impacts on the Lyon Village neighborhood (a historic neighborhood): Adjacent parcels of the southern edge of Lyon Village would likely seek similar zoning changes.

The development should not loom over the residential areas to the north and south, or make the Wilson/Courthouse arterial roads feel too much like a canyon. Ground level retail should be prioritized, and attention paid to not increasing traffic density around the busy Whole Foods. Listen to residents. With this and the very controversial Langston Blvd proposals, residents are feeling ignored as Lyon village appears to be targeted to be squeezed between ever greater density.

Greater consideration should be given to surrounding areas and historic neighborhoods. Current residents should be given greater consideration than developers.

I don't think that increasing the housing supply should be a goal for this parcel or for the Rosslyn/Ballston corridor generally. The area schools are already overcrowded, and parking and traffic congestion in that part of the neighborhood is already a problem. Increasing housing supply and adding population density to this area will only increase existing problems with no good reason for doing so.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

No

Additional principles should include Traffic Impact and Environmental Impact of development.

Add a principal to preserve existing mature trees and vegetated space — see references to trees and the urban heat island effect in the 2019 Community Energy Plan. Add a requirement/principal for an analysis of the fiscal impacts and added costs of providing community services and infrastructure: e.g. schools (student generation), added stormwater runoff, additional traffic congestion (reduced pavement lifecycle), etc.

Maximize green space.

The Guiding Planning Principles are reasonable for this GLUP, with two additions. Incorporate/meld the planning principles for the December 2021 draft of the Pentagon City Plan. Those 6 themes are essential to achieving visions for the future that have very broad support. Also, the "bulls-eye" concept should be replaced by a R-B vision of a flexible, continuous spine, with the linear design principles without regard to Metro proximity. The tapering of the GLUP would still apply.

This property should be subject to the same current zoning as adjacent properties. "Node" higher development adjacent to Metro stations makes sense, but this property is not close to a metro - almost directly between two stops. As a voter and significant residential taxpayer in Arlington, I find it surprising that the County would even consider this request that refutes their prior work and voters' priorities. The priority should not be the parcel owner making more money.

Arlington County processes are out of whack. The surveys you put up actually limit a citizen's right to comment completely. You have tremendous bias and you seem to not care at all about differing opinions. While I DO believe Arlington voter deserve the leadership they have (as they continue to vote in people with little regard for citizen input). "Arlington Way?": County nags residents to quickly clear snow from sidewalks, while never sending a single snow plow (Jan 3&4,'22). Shame on you.

As a Clarendon resident, I would strongly suggest updating the existing Type A-C street designation in the Arlington area.

Type A designation should expand dramatically to encompass an area that is within a realistic walking distance from each Metro station. My personal opinion is that this would be an area within half a mile of each Metro stop should be Type A.

The County process is broken and undemocratic. This "request for feedback" does not offer the opportunity to object to the proposed zoning and density changes and it does not even begin assess the impacts of these proposed changes. Resident feedback is not being requested for a lower impact alternative and no zero option is being considered. We need a voter's initiative to limit tie the hands of this kind of abuse.

No.

I think you should make sure you get feedback from a minimum of 30-50% of neighborhood impacted. The term of this feedback (esp during the holidays) and lack of outreach significantly limits value and gives too much input to parties requesting the changes who have direct and greater staff contact. Given sites location heights and density should be consistent with Clarendon plan with lower building heights. Affordable housing should not be an excuse to increase density in already dense area.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

: Because of the key location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, I would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

no

Based on the location, I suggest that a key guiding principle(s) be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville St. in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density and uses and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low residential density residential as in the Clarendon Plan.

With any development, let's look at the impacts we have on schools, the environment and overcrowding.

Let's be tasteful in developing this part of Arlington and make sure to respect existing communities and neighborhoods.

To be to the point. I do not agree with building higher than the current 4 stories for this property.

The County should consider whether there is market demand for development along Langston before proceeding. Covid has allowed employees to work anywhere in the country; proximity to DC is no longer necessary.

The Guiding Planning Principles should account for the height of the proposed building relative to the surrounding buildings and distance from the nearest metro center. The proposed location is outside the .25 mile radius to the Clarendon and Courthouse metro stops, and dwarfs the neighboring commercial spaces. The Guiding Planning Principles should be refined to avoid tapering toward metro centers, the opposite of a bullseye.

The Rosslyn-Ballston corridor has too little open space. The corridor is not biophilic and is not an attractive place to live and work. Most people live and work in the corridor because of its access to Metro, bus routes and I-66 (where nearby). The Guiding Planning Principles should therefore emphasize the need for more ground level public open space and biophilia than is presently planned and that presently exists in the Courthouse Sector, including at this site.

No.

Lack of precedent or need for "High" OAH at this site. Highest and best use would be a dedicated open public green space which, compared to the rest of Arlington, is in short supply in this neighborhood. Amenities to existing built environment & "walkable" Arlington would benefit this corridor rather than another structure nobody asked for.

The GPP doesn't address parking, current occupancy rates or ways to ensure natural light throughout the region. Areas like Rosslyn, va sq and ballston feel like concrete jungles focused toward working instead of living or true neighborhoods

Any GLUP change should only allow density/building height similar to those immediately East and West of the site. (4-6 stories)

On site underground parking should be no less than one space per unit residential. Anything less will overwhelm residential streets nearby with occupant cars.

Thoughtful growth benefiting small local businesses

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

I would like the height, tapering, and setback absolutely consistent with both the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans since this is a transitional property between the two.

Given the site's location between the Courthouse and Clarendon Plan areas, it's vital that the key guiding principles reinforce the need to maintain heights, density, and land uses consistent with both these plans. For instance, building height should be limited and tapered downward towards neighboring low density residential areas as required in the 2006 Clarendon Plan, with maximum 55' heights near these areas.

More public parkland is always a good idea.

As it relates to this site, "concentrate high-density development within Metro Station Areas" is the most important point in the Guiding Planning Principles by far and should supersede the others when thinking about density and future planning.

No

This should be viewed as a continuation of Clarendon, which caps building heights between Wilson and Clarendon Blvd at 60 feet., rather than the start of the much taller buildings in the center of Court House. This would be consistent with the neighboring office building and then allow for the ramp up of building heights to grow as you go further east towards Court House.

I would prefer to see this lot turned into a public space, a green that the public could gather at and enjoy together. Ideally, we could have a small stage or amphitheater that local residents could easily sign up and play at.

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

Limit building height to 6 stories.

180 feet looks very overwhelming, in an area with some buildings that already feel like behemoths. Also doesn't look very welcoming/human-scale-friendly.

If we are going to say vision zero then it means more people and less cars. We must either live to this principle or not

Need higher buildings and better non car transportation.

I feel that all GLUP should include best practices for transportation (for cycling and pedestrians, as car-centric best practices are often the worst for every other user while cycling/pedestrian best practices make the area safer and better for everyone including car users).

I want to see an emphasis on creating opportunities for more residents (of all stripes) to come to this opportunity-rich corridor, and enjoy the opportunity Arlington affords. This location allows this, given the existence of good mobility options (transit, as well as biking and walking).

No

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

The term "Guiding Planning Principles" are nowhere that I can locate in the slide deck or the website about this project.

Among the principles ought to be maximizing livability for existing residents, rather than the unfettered growth that is being pushed.

Also, planning principles should include planning for county services. Including schools. We can't accommodate infinite.

N/a

Concentrating high-density development within Metro Station Areas is very important. Tapering building massing down to surrounding residential areas to limit the impacts of high-density development will prevent using the space as efficiently as possible.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Keep Arlington affordable while maximizing public spaces.

No

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, I would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

Left out of the discussion is the impact on adjacent R-6 neighborhoods and any impingement on views or light exposure. How high above the horizon will a 17-story building appear from the intersection of Cleveland and Bryan or Edgewood and Franklin Streets, say, both distinctly residential in character.

Let's put more emphasis on building housing where all essential services are in within a short walking or biking distance.

1. Adhere to the Sector Plan
2. Adhere to the community process that defined tapering from one section of the Ballston corridor to another. We did not agree to a wall of buildings at the same height in the corridor, and do not want this.
2. No upzoning without expressed community benefits

N/a

Limit height of the buildings

Go big.

1) County staff claims the site is not sufficiently planned. County staff is undertaking this process on the ground that current planning documents for this site "lack sufficient planning guidance." The current Courthouse Sector Plan calls for "service commercial 1-4 stories" on this block, which we think is very clear "planning guidance."

(2) Scenario Three is the only one that is close to the current Courthouse Sector Plan and appropriate for this site, which is midway between the Clarendon and Co

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

No.

What ever is done must recognize that this location is not adjacent to the two nearest METRO stations and should be cognizant of the lower scale of existing structures. The last thing that the County should want to do is to encourage existing commercial operations in low-rise buildings to have an incentive to cease their operations just to make more money off of the land they occupy.

Consider the proximity to the metro, the fact that anything that gets built here will last for 50+ years, and planning for an Arlington of the future!

Please keep in mind that zoning laws are meant to promote a civilized society and, at best, avoid contention and be of benefit to all current residents. The County has a promise to purchase more land as a green space. The benefit of using this space as a park would be a great contribution. (The street at the entrance to the Whole Foods is often jammed with customers trying to get in the parking lot.)

Yes, space for mature trees and open green space, as stated in the 2019 Community Energy Plan: <https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2019/10/Final-CEP-CLEAN-003.pdf>.

As well as a mandatory fiscal impact analysis for each development model proposed, including the cost of new community services and infrastructure, the environmental impacts of the proposed redevelopment, and the likely impact on income gaps in the county from construction of these new high-end units

Can public utilities (sewer, water, electric, gas) support these changes?

Can the school system support the increased number of students?

Can county services support the increased number of residents

Can parking and transportation support this (onsite parking, Metro, bus, roadways)

Maintain current GLUP and Zoning or follow the Clarendon Sector Plan - building height limited to 55'

On Slide 12 my Condominium Complex is marked "High Residential" that is false. None of our buildings are higher than 5 stories tall.

The main reason I bought my first condo here in Courthouse instead of in the Clarendon, Virginia Square, or Ballston areas was because of the lack of high rise structures compared to those areas. Since I bought my first condo almost 15 years ago MANY things have changed in the Courthouse area and sadly much of that change has included higher or actual highrise buildings.

I've been an attorney for 33 years. This question is literally gobbledegook. I don't understand how you think anyone can muster an intelligent answer.

No. The Guiding Planning Principles are too generalized to be meaningful. Common sense applied to specific individual scenarios makes a lot more sense.

Not for now

N/A

Rather than pursuing additional housing supply for additional housing's sake, ensure that existing community resources and infrastructure can support new residents without sacrificing current quality and service levels.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

The excessive height (17 stories) and complete coverage to the very edges of the site has produced transportation and safety problems at numerous other locations. When intersections are not 90 degrees, need to use transportation safety setbacks clear line of vision and not block vision for buses/cars/bikes and pedestrians. Utility infrastructure future maintenance access should also be higher priority.

Should have 10% larger (2-3 bedroom) affordable housing units. Rather than 1 bedrooms that are not appropriate for families.

Should have affordable commercial space for small businesses - tailor, cobbler, dime store.

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, use the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan. This will encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

Severely limit building heights and types adjacent to existing single Family housing neighborhoods such as line Village and Lyon park for example

Impact on core services, fire, police, schools, green space, parks and rec, traffic and fiscal analysis of this project. What and how will the current neighborhood be impacted. Adding density for the sake of density without looking at the entire picture is not acceptable.

Please consider the number of people the area can support, especially in terms of streets and sidewalks. Sidewalks should be very wide and numbers of people and animals the project may bring to the area should be limited so as not to erode quality of life in the neighborhood.

It would be helpful if a key guiding principle included consistency with the Clarendon Sector Plan, which has lower building heights.

Yes, take into account the ability of the current community to absorb this project and consider it was originally zoned the way it was for a reason.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Don't allow construction right up to sidewalk/street without allowing space for trees, sunlight, etc. to reach ground level (as has happened in upper Rosslyn area). Don't need another ugly, unpleasant Ballston neighborhood.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

No

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

No

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Issues with this include but are not limited to, the environment, congestion, is infrastructure and safety. Safety for pedestrians, bikers and potentially home owners.

Generous sidewalk width. (Sidewalks on Wilson and on the north side of Clarendon are inadequate for good pedestrian life.)

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Emphasize a range of housing types. This neighborhood is mostly apartments/condos and could benefit from missing middle housing, such as townhomes and duplexes.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

no

The guiding principles in place west of N. Danville St. in the Clarendon sector plan make sense. That is, utilize consistent heights, density and uses. A limit of 55 feet near low density residential seems to make perfect sense.

Underground parking.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

No, they make sense.

The surround area cannot support more than 4-6 stories. Anything else will create significant traffic and parking issues in the surrounding neighborhood.

Stronger emphasis on vision zero in the MSA. The crosswalks and bike lanes are still scary places to be—drivers still get away with really aggressive behavior blowing through crosswalks, swerving without a signal between lanes including bike lanes, blocking lanes, and making prohibited turns at red lights.

Given the location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place elsewhere to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses, including a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan. The proposed amendment is so out of step with tapering that it would be incredibly destabilizing. Also Metro is not an elastic resource.

Opposed to change to High Office-Apartment-Hotel. NOT appropriate as study is surrounded on all sides by LOW. Keep the study area LOW. The heights are supposed to taper down from the Metro stations. Study area is on the very outer edge of the Metro bullseye zones so it is inappropriate to change this area to HIGH. Keep it LOW!!!!

Recommend that a key guiding principle be encouraging livability as Metro is not an inexhaustible resource, the neighborhoods don't need more cut through traffic, and there's limited public space. Heights should be tapered to slope into the surrounding neighborhoods and limited to three to four stories given nearby residential areas. What is being proposed is grossly out of line and a so called "compromise" of something less is still at odds with good planning principles.

The building should blend in with the existing topography of other immediately adjacent buildings. Placing a 10-12 story building there would stick out like a sore thumb. As is currently zoned, taller buildings should only be in the area immediately adjacent to the metro. Otherwise we just end with a impractical and clunky sprawl.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Consistent height, density, and uses should be the main guiding principle. As such, the location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans strongly favors using the recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan where building heights should be no more than 60 feet near low density residential areas with adequate tapering and observance of the bulls-eye concept.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Provide low stress bicycle facilities to reflect how Wilson Blvd and Clarendon Blvd and primary bicycle corridors

Follow the Clarendon Sector Plan

Given the location of the site with its proximity to Clarendon (and a low density residential neighborhood), the principles of the Clarendon Sector Plan would be most appropriate for this site. This would emphasize the principles of consistent density, uses and heights (limited to 55 feet near low density residential neighborhood as is in the Clarendon Sector Plan).

Follow the Clarendon Sector Plan that promotes consistent heights, density, and uses to include a height limit of 55 feet near residential areas

The Guiding Planning Principles should consider the future of transit-oriented development (TOD) in Arlington County. Concentrating development around metro stations is no longer sufficient to accommodate growth in the county, and development patterns instead should focus on building out TOD corridors. The Principles should also consider maximizing green/public space improvements (including adoption of biophilic design principles).

Support for Car/Pedestrian/wheels to co-exist -- will ultimately help safety, livability, equity, and biophilia.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities to encourage the area having "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Since the site is midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, I would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

The Guiding Planning Principle to "Taper building massing down to surrounding residential areas to limit the impacts of high-density development" seems to be misinterpreted by the massing scenarios on slide 66. Per those scenarios, the tapering is from the building in question towards the residential areas surrounding. Per slide 24, the correct interpretation of tapering guidance would be from metro/commercial area outward toward the residential areas.

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan)

In light of the site and location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

Yes. The first principle, to “[c]oncentrate high-density development within Metro Station Areas” should emphasize that development should be greatest directly adjacent to Metro Stations, and taper down between Stations, to preserve existing development patterns, foster variety in building heights and uses, and maintain street level access to light and air – all crucial for the narrow Wilson Blvd corridor. This has been a core principle of the GLUP since the original “rb72” Plan.

No suggestions for the principles as far as they relate to the specific site. I do think parks are important, and perhaps a principle focused on the availability of parks within close proximity to the site might be appropriate.

Provide low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors"

Because this site is located halfway between Courthouse and Clarendon, I suggest that the planning principles in place for the area west of N. Danville Street, included in the recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, be incorporated into the planning policy for this site. This would encourage consistent (and lower) heights, density, and uses.

The GPP needs to include impact of surrounding communities. This site was specifically zoned as part of the Courthouse/Clarendon Corridor, whereas the taller buildings were at the metro stops and taper down in between the metro stops. Changing the designation to “High” Office-Apartment-Hotel will negatively impact the neighborhood and sets a negative precedent. The developer invested in the property under current zoning laws and should NOT intimidate or coerce change.

The Principles need to include consideration of how many additional students will enter the APS system for each approved project. Failure to do so makes Arlington worse for its families!

This parcel is midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, so a guiding principle should be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

First of all you need to make this survey understandable. The questions seem to purposely confuse. Any building should consider the current situation and state of our commercial development in light of new norms within the working world - more at home working. How will high rise commercial add to our community tax wise? Out of town owners of our current commercial and residential development don't seem to have a concern for our community.

No.

In light of the site’s location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

I do not support changes to the GLUP or any zoning changes.

The pedestrian crossing at Danville and Wilson needs cross walks and signals. Also, drivers cannot see to take a left from Danville onto Wilson.

We also hope to see an emphasis on adding locally owned businesses to the retail location--at small business friendly rates.

None at this time.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

The principles should account for whether the county has the resources available to provide services (i.e., schools, police, etc.) for any added density. Adding density creates strains on those resources, where we are already facing acute problems without the added density. There should also be a consideration of whether increased building heights or density are out of character for the area and whether they change the nature and feel of the neighborhood.

Guiding Planning Principle should incorporate and apply to the development of the full block and not a partial development where not all the tracts of land are utilized (corner of Wilson and Cleveland). Historically, this has not been part of Arlington planning policy to up-GLUP when there is not full consolidation. For a monumental decision, please consider going with current guidance or wait for full consolidation.

The north-south alignment as a guiding principle appears to be result of ownership rather than a public policy goal. The slides present Scenario 3 as not massing north-south, thereby presenting Scenario 3 as a failure of this policy goal. The applicant does not own the two corner parcels of the lot, thereby massing will generally align north-south. Scenario 3 is definitely in keeping with this policy guidance, particularly since the height and density are already reasonable.

Guiding Plan principles should include a full estimate of all costs that will be incurred by the county for transportation, sewer management, education and all other service impacts. The county can no longer proceed with expansive property commercial property development without balancing the long term impact of costs on the county.

N/a

Not at this time but will need to consider effect on potential re-development to Whole Foods site and to the north.

Adjust the proposed massing, particularly for the tallest structures, to favor a due east-west orientation to maximize potential for climate-responsive building envelopes. Consider where shadows are thrown relative to micro-climates and mitigating urban heat island effects while creating public green spaces.

Please add to your considerations: 1. Shadow at noon on a winter day. Snow and ice that are not removed and/or refreeze are a hazard for pedestrians. Massing should not obscure the sun from the sidewalk; and 2. Affect of development on traffic. This is a particular problem for the block under study. It is already almost impossible to exit Whole Foods via Danville Street going onto either Clarendon Blvd. or Wilson Blvd. Adding residential parking onto this street is dangerous.

Scenarios one and two abandon the 'bulls-eye' idea on which current GLUP is based. I do not favor this, I think the bulls-eye idea is a proper response to the greater transit availability at the Metro stations.

There is insufficient infrastructure, like transportation, parking, school capacity, storm water management, etc. to support the proposed increase in density. Creating density without scaling up the infrastructure doesn't make any sense. Pedestrian safety is already a problem, and putting more cars on roads without increasing traffic police, speed bumps, stop signs, etc. throughout that area and surrounding areas is inviting additional safety problems.

No.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

High density building here would be great. But 100% need to ensure that the roads on either side provide for safe transit for pedestrians and people riding bikes. Do not turn this into a car garage/destination.

more specifics as to the degree of the taper into residential areas  
more specifics as to the type of affordable housing and what constitutes affordable housing, i.e. cost, price per square foot, rental rate etc.

The infrastructure supporting this area needs to be thoroughly examined. Parking is already overstressed, high traffic volume on narrow residential streets is a problem and so are overcrowded schools.

None I can think of.

My family is hoping that the current character of Lyon Village will not be adversely affected by development along Langston or Wilson. Changes that would adversely affect Lyon Village's character include, for example, increasing cut through traffic between Langston and Wilson, and increasing residential density beyond the properties that currently abut Langston.

We're unable to find the existing "Guiding Planning Principles" online, but we would recommend that the GLUP not be amended to allow "High" Office-Apartment-Hotel. Possible criteria to consider are traffic patterns and the vacancy rate of office space. There is already a high vacancy rate/turnover for office space and high-rise apartment would increase traffic in an already busy intersection of Wilson/Danville. Additionally, the increased traffic and empty office space could be a safety issue.

Guiding principles should include compliance with overall plan for the R-B corridor (bullseye plan with height/density concentrated at metro entrances, and less height and density further away), as well as compliance with the existing land use and zoning designations. Also, no consideration of additional height or density should be entertained without the assembly of entire block. there are many public interests to having an assembled block, starting with provision of services, and utilities.

I think it is extremely important to preserve open space and sunlight along Wilson and Clarendon Blvd. I think it also makes much more sense to retain the Service Commercial designation than to change it to a High Density-Hotel designation. There are numerous hotels and high-density high-rise apartments/condo buildings in the area, but in the Courthouse area they are all along the sides of the street, preserving aesthetics, privacy, and sunlight, rather than between Clarendon and Wilson.

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

Use of guiding principles like the Clarendon Sector Plan - limited to 55 feet near low density residential.

**1. The Guiding Planning Principles are intended to provide context-sensitive guidance based on adopted planning policy for this site. Would you suggest any additional principles or refinements to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)**

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

In light of the site's location midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon sector plans, would suggest that a key guiding principle be the planning principles in place west of N. Danville Street in the more recently adopted Clarendon Sector Plan, to encourage consistent heights, density, and uses (and preferably a building height limited to 55 feet near low density residential as in the Clarendon Plan).

Focus on the transportation around the site by providing low-stress bicycle facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Boulevard, reflecting their importance as "Primary Bicycling Corridors".

I'm not sure this comment relates to the guiding planning principles. It does related community input, which is part of the process. Please provide an option to review the power point at one's own speed. Some points can be reviewed quickly, while others require more thought. I have in mind: (a) the current slides with accompanying narration, or (not instead of) (b) the slides, accompanying by the written text of the narration in (a).

## Responses to Questions 3 and 4

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	The 17 stories is too dramatic a change from immediately surrounding projects.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	<p>190 du/ac is more than enough to promote affordability in a C-O zone. More than that will burden the infrastructure in that area. I'd support more if we ever get a metro entrance west of Adams.</p> <p>In all 3 scenarios, the SW corner is a poor choice for open space, given that Danville is the loading/dumpster area for both this property and Whole Foods. It should be in the SE corner to align with the CEA building's plaza.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Metro areas (which this is really in two of) should be allowed to build densely and scenario 1 does that best. I would like to see FAR above 10 on the site and would prefer a greater skew towards housing (hopefully at least 400 units). Especially since the "bullseye" approach has been eschewed in the area with the "neighborhood conservation" on 16th, I think it's vital to allow more density in the corridor areas.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The tallest scenario provides the best opportunity for more housing supply.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It maximizes housing and density in the Metro corridor while still tapering an appropriate amount.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>This site is completely underutilized in one of the fastest growing, most desirable neighborhoods in the County. We should allow at least 17 stories, if not more, to let more people live within walking distance of Metro, bus service, bike lanes, and amenities. Anything less than 17 stories would not meet our goals to increase the housing supply and address climate change.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Anything other than scenario one would represent a missed opportunity to build more homes in a dense and transit-rich area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The parcels opposite this lot on either side are under 6 stories. 17 stories would be towering and out of character given that single family homes exist two blocks away. The retail/commercial buildings across Clarendon/Wilson are 1-3 stories. Even 10 stories is a significant deviation and does not represent a gradual taper.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Its a compromise between what many nearby residents really want which is less height and density and the other priorities like housing. Pretty sure it won't be supported by local residents though.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I believe the lower height in scenario 3 better fits with the character of Clarendon. When we first moved to Arlington in 2006 we were attracted to Clarendon (as opposed to Ballston or Rosslyn) because of the lower heights of the buildings. I believe that scenarios 1 or 2 would be out of step with the current character of the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Scenario 3 fits in most naturally with the surrounding in terms of height-tapering and best promotes publicly accessible open space.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This is a low key mid rise neighborhood. Anything bigger would feel out of place.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Road and rail transportation along this corridor cannot support any more massing. We also cannot continue to take away visibility of the sky from street level. Why are we continuing to let real estate developers degrade our city?
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Concentrates housing in a way that allows for good density as well as wider sidewalks all around.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Because Arlington has no NEED for high-rises.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	There are very few sites in all of Arlington County that are better suited for dense, pedestrian-friendly development near 2 of the premiere Metro stations in the region. As a community, we should be taking the long view on this site and maximizing density in this central location.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	safety + good density
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	A very important principle is the allowance for tall buildings at Metro centers, along the corridor, with stepped-down building heights between. This was intended and agreed-upon a long time ago. The proposed development is in conflict with this principle.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Scenario 1 is clearly out of scale with respect to height at this Metro access mid station location. Scenario 2 gives some opportunity for the creation street level open space.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The maximum amount of density would allow for the most amount of units. Rental space near a metro is at premium cost in Arlington, and this would help lower that (hopefully) for the immediate area.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Who cares about your principles. You have failed planning and city planning 101. The neighborhood to the north is a historic district/neighborhood. Not one mention of this or the impact of any alternative on this historic area. Question 3 makes no reference to impacts on adjoining parcels or neighborhoods with any proposed change. Can't believe the study and staff are so tone def and do not care about impacts to the neighborhood, adjoining properties, or Arl co budget. Absolutely shocking.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>I concur with slides 66 and 67.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Maximize in high traffic areas</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>We need to maximize housing in locations where there are walkable amenities and that are well connected to our transit, bike and pedestrian networks. This location is easily walkable to the Courthouse Metrorail station and has dozens of community serving retail options. Proving more height can also open some of the ground level to a public space. We should be maximizing our under/undeveloped along the RB corridor and not holding back their ability to produce housing that will minimize pressure.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Arlington should maximize the value of the land by maximizing the development allowed on it. Arlington needs more housing and more public infrastructure, and the densest plan best enables both.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Tapering and relation to other buildings directly around the project</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Height would help with high density concentration. To accommodate more demand, I believe the retail space is still insufficient to allow space for smaller businesses..</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	<p>Similar zoning only a few blocks away Provides needed density Increased density will support additional street level retail/commerce</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>Bigger is better. We need the housing to take the pressure off the market.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>There is a massive shortage of housing near metro stations. It's irresponsible to push development into car-dependent areas by artificially limiting the number of housing units near metro stations.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>Adheres to the spirit of the plan to encourage TOD.</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	<p>At a quarter mile from metro, this should taper just a touch.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>Build it and they will come</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	<p>The Metro corridor is being severely overbuilt.</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	<p>Increasing housing supply while also keeping that building-tapered strategy: going from low to high with the metro station at the center.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>This is in the heart of an urban corridor.</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	<p>It would cause minimal obstruction of views to the surrounding area while still adding value to an otherwise unsightly and unused (mostly) lot.</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	<p>To be consistent with the massing adjacent, and not introduce a high-rise smack in-between (yet still 1/4 mile from) two metro stations.</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	<p>Need more housing. Tall buildings already common in the area.</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	<p>Increasing density to 10 stories allows for affordable housing and a healthy profit for the developer, without creating a high rise so tall the developer can externalizing costs to neighboring properties (eg, parking, loss of direct light).</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	More stories = more housing units. If we limit the height of residential buildings we become NIMBYs.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	It accomplishes multiple aims--additional housing, public space--while limiting negative impact on nearby neighborhoods and shopping areas.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	17 stories will look out of place and make the corridor appear to be a disorganized mess like Tysons.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	it concentrates development the most, provides the most housing, and provides the most ground level retail space
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Fits in with the neighborhood. A lot of space without making Courthouse a soul-less concrete jungle like Crystal City
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	There are not many very tall buildings in the area and 17 stories would feel very tall for the area.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Quality access to mass transit supports high density. However, developer should be required to provide sufficient parking as most residents will most likely continue to own vehicle.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Already too many high rises
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	I think the height of Scenario two strikes a balance with adding more density while still keeping with the city-scape surrounding it.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	My highest priority is to keep our local businesses thriving and to ensure urban vitality throughout the entire R-B corridor. That is best done with as much new housing as possible. I say this as the owner-occupant of a Lyon Village house who appreciates the vibrancy of this area. I am NOT in agreement with the NIMBYism of my vocal Civic Association leadership re the Plan Lee Highway process nor what I am sure will be their vocal opposition to anything significant proposed for this site!

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Height is in keeping with the area, and consistent with proximity to the Metro.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Maintain consistency with high-rise buildings near Metrorail stations
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	We are too congested as it is. Turn it into a nice park where people can gather.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Average
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Growing and maintaining a diverse housing stock is critical for development. To increase housing affordability, Arlington County should remove barriers to the provision of housing supply, including limitations on density. The enhanced height and mass of Scenario 1, with maximum heights of 17 stories or 180 feet, will allow Courthouse West to deliver the greatest number of housing units. Sufficient height, mass, and architectural emphasis will allow this site to fit well with its surroundings
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Reasonable balance to add housing while considering downsides of increased density.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Max usage of area
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The building site is on a major transit corridor in a walkable neighborhood that badly needs new housing supply due to tremendous regional demand. Located 4 blocks from 2 underground metro stations, and directly server by 4 bus lines, and across the street from a grocery store, this site needs to be built as dense as possible.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Scenario 2 strikes the correct balance for the neighborhood.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	That area is extremely walkable and very close to two metro stations as well as frequent bus and bike amenities. We need additional residential density in metro corridors and frankly, this site has been a parking lot full of weeds for too long.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	I think we should be taking advantage of this prime site located a short walking distance from two metro stations and building it to the highest density possible.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	no additional comments
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The tall buildings should be in the vicinity of the metro stations - that was the initial vision of the County. We don't need to be a corridor of all tall buildings where we never see the sun. Think about the quality of life of residents who live on the corridor instead of money in the developer's pockets.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Because there is already high-density development in this metro area with more on the way. so balancing that with a small residential development that would put less of a burden on the existing infrastructure which is already insufficient for the amount of people that live and visit the area. The sidewalks are already too small, bike lanes are not protected, and there is a lack of public space. These needs will only be exacerbated by the development of a high rise apartment building.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	concentrates residential density
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Less height, less density
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Too much density will turn this area into the cavernous Ballston corridor full of unsightly, tall buildings. Clarendon has a less dense, neighborhood feel to it with lower buildings and sunlight that should be preserved.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Site is within .25 mile of Courthouse metro and also close to Clarendon metro. Site is between two gold streets. We should allow maximum development density in these areas.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	It's a plot at the outer end of the 1/4 mile from the station with lower buildings around it. At 70 feet it will be high compared to neighboring buildings.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Allowing the building to be as tall as possible will allow the developer to maximize the number of rental units in the apartment building. Arlington has a huge need for housing stock, so the more the better in my view, especially in transit corridors (and the more units available, the larger share could be allocated for affordable housing, if practical).
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Less constraint on development. This block has been a neighborhood blight for a decade or more. Any option will be better than current.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The building should conform most closely to the heights of adjacent buildings (1-4 stories) and the current GLUP limit of 4 stories so that it blends rather than disrupting the current street scape.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Less density more sunlight
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Economy of scale. Land cost distributed over more units allows for more affordable housing. The Orange line corridor is becoming too expensive for residents and businesses.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	We already have a ton of tall condo/apartment buildings in the area and no way to expand the roads. Where will these people drive? Park?
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	17 would be significantly more than the surrounding buildings compared to the other two scenarios. 10 allows for plenty of sq. feet to accomplish a successful build without going over the top
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	It would blend in with the heights of the existing buildings better than the tallest option. But 4 stories is not enough to maximize the value of the space.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	N/a

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Better blends with surrounding areas, residential neighborhoods, less housing better fits parking availability
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Increases density and housing types in an anomalously empty lot, but not so severely that the building "stands out" markedly from the buildings east and west of it
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Better transition toward the lowrise development north of the site.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	N/a
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	None
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It would theoretically promote max density by building upwards
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Lower buildings will fit the facade better--we do not need more tall buildings blocking out the sky. The beauty of N Arlington is that it is an urban suburban landscape--with too many tall buildings it just becomes another hardscape
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	There should not be a resistance to higher density. Nor should the push be to limiting cars. The bigger our world gets the greater the ability to travel within the region where mass transit has massive gaps that will never be filled other than personal vehicle use. Also parking availability opens up commercial opportunities for retail. Personally I avoid areas and business where parking is difficult.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	I think with creative architecture you can maximize building space (height) with other goals (sustainability, affordable housing, preservation, etc.).
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Added density will allow for better use of available land that is becoming more scarce over the years

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Option 3 represents a reduced building foot print and leaves space open for other needs. It also eliminates another high rise building in the Clarendon/Courthouse corridor and lets residents enjoy open air spaces.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Most attractive to community, and best for the environment
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It adds the most density to a metro area and to a high activity, well connected corridor. Since the bulleye idea is being ignored in the Courthouse area with the zoning restrictions that force some lots about 200 yards from the metro to remain single family homes, we need to add more density than might otherwise be allowed at this property to make up for the lack of density in those areas in order to maintain a vital urban fabric.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The neighborhood here has an open feel. Adding a tall building would significantly 'wall off' Wilson from Clarendon. In fact, I don't believe putting a building here is the right decision, especially not for yet more rentals, luxury or not. People are empowered by owning, not renting.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Keep sunlight. Have open airy district between higher rises of courthouse and Clarendon.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Provides sufficient space for public parks, transit and mid rise buildings to keep consistent with other areas along the corridor
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Arlington has a lot of empty commercial space. A 6 story residential space with adequate parking is what's needed there in that neighborhood,
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	17 floors seems very high for the area so 10 seems like the best option for increasing housing options in the area. Also liked that it had more retail space than the 6 story option.

3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)	4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Has mass, but not overwhelming to the surrounding area.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Should stay current 4 stories
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	There is insufficient school capacity from Rosslyn to Balston and Wilson and Clarendon Blvd are already congested with traffic
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Stays within the height limits of the surrounding buildings.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	It allows for gentle scaling up of height and variation of the building outline, so that it creates some visual interest
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Na
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Less congestion.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	I lived 11 years along the Wilson Blvd corridor and frequently return here to shop and dine. Displaced by a house fire, I'm currently in a 8-story hotel towering over Lyon Village. Caving to developers and amending the GLUP to build 10-17 stories in this corridor is obscene, and puts developers short-term profits ahead of the County's long-terms sustainability at residents' expense. This is why so many residents are opposed to Plan Langston Boulevard and distrust the Planning Commission & govt.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Don't change neighborhood character
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Gives the most room for development
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Site is not metro-adjacent and does not warrant a high rise
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The buildings currently (and potentially as zoned) do not support a 17 story structure here

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It is not suitable for a re zoning allowing a mega structure of 10+ stories. There are not that many high rises in Courthouse/Clarendon and the existing ones are very close to the metro stations, surrounded by other tall buildings. This would be a one-off tall building in an area of 3 to 5 story building, and going above 5-6 stories would not just block the sun - it would destroy the local atmosphere of residential mixed with small businesses.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Higher building with more space is a more efficient use of the space. It'll allow the area more room to grow and more folks who can support the local economy due to higher spending. The only issue may be parking, but that area is close to metro, grocery, and retail that tenants shouldn't need a car.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>So close to metro, need to make as much use of the land as possible.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>I live practically across the street. This is an urban corridor, not a cow pasture.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>IF you give enough of the building to affordable housing. You can go big. If you don't then the smaller one.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Ballston is full of tall buildings that lack character. Clarendon and Courthouse are full of shorter, more interesting buildings and that makes it a better place to live and work.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Consistent with other buildings in the area, won't add excessive traffic/cars to the area</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>At the edge of the metro "bulls-eye" the density of this project should be low, also taking impacts on school attendance as well. With respect for the townhomes across Cleveland street, that portion of the project should mirror the trees with green-scaping and minimal structure. Parking in the area is already tight, and a lower density project would reduce the impact on the already strained parking back up that often occurs on Clarendon Blvd with people waiting to enter the Whole Foods lot.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Housing access = create more housing</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Higher density near metro stations</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Based on the limited information provided, Scenario 2 seems to best address these 2 principles:  -- Taper building massing down to surrounding residential areas to limit the impacts of high-density development  – Activate the ground level conditions with retail uses, publicly accessible open space, and below-grade parking  With that said, I have significant concerns that Scenario 2 will not provide adequate underground parking for the number of units.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>I don't believe that any of them are a good idea or a best response; these buildings are going to mimic exactly what's being done across Ballston/Rosslyn, so I don't really have any positives to say about it. It's not original, novel, nor necessary to build housing focused on high-income-generating younger adults. There's plenty of that already. So if it HAS to be such a building, at least make it focused on Biophilic elements architecturally throughout.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>With the other buildings there, anything larger will look misplaced.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	I believe maximizing the amount of available housing is necessary to support Arlington's rapid growth. Additionally, I believe this specific stretch of the neighborhood could benefit from added density.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The tampered size for low impact to surrounding residential area.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	It won't block out too much sunlight
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Makes the most sense in terms of both preserving neighborhood characteristics and satisfying demand for development and density.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Higher density by metro stations is just common sense.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	height conform to surrounding neighborhood
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Matches the taper with adjacent buildings (Whole Foods) and avoids a new ridge line between Courthouse and Clarendon Metro sites.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	1 is very out of proportion with the rest of the neighborhood, especially given its distance as the max point between Courthouse and Clarendon metros. This is not where to maximize density. 3 is inappropriately squat and low density, much like the far too small office building next door and the Whole Foods, both of which will hopefully be developed eventually. 8-10 stories would be appropriate, matching Courtland Park. Ideally this would account for moving the Whole Foods into this site.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	I think it looks nicest and would provide the most housing for the region near a metro station in a 15-min neighborhood.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	We need to maximize density in the few remaining developable parcels in Arlington. We have a massive housing shortage in the region and allowing the maximum density (if not more than suggested) would help.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Blends well with the existing buildings. Our schools are already crowded and the area is full of empty office spaces. We need to more retail and public spaces to keep Courthouse-Clarendon area an sought after the place to live attracting diverse residents.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Balances better with surrounding buildings.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Adds people and fits into the surrounding area
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The elevation makes the most sense for the growing neighborhood. Aligning heights with nearby properties that will likely be redeveloped in the coming decade is short sighted.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	A tall building in the center of two main roads amidst a lot of shorter buildings will create more traffic from residents/users and cast much of the street in shadow
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Site is very close to two Metro stations and should have the maximum residential space possible.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Allows for greater flexibility in design.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	We need a lot more housing capacity in Arlington and therefore a higher height maximum gives the most range to accommodate those needs.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	This plan increases the supply of housing in the metro station areas the most
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It will allow the most efficient use of land
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario 1 provides the most housing units which we desperately need more of in the area. Furthermore, the area seems like it's currently just being wasted. It would be nice to have more retail areas on the street level.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I think it is nice the buildings in clarendon are 6 stories. It helps light shine on the street level and makes the community nice when dining out and living there. If the buildings were tall, dining out wouldn't be as enjoyable. Tall buildings trap noise pollution as well</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>17 stories is way too high for the landscape. If you're going to do 17 floors such as many buildings in Pentagon City, then implement and maintain a new dog park! Because the people moving into that new location will undoubtedly have pups. RESTORE THE CLARENDON DOG PARK.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Greatest density with largest number of residential dwellings.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Arlington needs more housing. Prices are rising because supply cannot keep up with demand. Because the county is completely developed, the only way to go is up.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>The site is very close to to the metro, making it the right place to concentrate density</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Keep the feels of current neighborhood.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The long established plan for building heights to step down between Metro stations keeps harmony between the commercial corridor and the existing residential neighborhoods. If you allow for taller buildings and their presence looms over the residential areas, you will lower the desirability of the residential areas near the commercial spaces. Bethesda is a great example of what not to do. Further, allowing for more residential and less commercial space brings more neighbors to the area.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Because we need to build more housing and this land is already in an area full of dense housing. There is 0 reason to cap this height.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The guiding principles focus on housing availability and density. The largest structure provides the greatest number of residential units
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Within 1/4 mile of Metro means height, density, and units. Let's maximize the potential of the site.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	This height will fit in with the market common development and provide a focal point for the block without overwhelming the surrounding buildings.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Housing density adjacent to or within a short walk of transit stations should be maximized as much as possible.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	There has been significant high density development around Clarendon metro; the size and scale of this development is not appropriate for the location and will serve as precedent for future bad decisions.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Maximizing units available offers developers more opportunities to include affordable units or potentially segment the building into zones of more vs less affordable units. Additional height also allows the county to extract more concessions from the prospective developer including refurbishing nearby parks, street improvements, site incentives (such as electric charging), environmental concessions, etc.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	In general, high-rise development is the best way to boost housing supply while consuming the least amount of land. This preserves land for use in more necessarily low-rise development, such as parks and other public spaces. This site is prime for such development given its location in prime Metro corridor territory and current disuse. Thus, the high-rise development of Scenario 1 best suits GPP 1 and 2. On GPP 3 through 5 the three scenarios are effectively equal.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	highest density, most new residential space, public space
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Taper building massing and provide housing. Compliments existing g single family and high rises. There are already so many tall apartment buildings along this corridor we need more smaller scale buildings.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Density near metro.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	the location between two major thoroughfares, proximity to Metro/public transit, and to the Courthouse neighborhood make it a prime candidate for high density walkable development
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Please do not create a glut of cheap units in the area
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Seems the only way to enact as many of the principles as possible

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The largest massing scenario acknowledges that the Ballston-Rosslyn corridor is now a contiguous area, instead of the bullseye concept, with limited undeveloped spaces and numerous cases of denser backfill replacing older structures (Ballston Quarter, Ten, Red Top cab, St. Charles, GMU, Greystar Courthouse, most of Rosslyn). Dense massing will permit building for uses consistent with area activity today and in 50 years rather than a structure that will be a candidate for replacement in 20 years.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Best fits environmental goals
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It's near metro and matches existing space, and best addresses housing shortages while providing services.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Scenario 2 is high density without overwhelming the skyline.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	More need for housing.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	less drastic height differentiation and more gradual tapering
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	I don't think we need more people in Clarendon until our public infrastructure catches up.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Fits into the taper to neighborhood better, but I believe there could be a much taller central tower to increase the number of units in the building.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	High-density housing near metro stops is imperative
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario 3 provides density that is appropriate for this part of Arlington.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in a crucial metro Corridor and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the metro station area and adds the most housing units. This redevelopment is a prime opportunity for additional affordable housing development north of Rt. 50. We should be maximizing development in the walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon and Courthouse.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Maximizes opportunity for affordable housing and proximity to transit and daily needs for most residents
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	This site has great transit connections. Density along corridors of public transit, focusing on reducing automobile use, is the single most important thing we can do to combat global warming. Tall new buildings lead to healthier and greener communities. As a young person, NIMBY push-back from older wealthy homeowners is incredibly frustrating. We have the opportunity to build some of the best TOD anywhere, and those who would want to cut the building down to 6 stories are climate arsonists.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Because the county is overbuilt, noisy and congested. Give us taxpayers a break. I'm already ready to move out of this county. Don't make things worse. How would you like it if all this mess was in YOUR backyards? And please require setbacks. It's very claustrophobic with buildings being constructed right up to the sidewalk.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	avoid too many buildings

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>There is a housing crisis. Concentrating density in Arlington (and the region) where existing public infrastructure exists and where a mixed-use walkable neighborhood already exists aligns best with Scenario 1. Buildings are built to last over 50 years. The other scenarios would leave a legacy of a missed opportunity to address the housing crisis and leave a legacy of filling in this well located redevelopment site.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Development at the edge of the 1/4-mile radius from metro stops should taper down (not up) in height. The proximity of low-rise residential north and (particularly) south of the site should limit what is permitted here.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>The purpose of the Guiding Planning Principles is to ease from high density into low density areas (i.e., residential). This site is close to two Metro stations, and nearby buildings are tall. It is in the center of the R-B corridor.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario 1 is out of scale for the area—another high-rise is not needed. Scenario 3 does not offer enough housing to have an impact.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Arlington is turning into NYC with so much congestion from overbuilding, no sunlight, and massive traffic congestion. The buildings are so tall; they have no character and are not attractive to the eye. To reduce this footprint, buildings need to be built to the lowest density allowed.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario 2 seems to have the best blend of high density while balancing height and massing that fits the general area and plan. That said, it would be useful to understand what the projected commercial / residential demand is to justify the various scenarios - the plans lack any evidence or data to guide the decisions one way or another (there already is 16-21% office vacancy in the area now).</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>The site is smack in the middle of the Courthouse/Clarendon spine. Scenario 1 fits with its surroundings and will help provide much needed housing.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Maximizing density in this development is clearly within the goal of concentrating high density development within the Metrorail Transit Corridors. However, beyond the “Guiding Planning Principles”, the County has an obligation to its residents to permit the development of adequate housing supply to match demand, tamping down the unbelievable rise in rents and housing prices that have left the County unaffordable at both “Affordable” and “Market Rate” housing levels. Build more, now, everywhere.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>The greater height best fulfills the guiding principles.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Lower height more compatible with existing area and surrounding neighborhoods. This area should not become Rosslyn or Ballston.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with a County "bullseye" concept of higher heights and densities at the Metro entrances and lower heights and densities further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>More green space and a better height transition. Preserve a neighborhood feel.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I think that a 17 story building is frankly silly. Such a building would be so much taller than anything else. I think a 10 story building would also be strange given the height of the other buildings around the site. But I think the 17 story building is being offered as a straw man to try and get the county to compromise on a 10 story building. I don't think that the area can support (schools, parking, etc) even a 10 story building.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>This site is at the heart of the metro RB corridor.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It is the least worst option. The county trying to amend the GLUP to create a massive building without the appropriate studies and planning should be illegal.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impacts of these proposed changes on adjoining parcels and adjoining blocks. Surrounding blocks are occupied by structures ranging from 1 to 5 stories tall. The proposed development could be 3 times taller than its neighbors.</li> </ul>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario 2 best balances the need for additional housing near the metro, expands ground level retail, and also keeps building height proportional to surrounding development.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Six stories would fit in best with the properties around the development site, would have the least impact on traffic and parking, infrastructure, and would not set a precedent for higher development in the area. Keep taller buildings in Rosslyn and Ballston.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I strongly oppose a building with significant height on that lot. It would exacerbate crowding and traffic issues that are already problematic in that section of the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Focusing residential density near metro stations is correct long-term planning and the additional height allows the guiding planning principles to be achieved.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Height transition guidance must not be ignored. Tall, high density buildings along Wilson Blvd., directly across from Lyon Village, create a cavern of concrete, darkness and wind, and invite increased traffic along already congested 2-lane roads.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Because the county ALWAYS fails to consider or to realistically plan for the fiscal and environmental impacts of adding more heat-trapping surfaces, loss of publicly accessible green space and mature trees, more cars on the road, more students to educate, more stormwater runoff to manage, and all the other impacts that we know accompany more density. People are expensive. The more you have, the more you spend. Plus, there's already a HUGE apartment vacancy problem in the Ballston-Va. Sq. area.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This scenario has the most open space. It will allow for more biophilic elements and will be less overwhelming. It will not sit out on Wilson like a sore thumb towering over all the surrounding structures.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>The trade-off of height and residential units is the key. Any scenario could work, and follow the principles, if designed well. In any case the options demand rooftop garden and park area, especially S3 and the lower portions of S1 and S2. Ideally, the ground level public space and the low-level roof space could be integrated outdoors to expand the amount of natural, open space for residents and customers. Regarding Q5, below, massing is as important as height, so it depends.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This property should be subject to the same current zoning as adjacent properties. "Node" higher development adjacent to Metro stations makes sense, but this property is not close to a metro - almost directly between two stops. As a voter and significant residential taxpayer in Arlington, I find it surprising that the County would even consider this request that refutes their prior work and voters' priorities. The priority should not be the parcel owner making more money.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Arlington County leadership is not properly respecting the citizens of Arlington. Just look at Question 2. Why not leave a blank box for people to comment on some other factor? That is exactly how your LHP survey was, as well. I was tremendously frustrated with the limited choices. That is not good governance. And question 3 does not allow lower than 6 stories! Just ridiculous.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	It maximizes the density in areas that are walkable to the existing Metro stations. For the future prosperity of Clarendon/Court House, maximum density of this "half-mile" area surrounding each Metro station is essential.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	you give residents essentially no choices in terms of constantly developing. I believe your process is a joke and we need to pause on all of this development.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	More density near Metro stations, more opportunity for affordable units.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	It is much more consistent with the community and the area and the plans for the immediately adjacent areas. Too often staff works backwards from a decision and then looks for way in guiding principles to support zoning variances for large wealthy developers that dont bring real value to local community. The lower heights is consistent with Clarendon plan. This survey, as are the considerations above, are result oriented - for example it does not ask re impact on schools and local residents.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Three reasons: (1) the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Tapering and lower heights are critical to maintaining the density and scale for welcoming street level retail space

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>1. It is most appropriate for a site midway between Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away. 2. It would be the best transition to nearby low density residential. 3. It would be the most consistent with the heights, densities and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>With any development, let's look at the impacts we have on schools, the environment and overcrowding.</p> <p>Let's be tasteful in developing this part of Arlington and make sure to respect existing communities and neighborhoods.</p> <p>To be to the point. I do not agree with building higher than the current 4 stories for this property.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I don't support any of this. These questions are do not give any option for disagreement</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Scenario 3 most closely follows the tapering principles outlined in the Courthouse Sector Plan Addendum (1993) and "bullseye" from the Courthouse metro center. Scenario's 1 and 2 would create an inverse-bullseye by increasing the height of buildings moving away from the metro center.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The Guiding Principles concentrate height and densities near Metro stations and away from lower density residential areas. This site is further from the Clarendon and Courthouse Metro stations than are almost other sites that are directly between those two stations. The site is also on the opposite side of Clarendon Blvd. from a low density residential area containing town houses. This site should therefore contain the lowest heights and densities of the three scenarios.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Any building larger than 6 stories will stick out like a sore thumb here.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Scenario 3 is in character and appropriate for existing building profile of this neighborhood.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Provides housing but is different from many high rise buildings in the area
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Building size/height should be no greater than those between Wilson and Clarendon Blvds and immediately to the east and west of the site. It is inappropriate to have a 8-17 story building this distant from Metro.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Increase in density of transient (tourists plus people who work but don't live in Arlington) population doesn't serve the benefits of actual local economic growth and development
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	This is transtional propert between Clarendon and Courthouse and height needs to be tempered to insure maximum light and less imposing. Olur goalis to have the highest buildings at each Metro stop and lower buildings along corridors to insure we do not have a wind-tunnel effect like we allowed in parts of Ballston.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Scenario 3 is the most appropriate given the location equidistant from the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and the guiding principle of concentrating height and density at the metro entrances and scaling down moving away from those entrances. This provides necessary transition to nearby low density residential properties, and is consistent with the principles and requirements in the adjoining area covered by the Clarendon Sector Plan.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Arlington is becoming too much of a city. One can visit NYC if they want to walk between tall buildings.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>As much density as possible in the R-B corridor. The fact that it is barely more than 1/4 mile away from two metro stations should be a reason for more density, not less. Also I reject the 1-10 formatting in question two, my 1-3 are important, 4 &amp; 5 are important but not deal breakers, the rest are all dross.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This height seems most inline with the adjacent properties.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>There should be a segue between Clarendon and Court House where there is a gradual ramp up in building heights. 6 stories is consistent with Clarendon and the surrounding areas, with the next block towards Court House featuring a 10-story apartment building.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>If it is not a park, then I have little feeling about the height.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Leave the taller buildings in Ballston or Rosslyn.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>More typical of heights in that area, while accounting for increasingly dense/urban area.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Pretty straight forward Concentrate high-density development within Metro Station Areas – Increase the supply of housing by encouraging variety of housing types and prices at a range of heights and densities in and near Metro Station Areas</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Higher buildings means more space means more housing in quality transportation corridors</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>There's nothing really close to that tall in the immediate vicinity.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>We should capitalize on the rich transportation opportunities at this site and allow the most people to live here. This advances our sustainability, mobility and equity goals.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>As Arlington further develops and starts building 'up' as opposed to 'out', density is going to become more and more important</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The bulleye plan is what all residents, staff, and property owners everywhere are expecting. Giving away the farm is not appropriate. A building taller than 6 stories just doesn't fit, and never should.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Site context
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Balance that allows for development and potential increased housing options while also keeping in character with the heights of the neighboring sites, especially residences.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Most balanced between developer and community needs.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	It's a compromise between the urban nature of the site running east-west and closely adjoining neighborhoods to the north and south.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>This approach creates more housing where much of life is walkable.</p> <p>The increased height would have limited impact on the neighborhood given the tall building within a few blocks.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>See above. The entire idea in the corridor is to have heights that taper down from the centers of the neighborhoods between the neighborhoods. The County is on a rapacious tear to upzone, for the purpose of upzoning and not community benefits. I strongly object to this.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Being right in a metro station area, larger and dense housing is very typical. Such building will be necessary to keep housing affordable over time.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Keeps proper balance near residentiao area</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Whole Foods is quite short, the Navy League Building and adjacent buildings aren't much taller. Without a guarantee excellent below-ground parking, transportation could become challenging. Scenario 1 is ideal. Scenario 2 may be more practical.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It actually needs to be 4 stories.</p> <p>(3) Tapering of building heights. In its planning, the County generally calls for the tapering of building heights from low density residential districts to districts with tall buildings and high density. For example, the Clarendon Sector Plan, requires that building heights next to low-density residential taper up, from a maximum of 55 feet on the neighborhood edge, to 110 feet under a slope line that includes several blocks; this slope line is part of the z</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Too many high rise buildings have destroyed the charm of the area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It maintains the "in-between METRO stations" character of the immediate area.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>I think 17 stories best accommodates for future development around and between the metro stops.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I would have chosen that allowing no more stories and height than is allowed now is best. It's become very awkward and difficult to maneuver by car in many places in Arlington. I do wonder how tourists deal with some of this. It does not seem to be rational to have everyday traffic become more difficult. The current zoning fits the situation much better.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Since I can't say stay with the current, this is the least disruptive.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I don't believe it best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles, but since you limited me to a drop-down menu, I selected the least offensive of the three options. The current GLUP and zoning should be maintained or, at worst, limit the height to 55' in accordance with the Clarendon Sector Plan</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Honestly looking through all 71 slides of the GULP presentation I'm more confused than I was before I looked at them. I can tell a lot of thought and time was put into the presentation but it is certainly not "regular person" friendly. I hope in the future you will provide the public with something that is more palpable to lay-person's level of understanding as it applies to Urban Planning.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It's lowest in height.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The zoning was set long ago. There is nothing wrong with the original plan. There is already too much traffic on Wilson &amp; Clarendon Boulevards. There are long established residential neighborhoods comprised of single family homes nearby. Skyscrapers are inconsistent with the character of those neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The neighborhood is so crowded as is, imagine the chaos with more tall buildings! Plus the shade that a tall buildings create, tapered or not.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Having a building taller than that will greatly change the skyline in that transition area between Clarendon and Courthouse.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Allows the most commercial development while limiting aesthetic impacts of building height.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Higher than that would be ridiculously out of scale with the neighborhood. The blocks selected for density comparison did not include some of the neighboring majority single family home areas. The county has a plan to increase open spaces but in my opinion projects like this significantly increase the pressure on existing open spaces. There may be a need to elevate pedestrian street crossing.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>not too tall, more livable urban space</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	I actually think 7.0 feet is too high and all these 3 scenarios are problematic...But this will be the least damaging and would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	High buildings have Too negative of an impact on single family Neighborhood, as cast shadows, problems with parking noise elements etc., without Jewel single-family home neighborhoods preserved, large companies will have nowhere to House executives. And companies will not move to Arlington. Overall it will be a net loss for taxes.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	To add a 17 story building in the middle of Clarendon is not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood and is too much for this small parcel. The county needs to consider the impact on all core services as noted above.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Street and sidewalk congestion and quality of life mean changes to heights should not drastically change from what was there previously
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	While we want density (and higher buildings) near metro stations, the density and height need to taper down between metro stations, and toward residential neighborhoods.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Because we don't want Courthouse and Clarendon to become Rosslyn.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Living in Rosslyn, I am acutely aware of how all the new, tall building are a detriment to residential life at ground level (block sunlight, cold, damp, no trees).
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	Provides most density without compromising the feel of the area
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario 1 reflects concentration of high-density development in Metro Station Areas and the principle of increasing housing supply
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon & Courthouse.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	MOAR HOUSING
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The more stories, the more people and congested an already congested area becomes. The Infrstructure can't keep up.
Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)	This property is at the farthest edge of the Metro accessibility circle (the "bullseye"), so 17 stories is inappropriately tall. Even 10 stories is quite tall, but would be worth it to the county if the developer would make a significant payment toward public amenities.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Because this would allow tapering from the higher density near the metro and blend in with the current buildings in the area. The 17 story scenario is not appropriate for this area---this height is more appropriate for Rosslyn. The appeal of this area is its neighborhood feel, which would be undermined by such an increase in density.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Without additional commercial taxes and a proffer system, property taxes will get another significant increase to pay for second order effects. The reckless driving around Clarendon, including 11th St Park, has decreased quality of life from once quiet streets to routine short cuts, and Arlington has not funded DES-Transportation or the police enough to manage properly. Further development and increased traffic from this property will add to cars speeding by houses versus using main roads</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Because of the site's location between the Metro stations, this would be more in line with the County "bullseye" concept, which makes good sense. In addition, it would be consistent with the heights, densities and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It is already over the 4 story allowance. If the change in GLUP and zoning are allowed for this project, it would set a precedent for allowing the same changes for the remaining lots between Courthouse and Clarendon.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>The county should be promoting transit-accessible growth, and this site is located near two metro stations in a very walkable, bikeable area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The area cannot support more people than would be included in this height.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario 1! We need density. It's always struck me as bizarre how much flat asphalt there is within just a few blocks of the metro rail stations. We need more housing! 300 won't solve the crisis but that lot currently houses nobody, which is nuts. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>(1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area. Six stories is too high given the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I do NOT think ANY of the scenarios responds to the Guiding Planning Principles. In all cases, the building heights are too high and are not appropriate. Building height should remain consistent with the LOW designation of all of the neighboring blocks.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The site is midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and should be the low point in terms of height and density, consistent with having less height and density further away from the Metro entrances. Although still too high, it also offers the best transition to nearby low density residential.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It best fits the existing zoning and does not create other likely future issues (e.g parking, schools, additional development)</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse. It is also very close to multiple schools. This is the kind of development we should be encouraging.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: ONLY scenario three is appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations The bullseye concept requires lower height and density as you move away from the stations. Scenario 3 is the best transition - taper- to the nearby low density residential. Scenario 3 is most consistent with the height, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan. The other scenarios are inconsistent with the plan - too high and dense.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Absolutely we need housing density in the ballston-Rosalyn corridor to maximize affordable housing</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>The County had taller buildings situated near the Metro stops and then tapering off the heights as buildings were constructed further away from Metro. Putting tall buildings along Langston Blvd goes contrary to this principle. Furthermore, the proposed increased height and zoning severely impacts those single family residences in close proximity to the proposed changes.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>1) It would provide the best transition to low density residential. 2) It is the most consistent with the heights, densities and uses of the Clarendon Sector Plan, and 3) It follows the County's plan to have greater heights at the metro stations with lower heights and densities between stations. Heights 10-17 stories are grossly inappropriate for the site.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This is consistent with the concept of higher density and more height near metro station, and NOT near residential neighborhoods; need this lower height restriction given proximity to residential neighborhood; consistent with the Clarendon Sector Plan relating to the heights , densities, and uses in the west of the Clarendon sector Plan.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Higher densities should be allowed on this parcel due to the proximity of two metro station areas. The tallest building scenario allows for the greatest addition of housing to the area, and also allows for the greatest addition of ground-level uses.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>best balance between making it feasible and neighborhood livability.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area, maximizing walkable mixed-use design and encouraging sustainability.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It is most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away. it affords the best transition to nearby low density residential. it is the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>1. As the smallest option, it follows to concentrate less density as you get away from metro station areas (location in question is on the far edge of Courthouse metro station area), 2. Adds ground level retail and parking, 3. Encourages the supply of housing in a reasonable way - all 3 options provide apartment housing that the neighborhood is not lacking in. Density in this location should be low as aligned with its surroundings therefore scenario 3 remains the best fit for its location.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>(1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the bullseye concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County &amp; "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>For 40 years, this site – midway between the Clarendon and Courthouse Metro Stations, and about ¼ mile from each – has been designated for low-scale commercial/service development. These uses support nearby residential neighborhoods as well as more densely developed properties near the Stations. All 3 scenarios would disregard this long-standing designation, but scenarios 1 and 2 in particular would permit development that looms over Wilson Blvd and is grossly incongruous with its neighbors.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 2 (Max height = 10 stories, 110 ft.)</p>	<p>Am concerned about the impact on traffic for a max height of 17 stories. I think 10 stories is a nice balance between the importance of providing for housing within walking distance of the metro, and keeping the feel of the area as something having a human scale.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Scenario #1 adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I selected Scenario 3 for three reasons: 1) It is the most appropriate choice for a site halfway between the Court House and Clarendon Metro Stations, consistent with the County's concept of more height and density closer to the Metro stations and less height and density further away. 2) It represents the best transition to nearby low density residential areas. 3) It is the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses in the Clarendon Sector Plan area to the west.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Do the right thing. Follow original zoning laws. Developer purchased land based on the zoning allowance. Lets not turn area into high rise concrete neighborhood. Developer's profit should not guide the requested new development and zoning.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Actually, even Scenario 3 doesn't adhere to the GPP. Even a 70' scenario is a higher building height for this block than in the current Courthouse Sector plan, which calls for service/commercial 1-4 stories, which is approximately 45'. This is a "false" option. The correct answer is "none of the above"!</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>(1) It befits a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and is consistent with the County “bullseye” concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area. This is not Rosslyn</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>It doesn't. It was the only choice. Very clever. You make it seem like a choice but it really isn't.</p> <p>I say no more than 4 stories.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>Arlington needs more housing, and this is one of the last remaining open lots available to provide such housing close to a Metro station and walkable amenities.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County “bullseye” concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I think 6 stories is much too high, but you did not offer any lower options. Current heights in this area - 2-3 stories - seem reasonable. There is no need to infuse high rise buildings, as such will destroy the ambiance of the community.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>That is the largest building this area can comfortably accomodate</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Two reasons:            1. This site is at the VERY far edge of the Metro Station Area and thus should be at the lower end of density not the higher end.            2. In order to taper closer to residential, these need to be kept lower - 6 stories is the MAX they should be.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>This scenario best responds to these principles because it does so in a sustainable way that fits in with the neighborhood. Additionally, it is consistent with lowering building heights as you move away from a metro stop, not drastically increasing them.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Scenario 3 represents the ideal continuity of the Courthouse-Clarendon community without displacing sensibilities. The 6 story sizing would naturally taper to the low density townhouses and adjacent commercial properties. The refinement should be considered only with the full consolidation of the block.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Massing density closest to the Metro stations is a long-standing Arlington policy. Only scenario 3 keeps this long-standing policy in place, though still with an increase in density on the site. The other scenarios have a FAR above most other buildings nearby. And that FAR calculation appears to include two parcels that the developer does not own. Absent full block consolidation, there should not be any additional density be considered for this block.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Constraining the height and size of the development on this property beyond its current zoning will maintain the intended density of the site as well as adjoining corridor sites between Courthouse and Clarendon.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The maximum height options are completely out of place within that area compared to other buildings and bring in a ton of traffic to an already high traffic area.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	Allowable under current guidance.
Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)	The number of dwelling units in proximity to Metro should be maximized, along with density in general at this location.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	The lowest height is consistent with the other buildings on the blocks bounded by Wilson Blvd. and Clarendon Blvd. Consideration of BOTH Wilson Blvd. and Clarendon Blvd. frontage are required (not just one, as asked in question 5). There isn't another place for me to provide this comment: I think the best use of this block is as should an urban park. It has been an open space for many years; this is one of the last open spaces between Courthouse and Clarendon. Don't miss this opportunity!
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Development should be concentrated nearest to Metro stops. Options 1 and 2 will loom over surroundings.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	There is insufficient infrastructure, like transportation, parking, school capacity, storm water management, etc. to support the proposed increase in density. Creating density without scaling up the infrastructure doesn't make any sense. Pedestrian safety is already a problem, and putting more cars on roads without increasing traffic police, speed bumps, stop signs, etc. throughout that area and surrounding areas is inviting additional safety problems.
Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)	Fits in better with surroundings.

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County “bullseye” concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>If Arlington is going to live up to its marketing wrt sustainability, walkability, etc., it needs to permit density.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>more in keeping with the overall neighborhood. We should not attempt to convert this neighborhood into another clone of Rosslyn or Ballston.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>A six story building would be tall for the lot in comparison to what is near. It would not be out of step with Arlington planning. Anything higher than 6 stories would tower adjacent properties and the single family homes within a block of the site.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Provides best integration and tapering into the surrounding neighborhood.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>I don’t think any of the scenarios respond to the concerns raised by residents of Lyon Village. This survey is flawed because the scenarios are flawed.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Less traffic, safer, higher likelihood of occupancy, aesthetics.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>None of the 3 scenarios complies with the current bullseye plan for the R-B corridor, or current GLUP or zoning. Scenario 3 comes closest to those. Moving from this plan has precedent setting impact upon the junctions of all the metro station areas in the corridor. If destroying the bullseye plan is to be done, it should be looked at corridor wide. Allowing one parcel to back us into undoing the bullseye plan is like the tail wagging the dog, &amp; is not the appropriate forum for this decision.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>None of the scenarios are fully consistent with the GPP, as all seem to contemplate adding a high building that goes beyond Service Commercial. However, if any scenario is adopted, the "Max height=6 stories" would be most consistent. The 10 or 17 story height would add high density to an area not around a metro, be completely inconsistent with the character of the area by putting a tall building between Wilson and Clarendon, decrease green/public space, and decrease the area's attractiveness.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Most consistent with Clarendon Sector plan and transition to low density residential.</p>

<p>3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)</p>	<p>4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)</p>	<p>Three reasons: (1) It would be the most appropriate for a site midway between the Courthouse and Clarendon Metro stations and consistent with the County "bullseye" concept of more height and density at the Metro entrances and less height and density further away; (2) it would represent the best transition to nearby low density residential; and (3) it would be the most consistent with the heights, densities, and uses to the west in the Clarendon Sector Plan area.</p>
<p>Scenario 1 (Max. height = 17 stories, 180 ft.)</p>	<p>It adds the greatest density in the Metro Station Area and adds the most housing units. We should be maximizing development in walkable mixed-use areas like Clarendon &amp; Courthouse.</p>

3. The preliminary massing scenarios were designed to respond to the Guiding Planning Principles and illustrate a range of maximum heights consistent with those allowed for residential buildings in zoning districts that are typically located within Metro Station Areas. Refinements to the scenarios will be based on community feedback. Which of these three preliminary massing scenarios do you believe best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Select one option from the drop-down menu)

4. Why do you believe the scenario selected in response to Question 3 best responds to the Guiding Planning Principles? (Limit response to 500 characters or less)

Scenario 3 (Max height = 6 stories, 70 ft..)

Arlington's approach Metro station development is correct. Building heights peak nearest the station and then decline with distance from the station. Scenarios 1 and 2 violate this approach, since the height would spike BETWEEN stations. Such high buildings would be out of sync with nearby commercial and residential properties. I fear allowing an exception might prompt more exceptions and bring us to the concrete corridor that those of us who live in the neighborhood want to avoid.