

Attachment 4

Clarendon Sector Plan Update

Community Engagement Comments and Response Matrix (as of 3/1/22)

County Staff Contact

CPHD Planner

Brett Wallace

571-329-0876

bhwallace@arlingtonva.us

Project Information

Project Name: Clarendon Sector Plan Update

Focus Topics: Building Height & Form, Density, Historic Preservation, Transportation, Public Space, Fire Station 4, Proposed Changes to Sector Plan Maps

About this Document

This document provides a summary of concerns raised by the community during the Long-Range Planning Committee's (LRPC) and Zoning Committee's online engagement for the Clarendon Sector Plan Update between September 2020- February 2022. The concerns are organized by topic and are followed with a staff response and recommendation. Additional issues/ concerns and staff responses are provided in the staff report. Staff will continue to receive comments leading up to Planning Commission and County Board, and will continue to update this document with comments/ responses.

Responses to Common Topics

Below are common topics or themes received through the online engagement sessions and materials that were identified by County staff. The list includes a summary of the topic and responses from County staff. Please note that the topics have been summarized to provide an overview of the common themes and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual commenter. Additional issues/ concerns and staff responses are provided in the staff report.

- **Building Height and Form**

1. **St. Charles Church Site- Mid-block connection**

Most respondents support allowing flexibility to bridge over mid-block connection

1. Staff Response: After further analysis and review, staff supports allowing flexibility to bridge over the connection on this site for the following reasons. Staff considered situations where the plan might support potential bridging over publicly-accessible ways, such as:
 - Alleys or non-street connections
 - Residential use connected to residential use (to better link shared amenities)
 - Locations where discrete building tower geometries and volumes individually are too small/inefficient for practical/operational purposes

Staff recommends adding language in the plan update allowing flexibility with design guidelines that will aid in future design review. The design guidelines would signal these attributes:

- Focus on the pedestrian experience, public realm
- Recommend that a majority of the segment length be open to the sky to allow air and light into the space- not entirely covered
- Establish minimum height/ clearance to provide views
- Setback from main façades (on Fairfax Drive and Washington Blvd.) to create a break in building mass
- Building articulation at entrances to mid-block connection
- Design should be welcoming and distinct from surrounding facades
- Encourage biophilic design into the space
- As appropriate, bridging could be for corridors only, single-loaded unit bars, double-loaded unit bars

Staff has developed language and design guidelines as part of the draft Sector Plan document that is posted online.

2. **Proposed heights on 10th Street**

Some respondents not supportive of staff's proposed increase in heights on 10th Street from 55' to 75' between Wilson Boulevard and N. Irving Street.

Staff Response: Staff considers the proposed transition in height from the south side of 10th Street to the north side to be appropriate, particularly give the significant width of 10th Street and resulting separation of building frontages on either side of the street. The

transition in height is established by setting maximum building heights that gradually step down from 75 feet on the north side of 10th Street, to 55 feet on the south side of the street, then to the lower density residential areas outside of Clarendon. Staff also considered the existing heights on 10th Street east of the study area as part of the analysis and modeling. Given this design analysis and the benefits of providing additional housing supply in this transit-rich section of the Rosslyn-Ballson Corridor, staff supports heights of 75' on the north side of 10th Street.

3. **Concerns over building step-backs**

Several respondents shared concerns on staff recommendations for building step-backs

Staff Response: As part of staff's analysis, consideration was given to the width and proportion of the street right-of-way, streetscape design, street trees and ground floor façade treatment and how they all contribute to the pedestrian experience. The Urban Design Guidelines in the Sector Plan also provide guidance for building orientation and frontage types that will be used in future design review.

Staff is recommending adding guiding principles for building step-backs (below) in the Sector Plan update.

- Consider the context- overall proportion and width of right-of-way, streetscape, trees
- Reduce the perceived scale of building facades along streets and sidewalks
- Maximize the amount of light and air on adjacent streets and sidewalks
- Promote the modulation of building facades along streets that adds variety and provides visual interest
- Encourage the integration of biophilic design elements, materials & landscaping on terraces, balconies & exterior walls

• **Historic Preservation**

4. **A few comments/ concerns about staff recommendations for the Joyce Motors and Verizon sites**

- Some respondents expressed concern about the recommendation to relocate the Joyce Motors façade to the corner and the step-backs
- A few respondents suggested preservation of the 1938 portion of the Verizon building.

2. *Staff Response (Joyce Motors):* The building's current placement is set back from the street with a large surface parking lot for the service and storage of automobiles. During the 2006 planning process, which pre-dated the adoption of the HRI, the Joyce Motors building was evaluated for preservation; however, other priorities for redevelopment were established for the site, and numerous other individual and groupings of buildings in the Clarendon neighborhood were recommended for preservation aiding in preserving Clarendon's past as redevelopment progressed. Prior to staff's initiation of the Clarendon Sector Plan Update process in 2020, the property owner of the Joyce Motors building filed a site plan to redevelop this property. The site plan applicant followed the 2006 Sector Plan recommendations, which did not specify preservation; however, they have indicated their intent to restore and reuse the façade panels as part of the 10th Street/Irving Street corner façade and have communicated the environmental constraints of preserving or reusing other portions of the building. Staff supports allowing the building to be reconstructed at the block corner, which would provide a glimpse into what the Joyce Motors business once provided to the community, while also creating a build-to line at the block corner and

framing the planned open space across N. Irving Street at the County-owned site. A step-back at a depth of 10-feet for any new development above the façade will be required and is consistent with Façade preservation policy and ACZO. Preserving the building in its current location, as recommended by HALRB, would be inconsistent with the Sector Plan's urban design objectives to locate building facades at the edge of the streetscape and to discourage surface parking lots along 10th Street, and would significantly limit the redevelopment potential for this site.

Staff Response (Verizon): Staff recognizes that the Verizon Building is ranked as Important in the HRI, and the goals and objectives of the HRI will be recognized in the study document. As noted in the engagement about the pending site plan development application for the Wells Fargo site, the Verizon site will be transferring density to the Wells Fargo site. This proposed site plan would limit future redevelopment of the Verizon Building, and Verizon representatives have indicated the need to maintain the building as a telecommunications facility for the foreseeable future. For all practical purposes, the Verizon Building would be preserved as part of a future site plan approval for the combined Wells Fargo and Verizon site. The existing building has been altered over the years with various additions, including the upper two floors of the main building.

- **Transportation**

- 5. Concern on the loss of parking and service/ loading for existing businesses on Fairfax Drive**

The owner of the TJ Auto and Northside Social rely heavily on Fairfax Drive for service and loading

Staff Response: Staff recognizes the need for vehicular access, service/ loading and parking for the businesses and the public. The concept design for Fairfax Drive provides an approximately 30'-wide right-of-way along the southern edge to accommodate pedestrians, one-way vehicular travel, dedicated bicycle facilities, emergency vehicle access and short-term parking/ loading. The final design and location for parking/loading spaces will be determined in a future park master planning process. **Staff has proposed language in the Sector Plan update that indicates the importance of maintaining access to the businesses as well as emergency access to Metro vents with any planned park space improvements.**

- 6. Desire for more emphasis in the plan update for protected bike lanes**

A few respondents expressed a desire for protected bike lanes throughout Clarendon, including making recommendations for areas outside the study area.

Staff Response: Staff understands the importance of enhancing the bicycle network in Clarendon and is committed to adding enhanced bicycle facilities within the study area on both Kirkwood Road and Fairfax Drive. For Kirkwood Road, staff is recommending the addition of protected bike lanes between 10th Street and Washington Blvd. For Fairfax Drive, staff is recommending upgrading the existing traditional bike lanes to a two-way cycle track (aka raised bike lanes) which will run parallel to the Fairfax Drive shared street.

Clarendon Sector Plan Update

Community Comments from October 5, 2021- February 8, 2022 Online Engagements

Note: The following table includes a complete set of comments received by staff following several online engagements.

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
1	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the Clarendon plan and provide comments. I appreciate the clear presentation and extensive work that goes into this important plan. Am I correct that the plan contemplates a single lane of traffic on Kirkwood between Washington and Fairfax?</p> <p>Right now, going north from Fairfax across Washington on Kirkwood, the second lane allows a left turn lane. If that isn't there, people wanting to go right or straight will have to wait for people taking the left onto Washington Blvd. Given the already high traffic at that intersection as well as the extensive current and pending development all around, that would seem to create the potential for backups and waits through multiple light signals. The issue may exist somewhat in reverse going the other way. I believe - though cannot recall 100% - that the right lane allows people to go right on Fairfax on red. It seems like that lane will go away, potentially delaying people turning right, and adding to the congestion getting through the light.</p> <p>Also, I'm not sure about the potential timing on such project, but we are already facing disruption at Kirkwood and Washington due to the Wash. / 13th St. realignment project for next year and a half. I look forward to you clarifying any misunderstandings I may have. If understand correctly, I would appreciate knowing that consideration has been given to these concerns.</p>
2	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>Thank you for your input and potential updates to the Clarendon Sector Plan. I really like the improvements over the current plan and think they should be implemented. The increased height with setbacks with allow more people to live in the area while also keeping sunlight for the people walking by.</p> <p>We need to update Clarendon Plan to include more pedestrian spaces. Space for people, not for cars. As someone who is car-free who also owns a bike, I want to feel safe riding my bike. Please include protected bike lanes so that my husband and I can feel safe when riding in the area.</p>
3	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>I'm a resident of the Clarendon Sector. I fully support the staff's recommendations as outlined in the slides for online engagement opportunity 4.</p> <p>I think staff has fairly balanced the needs and desires of the various stakeholders involved in this sector.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				It's a good demonstration of the value of having neutral professional assessments as part of a planning process.
4	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>COMMENT #4 NOTE: Staff received 72 copies of the following message from church parishioners and community members.</p> <p>This e-mail is in reference to the online engagement materials and presentation posted for the Clarendon Sector Plan Study. I am a parishioner of St. Charles Catholic Church. Arlington County Staff have recommended that the amendments to the Clarendon Sector Plan include a mid-block connection on the St. Charles site. They recommend that this connection is open to the sky. The St. Charles redevelopment team asked for flexibility to bridge over the connection and provided a series of architectural examples and convincing arguments that demonstrate how the connection could benefit the project and enhance the design of the alley that will cross the site.</p> <p>I urge you to adopt their recommendation and include flexibility to bridge the connection in your final recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Board. A bridge over the connection could be an interesting architectural feature that announces the alley to the public and invites them to the planned park on Fairfax Drive. It could provide some shelter from the elements for pedestrians while being high up enough from the ground to allow anyone to see clearly through the connection from Washington Boulevard to Fairfax Drive. Most importantly, bridging the connection gives the St. Charles team the flexibility they will need as they find a development partner and design a building that can achieve the church, the County, and a developer's goals as outlined in the Sector Plan.</p>
5	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	St. Charles Church is my secondary parish and I am looking forward to the renovation in cooperation with the county's redevelopment plan. Don't ruin it by demanding a useless mid-block cut-through for drivers too impatient to wait for one of traffic lights. The parish needs that space for our church.
6	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	I am a parishioner of St Charles Borromeo, Clarendon, and have read the parish's development committee's case in favor of being allowed to bridge over the proposed mid-block connection. That case is compelling (in fact I find it difficult to see anything against it) and I would respectfully recommend that the Arlington County Planning department amend its plan accordingly.
7	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	I know that you are obliged balance competing interests and priorities as you strive to ensure Arlington's future development is done in a way that is holistic and inclusive. As a former parishioner of St. Charles Catholic Church who usually walked to attend services, I realize how much that area stands to benefit from many aspects of the Clarendon Sector Plan. I do not see any clear advantage in revising the plan to include an open-air mid-block

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				connection on the St. Charles site, but if there is a compelling justification for a mid-block connection, I would suggest exploring whether a bridge might serve that purpose while enhancing the architecture of the new church complex. Done thoughtfully, it might also offer those approaching on foot an attractive frame for the future park on Fairfax Drive.
8	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	I am a resident of Lyon Park and a parishioner at St. Charles Church. For the future development of the site, county staff had recommended that the plan include a mid-block connection across the site that would be open to the sky. For St. Charles to pursue a feasible redevelopment of its property, such a connection would need to be covered so that a partner could achieve the goals shared by the county and St. Charles. The St. Charles team has provided a series of examples of how a bridge over the connection would work, how it would enhance the site and provide architectural visual interest and appeal. It has other benefits as well, such as offering shelter from the elements for pedestrians traversing the area. I ask that, after consulting these examples and the reasoning of the St. Charles team, you allow St. Charles the flexibility necessary to achieve a successful and appealing outcome for all parties.
9	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	This email is a comment on the latest Clarendon Sector Plan materials, in particular slide 14 regarding the St. Charles church mid-block connection. I have been a parishioner of St. Charles Catholic Church for 5 years (and have suffered through those years with the current building's unfortunate architecture). As such, I am very excited about the new development plans for the parish. Arlington County Staff have recommended that the amendments to the Clarendon Sector Plan include a mid-block connection on the St. Charles site. They recommend that this connection is open to the sky. While I agree that the mid-block connection would be a fantastic addition for pedestrian access, I urge you to include flexibility to bridge the connection in your final recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Board. A bridge over the connection could be an interesting architectural feature that would provide shelter from the elements for pedestrians while being high up enough from the ground to be unobstructive. Most importantly, bridging the connection gives the St. Charles team the flexibility they will need as they find a development partner and design a building that can achieve the church, the County, and a developer's goals as outlined in the Sector Plan
10	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	As a parishioner of St. Charles Church, I encourage you and the planning board to take our views into account. The Church does valuable and laudable work in the Clarendon community for Catholics and non-Catholics alike, and our redevelopment plan will allow us to continue that work and renew the mission. Please consider the value of having a thriving, welcoming community like St. Charles in Clarendon as you develop your plans further.

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
11	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>I write to you regarding the online engagement materials and presentation posted for the Clarendon Sector Plan. As the owner of a Clarendon-based small business and a St. Charles parishioner, I believe the mid-block connection proposed by the Arlington County staff for the St. Charles site is unnecessary. Though the County has pointed to the length of the entire block as its justification for imposing this recommendation, it seems that it could use its land at the end of the block as a pedestrian passage if that passage were so desperately necessary. That said, I understand that the church has relented to the county's pressure to incorporate a mid-block connection in its redevelopment designs. I don't see why that connection needs to open to the sky. It diminishes the marketability of the site and thus the potential for this eye sore to get redeveloped (in which case there would be no mid-block connection). The open-sky requirement also just seems like an even more unfair imposition than the requirement for a mid-block connection itself, which already is of questionable value to the community.</p> <p>I urge you to adopt their recommendation and include flexibility to bridge the connection in your final recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Board. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
12	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>I am a parishioner of St Charles Catholic Church in Arlington and am responding to the request for feedback on recent amendments to the Sector plan that would impact St Charles. My concern is over the Planning Staff recommendation that the connection between Washington Blvd and Fairfax Drive be open to the sky. Our parish redevelopment team has asked for flexibility to bridge over this connection at a height that would enable pedestrians to see clearly through the connection as well as offer some shelter from the elements. I understand that a set of architectural plans have been submitted by our redevelopment team to demonstrate how this could benefit the project and enhance design of the alley that will be built. Being able to bridge over the connection will give the St Charles team the needed flexibility in finding a development partner and achieving building results that will best serve church, county, and sector development goals. Please ask the Panning Staff to reconsider the "open to sky" design constraint, considering the impact it will have on the parish's ability to attract a development partner for this project.</p>
13	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>I am a long-time parishioner of St. Charles Catholic Church and work at George Mason University's Arlington Campus. Arlington County Staff has recommended that the amendments to the Clarendon Sector Plan include a mid-block connection on the St. Charles site. They recommend that this connection is open to the sky. The St. Charles redevelopment team asked for flexibility to bridge over the connection and provided a series of architectural examples and convincing arguments that demonstrate how the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>connection could benefit the project and enhance the design of the alley that will cross the site.</p> <p>This last part is critical. As a millennial living and working in the Orange Line Corridor, finding affordable and accessible housing is a personal issue for me as it is for many young adults in the area. Allowing the St. Charles team the flexibility with the redevelopment will allow them to find the right partner. This partnership will not only help make the development successful, but it will bring about much-needed accessible housing to the Clarendon area. With GMU breaking ground for its new Arlington campus in January 2022, it is critical that the development team consider housing partnerships like this in their plans.</p>
14	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>I respectfully request that the language in your final recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Board for the proposed Clarendon Sector Plan Update regarding the proposed mid-block linkage on the St. Charles site specifically include language offering the developer flexibility to bridge the connection. As our parish team has demonstrated, a bridge over the connection could be an interesting architectural feature that announces the alley to the public and invites them to the planned park on Fairfax Drive. It could provide some shelter from the elements for pedestrians while being high up enough from the ground to allow anyone to see clearly through the connection from Washington Boulevard to Fairfax Drive. Most importantly, bridging the connection gives the St. Charles team the flexibility they will need as they find a development partner and design a building that can achieve the church, the County, and a developer's goals as outlined in the Sector Plan.</p>
15	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I am against the county's proposal height increase on the north side of 10th St</p> <p>I am against changes to the setback, 20 ft is important.</p> <p>I am against elimination of 10St Park. The county needs all the green space we can get.</p>
16	October 2021	Anonymus	Local business	<p>We are the owners of T&J Auto Body (JBD of Arlington, Inc.) located at 3237 Wilson Boulevard. We understand that one of the proposals that the County is considering regarding some of the changes to the Clarendon Sector Plan is to consider the area currently containing part of Fairfax Drive as a County park. As the owners of this property, we need to make you aware that part of our building is only accessible from Fairfax Drive and that an accommodation needs to be made to allow continued access to our property from Fairfax Drive. Specifically, the lower level of the property is not accessible from the upper level of the building and its only entrance is off Fairfax Drive. If we do not have</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>access to Fairfax Drive, we do not have access to the portion of the building where the auto repairs occur, which is our main business.</p> <p>The need for access has been recognized in the past when Metro was in construction under Fairfax Drive. At that time a bridge was built from our property to the Catholic Church parking lot to permit vehicle access to the property during construction.</p> <p>We need this access in order to maintain our business since our business is automotive repair and body work. On occasions we have tow trucks convey the cars that we work on. This creates the need for more access and turn around space than automobiles require.</p> <p>We also own the Northside Social building and the tenants there have expressed concern about maintaining parking spaces for vendor loading and unloading. Without some spaces set aside, there is no location for serving the building other than Wilson Boulevard which is untenable.</p> <p>Please consider these comments in your planning.</p>
17	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Slide 11- I prefer the 55' height at the Lot site as the start of the stepback, rather than the new 75' one. From the ground, there isn't much difference between 75' and 110'. 55' would be consistent with the buildings across the street, which would be a plus. I am fine with a steeper incline from 55' to 110', if necessary, as I do not care about maintaining the same angle. 2. Slide 12 - I like the new 10 foot stepback at the second floor of the Joyce Motors corner. In my view, the stepbacks do not make a significant difference if they come above the first or second floor. Thus, I think this will be much more effective and interesting. 3. Slide 14 - I think the St. Charles changes are reasonable, but we should be realistic that the split in the buildings will be a dark alley, unlike three of the examples presented on that slide. 4. Slide 21 - I like the cross-section of Wilson and think that will work well. 5. Slide 30 - I am disappointed with the Fairfax Drive park. I do not think this will be a well-used asset if it is merely a nicely stoned drive with some landscaping and the ability to sometimes close to traffic. The existing Clarendon Central Park is too similar - a pedestrian

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>walkway with rarely used park seating that can occasionally be activated for community events.</p> <p>It would be far preferable, particularly given the loss of the 10th Street park space, to have some active uses within the park such as a playground, outdoor cafe/biergarten, or, if space permits (which may be possible without the shared street), pickle ball or basketball courts. While I recognize that there needs to be access to TJ's garage and Northside for deliveries, that could be achieved by preserving a path from the existing Wilson driveway to the back garage and side of Northside, which would save the bulk of the park for other non-vehicular uses. A 15,000 square foot shared drive is simply not necessary if the main goal is to gain a handful of parallel parking spaces and to serve two businesses that can be served by a more limited path.</p> <p>6. Slide 30 - As for the 10th Street Park, while I originally advocated for a creative use of this space, I believe it would be best used by the county for affordable housing in conjunction with the fire station and, ideally, a small community center. While some have proposed trying to maximize space by putting a park on the roof of any buildings built here, I believe it is likely cost prohibitive and impractical to do so, particularly given that it may generate little traffic. While there has also been some discussion of turning the space adjacent to the fire station into a park, I think we should be realistic that it is a small and unattractive space. As a result, it would be preferable to develop it and focus on parks on Fairfax Drive. To offset the added density at the site and the loss of the park at the site, I suggest adding some community benefits (such as community rooms, racquetball courts, a gym, or other community center features) in the new building, which will make it an asset for the neighborhood</p>
18	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident- Lyon Park	<p>I strongly disagree with the county staff's decision to cave to the developers and eliminate the majority of the taper that was designated in the Sector Plan and that helps ensure 10th street does not become a tunnel. The Sector Plan should not be undone because of this year's staff predilections or persuasive developers. Stick to the Plan and the process that brought us the CSP. And respect the reasoning for the taper towards the neighborhood. Though I now live in Lyon Park, I used to live on Ivy Street, essentially in the "shadow" of these upcoming buildings (I know the sun doesn't actually set north of these buildings). I like the redevelopment in many aspects, but I worry not just about these sites but the precedent it sets by abandoning the site plan and encroaching on the single family homes. The developer may complain that the taper requires them to build an inefficient staircase-like building. But that's only if they want to build maximum height. They have a choice. And their choice must fit within the box that Arlington has prescribed. I'm not concerned with</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>the other streets, just the bordering frontages. Don't abandon the CSP for a few additional apartments or higher profits for developers.</p> <p>I think the linear park on Fairfax is interesting, but with access required for the coffee shop and tire store, it seems unlikely that it can happen as presented. So then what can happen? The cycle track along Fairfax seems to be by far the best thing that could come from this. But you can't share bike space with truck space. Making a cycle track contiguous and safe all the way to Glebe would be a huge benefit to many. If you want the park to do more, you may need to work with St. Charles about potential land swap or similar.</p> <p>I love the new fire station in Rosslyn. I think it is very smart to incorporate it into another structure and thus free up county land for green spaces. This should be done in Clarendon, too. It shouldn't be decided by the fire department preference, but by best practices and long-term visions for the county. I think the St. Charles site (south end) would be a location worth considering. It is a large site and can be configured for pass-through truck flow (either off Washington or the new midblock road that is proposed).</p> <p>Not doing this kind of relocation of the fire department would mean that Arlington kids and families lose out on a potential large park in an area that has very little green space and a huge and growing number of people. Kids can't play in tree pits. We need large open spaces for our mental and physical health, and even if Verizon never leaves, using as much of that block as possible for a park is the best way for the county to do the right thing for the residents.</p>
19	October 2021	Anonymus	Park & Recreation Commission	<p>I strongly support the retention of Triangle Park as a complement/extension of the Fairfax Drive Public Space. This will in part make up for the loss of the 10th St. open space proposed.</p> <p>Extraordinary Benefits: It should be stated more clearly that these benefits can include contributions for improvements for both public and privately owned open spaces throughout this section of Clarendon,.</p> <p>I support the mid-block connection at St. Charles that should allow for easier pedestrian circulation to and from the neighborhood North of Washington. I agree that some type of bridge over this connection, designed appropriately, would provide a reasonable compromise for the St. Charles owners.</p> <p>I was a little confused by the terminology used for the Fairfax Drive Public Space. I think there should be a more clear statement of the plan and naming for this site. There was one</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>reference to it as a Shared Street, which I have always understood involved sharing between cars, pedestrians, and bicycles. The term might lead people to believe that this is a vehicular passageway. In all the discussions, I have always understood that Fairfax Drive was going to become essentially a non-vehicular, urban parklike open space--a change that would in part make up for the loss of the 10th. St. open space. This is the reasoning behind proposing a Master Park Planning process for this area. I have assumed that cars would be allowed for limited retail delivery parking and I would expect that a path for bicycles would be included. .</p> <p>But on Maps 2.9 and 2.10 there is shown an apparent street that extends from Ivy St. in the North down to Fairfax Dr within the Fairfax Drive Open Space area. Is this a through street that can be used by vehicles, regularly? I don't recall the Ivy St. extension option from some of the discussions. If regular vehicle use is allowed, will it be one way? Won't it complicate traffic on Washington Blvd? The extension will definitely interrupt the open space feel between the West End Plaza and the Fairfax Dr. Public Space.</p> <p>Related to this, on Map 2.10, shouldn't this street be labeled as a Planned Tertiary Street? I don't see a legend for the depicted green-colored street.</p> <p>I support the proposed changes in the Street Tree Map and the use of an approved street tree list.</p>
20	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>Slide 12</p> <p>I am disappointed the setbacks on the Joyce Motor side of North Irving are proposed for removal (except for the corner.) I appreciate the face to building face distance is deemed executable - but that doesn't really go to the pedestrian experience - that generally is something experienced from the ground up to the 4-5 floor. I think the distances will help with air and light - but not with pedestrian experience.</p> <p>I would hope that language could be added the Plan for this block that would request facade materials - and perhaps features like cornices, etc. - to help with pedestrian scale. Such language could help the applicant and the SPRC process. While not the same as setbacks, architectural features/materials can go along way in providing an interesting ground-level experience.</p> <p>Is there a reason we don't have setbacks noted on the Verizon building site? Should we note them just in case it's every redeveloped?</p> <p>Slide 13</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>I am still not comfortable with bringing 110 feet up to Fairfax Drive on the St. Charles site. I just think a lower height - 85 feet or so - would be more complementary to the pedestrian/park experience. The proposed height is not tragic - but it could be better.</p> <p>Slide 14 The proposed pedestrian only connection through the St. Charles site is very helpful with connectivity and design of the block and I support its inclusion in the plan and on the maps. I'm curious how it would function with loading as it isn't a through street for vehicles (only pedestrians.) Would there need to be extra space between the buildings to accommodate truck turnings? Would all the loading and maneuvering be internal to the buildings like the Ballston Saul project? I can see how regular vehicle garage access work but am curious about loading docks.</p> <p>Slides 16 and 17 I agree with the proposal of no preservation for 3240 and 3260 Wilson Boulevard - providing a setback, as proposed, would most likely retain the "memory" of the buildings and provide a similar sightline down Wilson Boulevard. As staff notes, the stepback also honors Northside Social (Clarendon Citizens Hall) and the Kirby Garage.</p> <p>Slide 18 The 1938 portion of the Verizon building (minus the added upper floors) is, I would argue, an important historic asset for Clarendon. (It's actually the second phone company building to be on that site.) I understand the hesitancy to designate it so - but it is an essential structure. Am I correct in understanding the currently unused density on the site is going to be transferred to the Wells Fargo site? Density transfers are for historic preservation as well as open space and affordable housing - and here it's as though the traded density from an historic building isn't actually achieving any level of preservation - as other TDRs in Clarendon have done. Also, should for some reason years from now Verizon or its inheritor demolish their current buildings on site - would they only be able to build back to the density in those structures since the rest had been transferred to Wells Fargo? Are we setting up a situation where that owner would come in and ask for an increase in density to make up for what had been transferred?</p> <p>Slide 19 I am supportive of the notion of "tree notches" to mix green and parking along the business side of Fairfax Drive if it becomes park. I still believe it would be beneficial to the viability of the two historic structures (Citizens Hall and Kirby Garage) if more parking could be provided. Perhaps there could be a mention of such a general arrangement added to the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>Plan. (Also - with reduction of parking on Fairfax, will the County seek to have parking in structures - say the hotel - on the Bingham site - provide public parking that might validate for those businesses? Or something like that be part of the SPRC discussion? We need to do more in the County for our small businesses and such an arrangement could help.)</p> <p>Maps In general. I'm glad to see in this process the maps will be updated to also reflect built reality with the Red Top site and street configurations.</p> <p>Slide 25 -Density The new densities here make sense to me in light of the foregoing proposals in the presentation. I am very much in favor of removing the density from the County-owned land at Kirkwood/10th/Fairfax. Putting a park - hopefully with some plantings along the power substation (tall evergreens or broadleaf evergreens) would be great. It would not only hide the substation but also make a great green transition into Clarendon - and provide a linear progression of open space from GMU campus to Fairfax Drive up to the Metro Park. I know we're not planning any park space at this time - but turning this land to park has the potential to make a great connection among elements of Virginia Square and Clarendon.</p> <p>Slide 28 - setbacks As noted above, I am disappointed to remove the setbacks along North Irving.</p> <p>Slide 29 - use mix I am supportive of the use mix being proposed. In the previous Sector Plan update there was a goal to achieve more office in order to help businesses have daytime activity in the area. (There was just an article in the Post about downtown DC businesses struggling because of lack of folks working in the office buildings.) However, I suspect we will never see a full return to office only work environments and now people's residences are essentially being used as offices - and so having residential could be just as much supportive of businesses during the day as office had been.</p> <p>Slide 33 Just a question - Do we really want to be specific about bus route numbers and/or ART bus - since they can and have changed over time? Could we just do regional and local bus service or something like that?</p> <p>Slide 36</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>It is indeed hard to prescribe exact street trees as we have found. Having a list is good - and also keeping a running tally for an area of species in approved site plans so we don't overly rely on any one species that might become blighted and we lose them all.</p>
21	October 2021	Anonymus	LRPC Member	<p>Slides 7-21:</p> <p>You note that we are not revisiting the vision, overarching goals, etc. If this is the case, I feel we need to pay much more attention to the "village" character that makes Clarendon unique-more respect for historic character and fabric, sufficient open space and high quality streetscapes, and a strong interrelationship between commercial activity and the street.</p> <p>Sl. 9: I guess the staff recommendations for more residential is just based on the fire station redevelopment. I'm not sure what happens if this does not seem feasible.</p> <p>Not entirely clear whether/where staff is anticipating the "bonus" density - does this anticipate projects that exceed those under discussion now? E.g. could the projects proposed (many of which are getting substantial increases) also ask for bonus density? I do not support that since I feel that most of them should earn this increased density already.</p> <p>Sl. 10: I do not support the way staff has designated preservation of the Joyce Motors facade. This site is getting dramatic increases in development potential and I think an applicant can do more to explore preservation in place. This is an Essential building (the highest category). Moving should be a last resort. This does not show adequate respect to an Essential building or to historic scale. Our policy language is very clear about trying to save Essential buildings even if it is difficult.</p> <p>Essential – "County's top priorities for preservation that include the most significant, best preserved, and key resources that best define Arlington history." (from the HRI fact sheet)</p> <p>Essential to the historic character of Arlington County. This category will be applied to the most significant and best preserved of the County's heritage resources, those that define Arlington's history....They will also retain substantial architectural and historic integrity and as much historic context as possible.</p> <p>The Essential category will only contain those resources truly essential to telling Arlington's history; it will contain a selective list of properties or multiple property groupings that the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>County and historic preservation advocates, among others, are willing to protect despite challenges and difficulties (from the Historic Preservation Master Plan)</p> <p>Sl. 11. Again, I do not support moving the building without further exploration of keeping the Essential building in place. If the building is moved, I do not think 10' is enough to preserve the sense of a historic building.</p> <p>Sl. 13. I feel that the 110' height extension will make the church tower over the Fairfax Drive park and the important historic properties.</p> <p>Sl. 14. Strongly support the staff recommendation to have the cut through, and that it be open to the sky. A dark alley-like condition will seem unsafe and will not contribute to the streetscape or promote activity and passage to the park. The mixed vehicular/pedestrian access section needs to be carefully thought through and as much as possible should be geared towards pedestrians.</p> <p>Sl. 15. This is a very sad chart. The County should take HRI rankings seriously, especially in the historic core; otherwise, what is the point of the HRI. We need to integrate the HRI with land use policies.</p> <p>Sl. 16-17. The Willson Blvd buildings provide important context. I think they could have easily been incorporated. I do appreciate the attempt to scale back the Blingham Center building a little bit to reduce the impact on the few remaining historic buildings.</p> <p>Sl. 18. If we are making a lot of assumptions about this building remaining, can it be designated a local historic district (at least the 1938 portion)?</p> <p>Sl. 19. Support taking special care to ensure some parking for the local businesses. Can there also be designated easily accessed short-term spots in the church or hotel lots?</p> <p>Slides 22-36</p> <p>Sl. 27. I do not support the way the facade preservation is designated at the corner. I feel this gives up on the Essential property too early before a project is even proposed. Is it possible to designate a larger area of the parcel, or designate it in place? Then the applicant would then have to make an argument for why it is not possible to save in place and deviates from the plan and our preservation priorities.</p> <p>Is there a reason the local historic district stars have been removed in the staff proposal?</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>Sl. 28. As noted, do not support the 100" extension east of the St. Charles site or the destination of the step-back for the Joyce Motors site.</p> <p>Sl. 29. My understanding is that a large amount of the St Charles site will be sold for a residential development. I do not support treating that as a "church" activity for the purposes of being a retail equivalent. It is important that future retail is not precluded by giving allowances for the church (in terms street widths, etc.).</p> <p>I think it's important to have some kind of active frontage along Fairfax Drive to help enhance the park.</p> <p>Sl. 30. Thanks for calculating the public space. This chart shows a really significant reduction. I feel that Triangle Park is an awkward site and we will need to work hard to make it an impactful public space. Occasionally closing Fairfax Dr is a good idea but I don't feel that this really counts as significant public space. The loss of public space is a very big issue - we need to find it somewhere and any parks that may get developed (like Fairfax Dr and Triangle) should be funded and constructed as soon as possible. Are there any other options, like significant enhancements to Central Park?</p>
22	October 2021	Anonymus	LRPC Member	<p>I am in agreement with most of the changes to the current sector plan. There are a few points that I question.</p> <p>I would prefer to keep part of the County-owned property along 10th St as an active use park. There should still be sufficient space on the fire station property for a new fire station and residences above.</p> <p>I agree with not preserving any of the Wilson Blvd buildings. I still maintain that the Silver Diner building is not eligible for any historic status because it was only built within the past 20 years. I would put a historic designation on the 1938 Verizon building plus its 3rd and 4th stories, but not the 1973 addition.</p> <p>I agree with adding the ROW through the St Charles block and keeping it mostly open to the sky. I am open to some sort of sky bridge (maybe similar to the one north of Wilson Blvd a few blocks away).</p> <p>Reconfiguring Kirkwood with cycle tracks is a good change.</p>
23	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>The update must assure that the building on the Wells-Fargo site preserves the view of the upper portion of the Olmsted Building that now exists along a view corridor extending</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>along 9th Street from the Virginia Square Metro Station. The Virginia Square sector plan illustrates this view corridor.</p> <p>The open space on Fairfax Drive near the Church needs to emphasize biophilia, with pollinator plantings. Paved areas, mowed lawns and plazas must be minimized. These are already present in the open space west of the Clarendon Metro Station.</p>
24	October 2021	Anonymus	LRPC member	<p>In general, I am supportive or have no objection to the items presented in the video with the exception of the following bulleted items below. I am especially glad to see the protected bike lanes added to Kirkwood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While I agree the mid-block passage of the St. Charles site should be open and welcoming, I don't necessarily think it needs to be fully "open to the sky". It could be a well appointed arcade instead. • I am disappointed in the deferral of addressing the competing transportation issues on Fairfax. I worry that the "future park planning effort" won't properly respond to those issues based upon my experience in prior park projects that had transportation components. Let's address these issues now.
25	October 2021	Anonymus	LRPC member	<p>From my perspective as a long time member and former chair of the HALRB, the decisions not to preserve, in any way, the HRI-listed Notable buildings along Wilson Boulevard and the reduction of the Joyce Motors building, the only HRI Essential building in this part of Clarendon, to a reconstructed and relocated facade in a 75 foot building are inconsistent with the approach taken to historic preservation in the original Clarendon Sector Plan. The treatment of the Joyce Motors building is particularly troubling. The staff's proposal for facade "preservation" not only strips the facade of any sense of place and historic context by moving it from its historic location to the corner of a monolithic block of a building with only a minimal step back, but staff 's unsupported proposal to remove a portion of the previously designated step back based on the distance to the Verizon building adds insult to injury. If this is all that may be left of an historic building found to be an Essential historic resource in Clarendon and Arlington, the remains of this Essential historic building should at least be honored with a greater than 10 foot step back above the entire facade and that extends along the Irving Street side for the originally proposed distance.</p> <p>I continue to have concerns about and do not support the uniform reduction of the step backs to 10 feet. The proposed building heights and the heights possible with bonus density as shown in slides 10-13 and Map 2.7, if built as shown, will present a very different environment and feel from the rest of Clarendon. Effectively placed step backs of different</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				widths can help to reduce the monolithic masses of the proposed building heights. This is not likely to happen if developers know they only have to provide 10 foot step backs.
26	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>1) Open Space: I would like the County to prioritize need for more open space to serve a growing population in and around Clarendon. I strongly oppose total elimination of the 10th Street Park -- as depicted in slide 30, and the changes to Clarendon Sector Plan Map 2.9 -- especially as the options for retaining elements of the planned park have not been presented or publicly discussed. An active park at that location would provide an essential public benefit that has yet to be addressed in the LRPC discussion or online documents. County staff should be exploring creative ways to accommodate redevelopment of the fire station while at the same time brainstorming good ideas to ensure much-needed open space in Clarendon that will be even more populated in the future. It is important to develop viable options now to retain leverage in actually making the project happen. While I welcome the proposed linear park on Fairfax Drive between Northside Social and St Charles Church this would not substitute for the 10th Street park, which would provide vital green space and active park facilities (neither of which are incorporated in the linear park proposal). Reinforcing the significance of the 10th Street park, the table in slide # 30 shows that total public space now being proposed -- even including the new linear park -- is still 25,000+ sq feet less than what was projected in the 2006 Plan, and even as the population continues to grow.</p> <p>2) Building height: I remain opposed to the County Staff's proposal -- per slides #10 and 11, and map changes on slide 28 (revision to Map 2.7) -- to increase the maximum height frontages on the north side of 10th Street between Wilson Boulevard and Irving Street from 55' to 75'. This would raise those heights by more than one-third above the 2006 Sector Plan, adding significant and unwelcome density along the northern rim of Ashton Heights. This is not supported by the neighborhoods, has not been requested by the developers, and is inconsistent with the urban village vision for Clarendon set forth in the 2006 Plan.</p> <p>3. Step-backs: I remain concerned over Staff's proposal to reduce the depth of step-backs from 20' to 10', as depicted in slides # 10 and 12 and its proposed map changes on Slide 28 (revision to Map 2.7). Insisting on a minimum 20' step-back remains very important at some locations, for instance along Wilson Boulevard where the proposed hotel would tower over Northside Social and the adjacent garage. In my view, when warranted, consideration of reduced step-backs should be negotiated in the context of the specific project as part of the site plan review process and with public input.</p> <p>4. Public Parking: It is also concerning to me that the Clarendon Sector Update has not addressed the need for additional parking posed by the additional density requested by developers. The County should share its projections of anticipated demand for parking and</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>consider options – including as a public benefit requested from developers. This takes on added urgency in light of the reduced parking capacity envisioned on Fairfax Drive.</p> <p>5. Process: It is unclear to me whether the 10/26 LRPC is intended to be the final LRPC public discussion before County proposals go to the Zoning Board, and thereafter to the Planning Commission for final review. I endorse the request in the Associations’ August 6 letter that the process be extended to permit at least one or two additional virtual LRPC meetings in order to further consider Civic Association and other public input and reach a consensus on key issues.</p> <p>Finally, I welcome the quantification of the bonus density for which developers will need to contribute public benefits in slide #9. It is important to broaden the LRPC discussion to review options for public benefits and where possible specify which extraordinary benefits will be requested by the County, and what the developers will have to do to achieve them.</p>
27	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>I am writing in regards to the latest Arlington County staff recommendations regarding the mid-block connection on the St. Charles property. As a resident of Arlington and parishioner of St. Charles, I have the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring the inclusion of a mid-block connection places a significant burden on St. Charles by substantially reducing its already-small footprint. • Further dictating that the connection has to be open air places an even greater burden on St. Charles. • The main opposition to a covered connection was that the connection "should feel open, welcoming, and provide a safe linkage". These goals are not, however, inconsistent with a covered connection. The space will be wide and a well lit tunnel could be tall enough such that it would feel safe, open, and welcoming. Additionally, this gives the opportunity for an architectural statement piece that would bring additional beauty and interest to the area. Architectural beauty has the potential to increase the welcoming effect over an open-air alley. St. Charles provided good examples of covered walkways that achieve this. https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/10/St.-Charles-AC-Block-Break-Images-210928.pdf <p>Given that these goals can be satisfactorily achieved with a covered walkway, combined with the impact that an open-air requirement would have on St. Charles, I ask that you allow for the flexibility to have a covered connection. Thank you.</p>
28	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update of the Clarendon Sector Plan. I appreciate the time and effort that has gone into planning the space in this transit-rich, central area of Arlington.</p> <p>I am concerned that the plan for transportation through this area has not taken into consideration and provided enough safe infrastructure to those people traveling by bicycle. I appreciate that the project team has taken into consideration how people will walk</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>through this area. For an area as dense as Clarendon, we need to allocate more space for alternatives to cars for transportation. If we don't make it easier, safer and more comfortable for people to bike, people will take their cars the distances they aren't willing to walk, making our community less safe & less inviting, and contributing more to climate change.</p> <p>It is important we plan for all modes of transportation in order to have a transportation network that serves Arlington's goals and is consistent with our values. The current plan does not sufficiently provide for people traveling by bicycle.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Space for everyone on Kirkwood Drive. I am happy to see the updated plan to add protected bike lanes on Kirkwood Drive between Wilson and Washington Blvd. These lanes should continue north to connect to ASFS and Lyon Village Shopping Center. 2. North-south connections for people biking. Connecting north-south through this area on a bike is difficult and unsafe. Currently, the crossings of Wilson Blvd are either unsafe (e.g. N Jackson Street), difficult to navigate (e.g. N Irving Street) or involve significant detour (N Highland Street or N Monroe Street). This project should include a safe way for people biking to cross from the southern part of the project area to the north. This could include a bike signal at the new 10th Rd N that connects to the shared space on Fairfax Drive, a safer crossing of Wilson at Jackson Street that connects to Fairfax Drive, or protected bike lanes on 10th Street N, with safe crossings at Irving Street. 3. Movement through the shared space on Fairfax Drive. The plans shown on slide 19 of the presentation do not show a dedicated space for people riding bikes. The plan implies that people on bikes will be forced to mix with people walking, causing needless conflict. Instead, this plan should make clear that the specific plan for the park must have a dedicated path for people biking, and that the path should align with the approach for people biking on Fairfax Drive, such as a cycletrack on the north side of Fairfax Drive west of Kirkwood. 4. Space for everyone on Wilson and Clarendon. Wilson & Clarendon Blvds should have safe, low stress places for people to bike. The current CSP update only plans for safe places for people to drive and walk, but should be updated to clearly call for protected bike lanes.
29	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>As a parishioner of St. Charles Catholic Church for 21 years, I look forward to the redevelopment of St. Charles will be not only for the parishioners of St. Charles, but for the Arlington community as well. It is my understanding that the Clarendon Sector Plan Study proposed to add a "mid-block" connection through the property from Washington Blvd. to Fairfax Drive and have recommended that it be open to the sky. I request your adoption of the recommendation to allow St. Charles the flexibility to bridge over the connection,</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>which will enhance the design of the alley that will cross the site and have the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bridge over the connection could be an interesting architectural feature that announces the alley to the public and invites them to the planned park on Fairfax Drive; • It could provide some shelter from the elements for pedestrians while being high up enough from the ground to allow anyone to see clearly through the connection from Washington Boulevard to Fairfax Drive and; • It would provide the St. Charles development team the flexibility they will need as they find a development partner and design a building that can achieve the church, the County, and a developer’s goals as outlined in the Sector Plan.
30	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>As an Arlington resident who spends a lot of time in Clarendon and as a member of St. Charles Church, I am writing to express my support for the flexibility requested by the St. Charles redevelopment team to bridge over the proposed mid-block connection on the St. Charles site. Please reconsider the architectural examples and benefits shared by the redevelopment team.</p> <p>Personally, I believe that their argument for an interesting architectural feature that invites the public to the planned park on Fairfax Drive is most compelling (especially recognizing that new construction in Arlington often lacks inviting architectural features). I believe that there are many ways to make a pathway open, welcoming, and safe; none of which requires it to be open to the sky.</p> <p>I ask you to adopt the St. Charles redevelopment team's recommendation and include flexibility to bridge the connection in your final recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Board.</p>
31	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident-Clarendon	<p>I’m a resident of the Clarendon Sector.</p> <p>I fully support the staff’s recommendations as outlined in the slides for online engagement opportunity 4.</p> <p>I think staff has fairly balanced the needs and desires of the various stakeholders involved in this sector.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				It's a good demonstration of the value of having neutral professional assessments as part of a planning process.
32	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>I am writing to share feedback on the Clarendon Sector Plan Update. Overall, I am very happy with the added growth opportunity that this corridor will have. I'm excited to have more apartment buildings and more shops and restaurants in this part of Arlington. My concern is around the bike connection through Clarendon. I currently live near Courthouse. The closest public library is Central Library. I prefer to bike to the library in order to reduce car trips. But the route is not as safe as I would like, especially if I want my kids to eventually bike with me.</p> <p>There are multiple places within the Clarendon Sector Plan Update to improve the protected infrastructure for biking. I would like to see separate space for biking along the rebuilt Fairfax Drive. The bike lanes on Clarendon Blvd and Wilson Drive are currently unprotected, making them completely unsuitable for kids and not comfortable as it should be for more experienced riders.</p>
33	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident- Ashton Heights	<p>I want to express support for the comments in the letters posted online. In addition, I am generally pretty happy with the concepts shown in St Charles' July submission, still a few things I'd like County staff to consider -</p> <p>I am very happy with the pedestrian passthrough/alley in midblock. I am concerned that the alley/festival street/pedestrian bike way replacing Fairfax Drive will provide too little parking to keep Northside Social viable, and that loading for Northside Social and Kirby Garage will be difficult. Counting from the diagram presented by the church, it looks like we are dropping from 80-plus parking spaces to about seventeen, and that's a big concern. I think the concern raised by Chris Slatt and others about bicyclists exiting the alley facing towards the south side of Fairfax Drive instead of the north is something we should support. I'd like to raise the possibility of curving the alley towards the Church trash area at about the '4' on the diagram they submitted, and then bringing it to Kirkwood facing the north, rather than the south, side of Fairfax across Tenth/Kirkwood. This could involve shrinking that Fairfax Drive park area some and combining the currently-shown micro-park space south of the first arrow on the church's diagram with some additional space. Better bicycle access and more parking, with some loss of green.</p> <p>The 2006 Sector plan includes "Activate the ground-floor space of the proposed building east of the proposed North Ivy Street segment on the St. Charles Church property with retail and/ or public market uses" and that language assumed that the church would remain in its current spot rather than moving to the east as it now plans. I like the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>drawings of the church as an inspirational building facing the Wilson-Washington intersection but I think we could lose that specified retail if we don't pay attention – I don't think there's any good reason not to transfer that expectation to the developer building to be constructed where the Church now is, along the Washington Boulevard frontage. It's still worth pushing for - Washington Boulevard is going to have a great deal more pedestrian traffic in future than it does today, with the new buildings being constructed northwest of the Kirkwood-Washington intersection, and walkers to the Clarendon Metro Stop can have a much enlivened experience if there is retail along Washington Boulevard there.</p> <p>Additionally, and as a guy who has just retired from thirty years of walking to Clarendon Metro from Ashton Heights, I'd like to plump for the idea of center islands in the middle of both Wilson and Washington. As a pedestrian at Tenth over the years, it was an enormous plus to be able to cross two lanes at a time instead of needing to wait for all four to clear. To get a three foot center island I would happily give up a foot and a half from the sidewalks on either side.</p> <p>I am very unhappy with what seems to me the staff view that they have an open field for negotiations with developers, and that the 2006 sector effort can be dispensed with when it conflicts with developers' claims of what they 'need' for project viability. I'm certainly aware that several thousand people actually live in Clarendon now, compared to very few in 2006. Perfectly reasonable to consider their needs and desires in refreshing the document. But the developers have bought and assembled their parcels in full awareness of the 2006 planning results. If they are hoping to justify changes in the planning which are detrimental to agreed neighborhood and sector goals, they should be providing the 'extraordinary' benefits mentioned in the plan.</p>
34	October 2021	Anonymus	Resident-Virginia Square	<p>Hello, thank you for taking our feedback. I'm a resident of Virginia Square and the primary reason we chose Arlington to be our home is the friendliness towards pedestrians and bicyclists. We bicycle a lot, and even my six year olds are slowly getting comfortable on the bike. But sadly, Clarendon is not safe for them to bicycle.</p> <p>I'd encourage the following changes to the Sector Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create dedicated bicycle Lanes on Kirkwood to connect Lyon Village shopping center with Clarendon. The bike Lanes that currently exist don't offer any physical protection and

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>therefore can't be used by families bicycling and the like. The only safe bicycle facility are protected bike lanes.</p> <p>2. Similarly let's make sure bicycling from Court House to Ballston becomes truly safe, without the mix of cars with bicycles. Dedicated bicycle Lanes on Clarendon/Wilson and Fairfax are essential.</p> <p>Broadly speaking it is a shame that we have so much space for fast moving traffic going through the heart of Clarendon. Wilson and Clarendon Blvd have the same width as 66... Which is an indication that we are not building our downtown area right.</p>
35	October 2021	Anonymus	Commuity member	<p>I think this plan sounds really great, but I wish it made it safer/easier to bike. I currently avoid the orange line corridor as much as possible because I feel so unsafe biking there. Including protected bike lanes more comprehensively would definitely draw me and my family to Clarendon more frequently.</p>
36	October 2021	Anonymus	Commuity member	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the update of the Clarendon Sector Plan. I applaud the thoughtfulness that has gone into creating more space in this transit-rich, central area of Arlington for people to work, live and play.</p> <p>My comments focus on the transportation aspects of the plan, and specifically on four areas. Many of my comments focus on facilities for people to use when biking, because the project team has spent a lot of time thinking about how people will walk through this area. A lot of space is allocated to people driving through this area. However, the plan for people biking through this area is insufficient. This location is an important node in the transportation network that people of all types need to travel through to get to various destinations: the Clarendon Metro station & the restaurants and retail shops in Clarendon to the east; the Virginia Square Metro station & the restaurants and retail shops in Virginia Square and Ballston to the west; schools, such as Arlington Science Focus School to the north, Washington-Liberty High School to the west and George Mason immediately adjacent to this area, along with the many daycares nearby; and parks, such as the dog park along 13th and Zitkala Sa park to the south. Many of these destinations are farther than people will walk and are poorly served by transit. If we don't make it easier, safer and more comfortable for people to bike, people will take their cars, making our community more safe & less inviting, and contributing more to climate change.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>In short, we must plan for all modes of transportation in order to have a transportation network that serves Arlington's goals and is consistent with our values. The current plan falls short when it comes to people biking.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Space for everyone on Kirkwood Drive. I applaud the updated plan to add protected bike lanes on Kirkwood Drive between Wilson and Washington Blvd. These lanes should continue north to connect to ASFS and Lyon Village Shopping Center. 2. North-south connections for people biking. Connecting north-south through this area on a bike is difficult and unsafe. Currently, the crossings of Wilson Blvd are either unsafe (e.g. N Jackson Street), difficult to navigate (e.g. N Irving Street) or involve significant detour (N Highland Street or N Monroe Street). This project should include a safe way for people biking to cross from the southern part of the project area to the north. This could include a bike signal at the new 10th Rd N that connects to the shared space on Fairfax Drive, a safer crossing of Wilson at Jackson Street that connects to Fairfax Drive, or protected bike lanes on 10th Street N, with safe crossings at Irving Street. 3. Movement through the shared space on Fairfax Drive. The plans shown on slide 19 of the presentation do not show a dedicated space for people riding bikes. The plan implies that people on bikes will be forced to mix with people walking, causing needless conflict. Instead, this plan should make clear that the specific plan for the park must have a dedicated path for people biking, and that the path should align with the approach for people biking on Fairfax Drive, such as a cycletrack on the north side of Fairfax Drive west of Kirkwood. 4. Space for everyone on Wilson and Clarendon. Consistent project 3-19 of the Bicycle Element of the Master Transportation Plan, Wilson & Clarendon Blvds should have safe, low stress places for people to bike. The current CSP update only plans for safe places for people to drive and walk, but should be updated to clearly call for protected bike lanes.

Clarendon Sector Plan Update

Community Comments from December 8, 2021 LRPC

Note: The following table includes a complete set of comments received by staff following the October 5-13, 2021 Online Engagement. A total of 109 messages were received during the engagement period.

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
37	December 2021	Anonymus	Ashton Heights CA	<p>1. Would you clarify for us:</p> <p>My recent listening of the Oct 2020 (a year ago) LRPC presentation by the fire chief indicated that only the first floor of the fire station was essential to stay in Clarendon. And that therefore floors 2 and 3, which had some other important, but not essential to be in Clarendon function, could be separated from the fire station in Clarendon. And that therefore, the essential to Clarendon fire station needed only to be one story high. Would you confirm that??</p> <p>Assuming so, integrating public space between the ground level and the roof of a 1-story building would be easier than that of a 3-story building.</p> <p>2. We would like to explore this option:</p> <p>Moving the fire station annex that the fire chief described as their decontamination/shop/equipment space to the area marked "p" on the firestation maps that you said was surface parking and loading dock for the verizon building and Wells Fargo.</p> <p>How could this be accomplished?</p> <p>We would then have more ground space on 10th Street for a park, all the ground space on the block would then be contiguous, the resulting rectangular space on top of the building would be more flexible to plan, and this action might give us a total of 50,000 square feet of public space.</p> <p>3. Given the meeting concensus tonight, we would request these changes in the Sector Plan maps:</p> <p>a. Map 2.3 Remove verizon density (as Dominion and Triangle Park density have been removed), so that block 23 has no FAR</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>b. Map 2.4. Remove entire block 23 as potential receiving site. (Note: change text to reflect that this block would not be a receiving site for additional height) Consider block 20, the hotel site, as a potential receiving site for height.</p> <p>c. Map 2.5 Change block 23 to 'existing and proposed open space' (and 'utility' to accommodate the fire station), so that if/when the verizon building is exceeded, it will become a park.</p> <p>4. I would also like to explore with you the possibility of installing a pocket park along Irving Street on the Joyce Motor site, as a substitute for the proposed elimination of the tapering, and reduction of step backs. I'm thinking pocket park in the spirit of William H. Whyte and NYC: small, some green, but mostly seating/gathering area in a protected spot (so, indented into the building) . Irving is a huge pathway from Ashton Heights to the metro (when metro is working, and commuters are commuting). Across the street from our future active park, these areas would be synergistic; a plus for the urban village, the residents, commuters, and neighborhoods.</p>
38	December 2021	Anonymus	Ashton Heights CA	<p>Mark Twain said: "There are some things that can beat smartness and foresight. Awkwardness and stupidity can. The best swordsman in the world doesn't need to fear the second best swordsman in the world; no, the person for him to be afraid of is some ignorant antagonist who has never had a sword in his hand before; he doesn't do the thing he ought to do, and so the expert isn't prepared for him; he does the thing he ought not to do; and often it catches the expert out and ends him on the spot." I may well be that ignorant antagonist, and there may well be reasons this would not work. However, there is a really big cost and footprint to the ramp for an underground parking, and if that could be shared with one of the across-the-street buildings, it could enable fire station parking without taking surface space out of the lot. Could be very handy for the Fire Department to have a basement! There's underground connection between the A garage and the B garage at Virginia Hospital Center. If the parking were accessed from the east under the Verizon loading dock, maybe Verizon would get some benefit, too. This would not be cheap, but could look like the 'extraordinary' community benefits called for in the 2006 Plan?</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
39	December 2021	Anonymus	Ashton Heights CA	I am unconvinced that option 4 is at all realistic – the fire station is not going anywhere, unless you put it across Tenth on the current used car lot. Options 1 and 2a are unfaithful to the 2006 Plan, and more important do NOT meet expected future neighborhood park needs. About 2b and 3 – I’d like to hear about the one-story annex to the fire station, and why it could not be built on the top of the new fire station, enabling the larger park? So those are the questions I expect to raise tonight, and I’m hoping that by letting you see them in advance it will enable better answers. Both 2A and 2B have a kind of low and small annex on the fire station northwest of the main FS4. What is that, and why can it not be a top story above FS4? Is it Fire Department offices? For 2B it looks like the difference between a 10000 sf park and a 17000 sf park. I kind of don’t take seriously 3 or 4, because I don’t believe Fire Station will move, but I haven’t been convinced that fire station would need the annex. Parking access looks like a real problem, and not fully thought through. Would there be a way to make a deal with one of the other buildings to be built in the surrounding area, enabling fire personnel to go town the ramp for an apartment or the hotel and then enter the FD space through a tunnel under the street? That would enable us to put parking under both the fire station and the park. Our own Union Square? Surely we can put a couple of pickle ball courts on the roof of the fire station annex, at the least!
40	December 2021	Anonymus	PRC	Given the uncertainties about Fire Station relocation possibilities, it would seem that presenting a couple of the options moving forward, say 2B and 4, would be prudent. This would allow for a certain amount of flexibility given all the uncertainties, combined with the apparent preferences of the local community. The discussed idea of some type of recreational facility on top of any built Fire Station structure, was compelling.
41	December 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maps throughout the Sector Plan show Fairfax Drive aligned with 12th Street at its intersection with Washington Boulevard, thereby giving the impression that the majority, if not all, of the road is located on the Church’s property. During our multiple meetings with County staff regarding the proposed plan, we were assured that the images in the Plan were general, that given its public nature, the majority of Fairfax Drive would not be on the Church’s property, and that the final alignment of the road would be determined during the site plan process for redevelopment

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>of the Church property. To avoid confusion moving forward, please add language to the Sector Plan stating that the final alignment of Fairfax Drive at Washington Boulevard will be determined during review of a site plan application for the Church property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map 2.9 regarding public open space includes a black bar designating “building frontages defining public spaces”. This designation is shown along the Church property frontage facing Fairfax Drive. However, given the location of the existing metro vault, conceptual designs provided by the Church show the building necessarily pulled back from the frontage along the eastern portion of the site to accommodate the existing vault. Please adjust the designation line to acknowledge that the building in the area near the vault will necessarily need to be pulled back. - Language in the sector plan on page 18 of your marked up PDF addressing step backs for frontages with heights of at least 60 feet should be clarified. We realize this is existing language, but is somewhat confusing as written. The phrase “along designated frontages” should be at the beginning of the sentence to clarify that these steps are expected where they are identified in the corresponding map in the plan.
42	February 2022	Anonymus	Lyon Village	<p>In general, Lyon Village supports the position of Ashton Heights in response to the staff's Friday proposal.</p> <p>(1) We share Ashton Height's concern about staff's last minute presentation of the staff position. This limits the ability of our Association to share the staff position within our community and obtain community input. We would urge that the February 8 meeting be postponed. There would be no harm in deferring but there will be harm to the community process (the "Arlington Way") in preventing a community review.</p> <p>(2) We similarly share Ashton Height's concern about staff's apparent lack of support for a meaningful park on the 10th Street site that is part of the current approved Clarendon Plan. Park and recreation space are an important part of any successful community. The five area civic associations, as part of the multi-month</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>process that is leading up to the February 8 meeting, all have indicated that realizing an active park with recreational facilities on the County-owned site is a top priority, and presented a number of creative ways in which a meaningful park within the concept of the current Clarendon Plan could be provided. We don't understand staff's current position, including the 11th hour introduction of an alternative option that has not previously been presented or discussed, and which would minimize park space, and thus be an apparent rejection of those ideas.</p> <p>(3) Perhaps even more importantly, we are very concerned about the approach that staff is taking in regard to review of parts of the Clarendon Plan and also the Courthouse Plan. The current Clarendon Plan was approved after a lengthy community process several years ago with the support of all the surrounding civic associations, County staff, the various commissions, property owners, and the County Board. The process was overseen by the County Board member Chris Zimmerman and it did not go forward until it had the support of all the interested parties, most importantly the surrounding civic associations. This was important so that the County would know that proposals consistent with the Plan could go forward without community objections and without the extended delays and costs that would otherwise occur in the absence of a Plan that all parties had endorsed. What staff appears to be trying do here is dismantle, block by block, the Clarendon Plan here and also the Courthouse Plan, and pursue a vision that differs from the consensus plans. (The Courthouse Plan block at issue is the block just east of Whole Foods.)</p>
42	February 2022	Anonymus	Clarendon-Courthouse	<p>While this Sector plan update definitely does not have everything I would like in it and has far too many setbacks and tapers for aesthetic purposes at the cost of additional housing than would be my preference, this proposed update creates conditions for growth and improvement of my neighborhood that I'm very excited about and hope the ZOCO will fully support.</p>
43	February 2022	Anonymus	Unknown	<p>Increased development in Clarendon is causing map algorithm updates from Google Maps, Waze, and TomTom, to add cars to residential streets around 11th St Park (and other parts), so drivers can avoid red traffic lights on 10th St N, to save a few seconds. Clarendon Courthouse residents have repeatedly requested methods, such as progressive cities in California use, to keep non-local traffic off residential streets when there is no time and/or distance advantage, and make it safer for the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>large number of pedestrians, cyclists, pets, families and children, who use these streets. Similar to Arlington County policy to keep delivery drivers from using residential streets as short cuts. This development and Courthouse West will make non-local traffic significantly increase. And this will occur in every developed area such as National Landing and Langston Blvd, and needs to be addressed as county wide policy. DES-TEO will not address this issue and refuses to acknowledge anything has changed. One resident already got crushed by an SUV in July 2020 by 11th St Park from a non-local driver who was not paying attention and driving with excessive speed, and many short cut drivers treat residential roads as main arterial roads. How does the County Board plan to fix this?</p>
44	February 2022	Anonymus	Clarendon-Courthouse	<p>Having been the Clarendon-Courthouse Civic Association's representative to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, I'm frustrated with the process for the proposed update.</p> <p>I understand we have new information on some of the CSP assumptions like — the Verizon building isn't moving and the future of office space may not support our desired use mix. But, most other key components have not changed.</p> <p>We see no reason to change the parts of the plan that refer to building heights, or step backs, or the need for open space (especially if we are going to see increased residential uses).</p> <p>These are precisely the tools that realize the vision and goals of the SP. A vision and goals that staff assures us are not supposed to be changing in a new version of the CSP.</p> <p>These are the tools we all agreed on during a robust, months-long process resulting in the 2006 plan.</p> <p>Process is important. Sometimes it feels long or messy but those long, messy processes yield better outcomes. Arlington's super-power has been good planning processes. Please, let's remember and value that.</p> <p>A staff-driven rewrite of the CSP doesn't uphold the Arlington standard for good process and planning.</p> <p>We would be wise to start thinking about "carrying capacity" in Arlington zoning and planning. In this case, increased residential uses necessitate an adherence to the 2006 plan for open space.</p>
45	February 2022	Anonymus	Ashton Heights	<p>Ashton Heights Civic Association (AHCA) Public Comment for February 8 ZOCO:</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>"The Ashton Heights Civic Association opposes the proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan and associated Zoning Ordinance Maps posted by the County on February 4. In the course of six public meetings, culminating in the last meeting that focused almost exclusively on the 10th Street Park, our civic association, along with those of Clarendon-Courthouse, Lyon Village, Lyon Park, and Ballston-Virginia Square, clearly enunciated that our single biggest priority was securing a commitment to preserve as much as possible of the 50,000 square feet in park space on 10th Street that was specified in the 2006 Sector Plan. We have expressed our concerns about a number of other changes in the plan (including the increased height of the building frontages on 10th Street, the reduction of setbacks to 10 feet, and other concerns discussed in our October 27, 2021 letter to the LRPC), and we are not willing to support the overall plan, if the planned 10th Street park is not properly preserved.</p> <p>We are extremely disappointed to see that the proposed plan (a) does not commit to use the fire station site as a park if the fire station is relocated, as specified in the 2006 Plan; (b) does not explicitly state that it is the plan's intent for any redeveloped fire station to incorporate public recreational space through a rooftop park or co-located community center, and (c) does not designate the Verizon building as future park space should Verizon ever stop using the facility. While the proposed plan includes an option that would convert the entire County-owned site to a 43,000 square foot park (Figure 2.19), it now introduces the possibility that a small park would be paired with a new affordable housing apartment building at the site, which would exacerbate the situation by adding even more residents to an area with inadequate recreational space (Figure 2.18).</p> <p>Moreover, we were surprised to hear for the first time in the entire process that the County staff believes this site should be dedicated to affordable housing. In all of the prior presentations and meetings, despite ample opportunity for it to be discussed, the County staff never indicated that this was a priority for the site. Though we strongly support affordable housing, this is simply not the right site for it. The irony is that through this process Clarendon will have hundreds of additional housing units. The potential to achieve affordable housing within the developments themselves is obvious, at least to us, to achieve the County's</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>affordable housing goals. The fire station site should not be used for this purpose. If the County is serious about maximizing park space at this location (as recommended by the Forestry and Natural Resources Commission and the Park and Recreation Commission in their letters to the County Board), it should make the commitment now in the sector plan, rather than adding in an alternative development plan that will allow this public need to go unmet.</p> <p>Finally, we are frustrated that the final proposed changes were posted on a Friday night, with comments from the public due on Tuesday morning, leaving little time for members of the public, including the participating Civic Associations, to review and comment on the new affordable housing proposal. In the LRPC process, we, along with other civic associations, commissions, and members of the community, clearly expressed the need to dedicate as much of the County-owned site as possible to active recreational space, and this last-minute proposal fails to do so. Accordingly, we encourage the Zoning Committee to reject the proposal as drafted, and revise the plan and associated zoning maps (including Maps 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5, as well as the reference to the proposed Figure 2.18 in Public Spaces Map 2.9) to maximize potential recreational space on the 10th Street site.</p>
46	February 2022	Anonymus	Ashton Heights	<p>I live within the bounds of the Ashton Heights civic association and was on the Clarendon Task Force (CTF) that participated in the Clarendon Sector Plan update in 2006 – but today I am just writing on my own behalf. My home, where I have resided since 1997, is located very close to the area that is designated for this Sector Plan update – in fact my house is one of those depicted on the diagram in the memo provided by staff for this meeting. My recollection from 2006 was that as the task force’s work was winding down, there was still some issues that some in the community had with things like building heights and historic preservation so an additional group – called the Clarendon Working Group (CWG) was formed to address these outstanding issues. I was not a part of the CWG but my understanding is that one of the outcomes of that group was the provisions in the zoning code and sector plan that defined the maximum buildings heights according to a 3:1 taper line defined as starting relative to the R/RA zoning line south of 10th street. Now, elimination/modification of this taper provision is one of the more significant changes being proposed.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>I did not and still do not think defining building heights and massing with this somewhat arbitrary geometry is the best way to achieve what I would consider to be optimal urban design. I would prefer if the decisions on massing and allocation of height was based on good civic design principles such as terminating view corridors and pedestrian street experience (which often has more to do this frontage design, in my opinion). Also, very importantly, that heights and location of step-backs take into account environmental factors and impacts to adjacent public land such as seasonal sun positions and relative placements of public spaces/parks. Specifically related to the potential for a public park at 10th and Irving, which is located on the south side of the Verizon/C&P building, this would be a good place to look at the shadows that would be cast in the morning and evening by the Joyce Motors proposal and the new firehouse proposal and see if there is a way (with building step-backs and targeted height control) to maximize the hours of sunshine reaching this new park, especially in the early spring and late fall when the sun is still low in the sky.</p> <p>My observation is that there doesn't seem to be adequate regulatory mechanisms to simultaneously offer builders the flexibility to creatively and practically allocate height and massing while ensuring that builders will also consider the impact that the placement of height have on adjacent properties and public spaces. Speaking for myself, I would not have much issue with any of the maximum building heights being proposed provided that massing and height are allocated according to civic design best practices and opportunities (like a sunny park) are not squandered. And, most importantly for me, that the details of the building frontages support an active, pleasant and safe pedestrian experience. However, we seem to only have the site plan negotiation as a tool for enforcement leading to a potential advantage for the community in having restrictive controls in the sector plan and zoning that can be used as bargaining chips. At the very least, I think any zoning changes that would come about due to the sector plan update (which is only occurring now because of these site-specific development proposals) should only be approved concurrently with the site plans that are pushing the change – and in that way, perhaps we can ensure that good design principles are enforced.</p>
47	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Community Member	1) The reduction in real, honest-to-god public green space is lower under this proposal. Counting a street "green" or "open" space is just plain dishonest. This

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>plan packs more people into a small space while reducing meaningful park and recreational areas. Given the persistently high vacancy rates in Ballston (both residential and commercial) and its lack of real green space, staff might rethink this strategy. Repeating the mistakes of Ballston and Rosslyn won't make Clarendon any more appealing.</p> <p>2. The fact that the County Board controls the amount of density on most of this plan area's sites makes the density map seem pretty much irrelevant, especially now that the "bonus" density cap on affordable housing bonus density is gone. The sky's the limit, as the board and staff have proved with the 1.3 million sq ft of "additional density that needs to be earned" on the PenPlace site. That's "bonus" density equal to 1.5 times the Chrysler building, but without any meaningful list of benefits to justify it.</p> <p>3. Likewise, the tapering/step-back map is largely irrelevant. There isn't sufficient width of sites along 10th Street (abutting the residential areas) to provide meaningful tapering of building height. This is especially true since the County Board can add however much height/density on a site that it chooses. Again, the promise of building tapering/step-back is inherently dishonest and meaningless to those living nearby.</p> <p>4. The retail-everywhere, prescribed types of retail confined to certain streets has been a failure along Columbia Pike. Brick-and-mortar retail is in the toilet. If you force buildings to contain retail space on the ground floor, why not make its uses as flexible as possible so that the space can be leased?</p> <p>5. Preserving 3 whole building facades in the entire sector. wow. I guess we cannot retain anything remotely human scale that might be appealing. How will the replication of Ballston and Rosslyn in this sector make it more appealing?</p> <p>6. Building right up to the sidewalk (virtually eliminating landscaped setbacks) has never been a wise idea from a security standpoint. It also increases the amount of heat-trapping surfaces that exacerbate the urban heat island effect (increasing the amount of power usage, the generation of toxic ground-level ozone, and the</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>generation of stormwater runoff while leaving no green space to receive and store that water).</p> <p>The lack of landscaped setbacks and minimal real/functional green space amplifies climate change; it accentuates the claustrophobic nature of excessive building heights (not human scale); it ignores prevailing wind patterns and reduces air circulation; it makes the streetscape hotter, more sterile and less pleasant for walking</p> <p>In short, it is the antithesis of climate-resilient urban form: https://uccrn.ei.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/pubs/ARC3.2-PDF-Chapter-5-Urban-Planning-and-Design-wecompress.com .pdf</p> <p>7. Anyone who would ride a bike in a traffic-choked, congested area like Clarendon has a death wish. Adding more density won't fix that problem.</p> <p>8. Yes, might as well remove the tree map. It's a joke anyway. There's no suitable permeable place to plant trees that can survive to maturity under the conditions created by this plan. Its wall-to-wall concrete and asphalt space means any trees that may be planted are unlikely to survive to maturity and are doomed to an premature, painful death. See below:</p> <p>The "typical street tree population half-life (the time at which cumulative survivorship is 50%) is only 13–20 years." And [s]treet trees must survive for several decades (26–33 years) to attain carbon neutrality." https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0215846</p> <p>This plan "update" reminds me why I never visit Clarendon for any reason unless it's to visit the Apple store once every 8 years or so.</p>
48	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Community Member	<p>There needs to be a greater emphasis on biophilia, the addition of green spaces and natural areas and a reduction of impermeable surfaces such as plazas that create stormwater run-off. Central and western Clarendon presently has too many such impervious surfaces, too few trees and no natural areas.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>Central Clarendon’s open spaces therefore presently attract few people other than the homeless except perhaps during lunch time. The area’s public events are too few and far between to correct this undesirable situation. Because of funding limitations, there can be no expectation that the number of public events in the area will increase in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Specifically, the following changes are needed:</p> <p>Page 27: <u>Present proposed language:</u> <i>“Design plaza on the east end of Fairfax Drive with a mix of hardscape and landscape areas which could be used for public gatherings and market-type activities as well as provide additional relief from the surrounding built environment.”</i></p> <p><u>Change to:</u> <i>“Design public space on the east end of Fairfax Drive with a mix of landscaped and natural areas to provide additional relief from the surrounding built environment.”</i></p> <p>Explanation: Hardscaped areas are not biophilic and create stormwater runoff. In 2013, the County paved over and leveled a landscaped area in Central Clarendon Park immediately west of the Metro station to enable it to be used for public gatherings and market-type activities. This new hardscape area is only one block from the east end of Fairfax Drive. Other plazas are located nearby at the base of the Olmsted Building, at 3033 Wilson Boulevard, and in front of the Fairfax Drive entrance to George Mason University.</p> <p>There is no need for any new hardscaped areas and plazas that are in close proximity to those that presently exist in this area. This is especially true because few public events and market activities presently take place in those areas. Additional new development is not likely to change this situation, as there can be no expectation that public or private funding for such activities will increase.</p> <p><u>West End Plaza (pages 30-31)- Change name to “<i>West End Public Space</i>”.</u></p> <p>Page 30 (last paragraph): <u>Present proposed language:</u></p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p><i>“West End Plaza</i> <i>The West End Plaza is an extension of the future comprehensive Fairfax Drive Park, a linear park, that includes the plaza, Fairfax Drive and future expansion of Triangle Park as a unified and cohesive park experience. The proposed plaza is envisioned as the park’s new main focal gathering space, approximately 20,000 square feet in size. The future designed plaza would create a new, prominent public space, with a blend of hardscape and landscape spaces to further support community activities, markets and events, providing a much-needed element to reconnect the western end with the center of Clarendon. It is anticipated that the space would be largely funded through redevelopment projects.</i></p> <p><i>Biophilic elements could include a range of direct and indirect experiences to nature and natural processes, from tangible materials and textures to the intangible expressions of nature that could be evoked and created through design.</i></p> <p><u>Change to:</u> <i>“The West End Public Space is an extension of the future comprehensive Fairfax Drive Park, a linear park, that includes the public space, Fairfax Drive and future expansion of Triangle Park as a unified and cohesive park experience. The proposed public space is envisioned as the park’s new main natural area, approximately 20,000 square feet in size. The future designed public space would create a new, prominent natural feature, with a blend of landscape spaces and natural areas to further support biophilia, providing a much-needed element between the western end and the center of Clarendon. It is anticipated that the space would be largely funded through redevelopment projects.”</i></p> <p>Page 31: <u>Proposed present language:</u> <i>“High levels of pedestrian traffic are expected in this part of Clarendon in the future, particularly as the George Mason University campus expands continues to grow and other sites in Virginia Square redevelop. The plaza and future linear park at Fairfax Drive, public market uses, and new retail space could enhance this corridor linking the Virginia Square and Clarendon Metro station areas.</i></p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p><i>The vision for re-designing the segment of Fairfax Drive between the new re-designed West End Plaza and North Kirkwood Road is to create a more flexible, pedestrian-oriented urban park space that will enhance the physical character and utility of this area. Biophilic elements could include a range of direct and indirect experiences to nature and natural processes, from tangible materials and textures to the intangible expressions of nature that could be evoked and created through design.</i></p> <p><u>Change to:</u> <i>High levels of pedestrian traffic are expected in this part of Clarendon, particularly as the George Mason University campus continues to grow and other sites in Virginia Square redevelop. The <u>new natural areas in the public space and in the future linear park at Fairfax Drive</u> could enhance this corridor linking the Virginia Square and Clarendon Metro station areas.</i></p> <p><i>The vision for re-designing the segment of Fairfax Drive between the new re-designed <u>West End Public Space</u> and North Kirkwood Road is to create a more flexible, pedestrian-oriented <u>largely natural urban park space</u> that will enhance the physical character and utility of this area. Biophilic elements could include a range of direct experiences to nature and natural processes.”</i></p> <p>Explanation: Intangible expressions of nature evoked and created through design are not biophilic. Most importantly, artificial surfaces do not necessarily evoke expressions of nature because they are not natural. They are works of art that people can interpret in many different ways.</p> <p>Page 64 (Public Spaces Map 2.9): Centering Spaces: Change name of Centering Space from “<i>West End Plaza</i>” to “<i>West End Public Space</i>”.</p> <p>Do the same for the location of the space on the map.</p> <p><u>Proposed Map Changes</u> Page 12: Public Open Space (Map 2.9): Change name of space from “<i>West End Plaza</i>” to “<i>West End Public Space</i>” in the “2022 Proposed Public Space Map”. Do the same in “2022 Proposed” box on page.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				Page 13: Public Open Space (Map 2.9): Change name of space from “ <i>West End Plaza</i> ” to “ <i>West End Public Space</i> ” in the “2022 Proposed Public Space Map”. Do the same in green “Proposed Public Spaces” box.
49	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan.
50	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan.
51	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I have followed the Clarendon Sector Plan process closely, now and back in 2006. I am particularly distressed that the update abandons provision for a park along 10th St. where it would be extremely valuable. What is proposed is insufficient. We need open space. The proposed public space on Fairfax Dr. is an inadequate substitute. Even if the fire station must remain, a park on 10th street would be valuable. However, the County has failed to think creatively about how to use this area. Figure 2.17 is particularly odd: seemingly two fire station buildings of uncertain height with the wasted space of front and rear aprons. Having the fire station stay and having affordable housing with the footprint of Figure 2.18 doesn't seem to be an option? Why not? It could include an indoor park area (where emergency personnel could work out) and be connected to the outdoor park. The plan fails to provide open space that will be sorely needed when the density increases. Shortsighted!
52	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I have lived in the Lyon Park neighborhood at 3 addresses since 1987. First I was a long-time renter and then finally a home owner. My neighbors on the other side of

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				the street are in Ashton Heights. I oppose any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height & density increases without commensurate community benefits, & prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan. Also increasing the height of the buildings to make interior residential space better has no benefit to the community. Just include fewer units.
53	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Community Member	I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan.
54	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	The exhibits provided for the Joyce Motors site by Orr totally miss the mark for contributing to an urban village environment. The plans completely fill the space without setbacks from the streets. No provisions are made for green spaces, nor community use of wider sidewalks. It seems like maximizing density far outweighs adding any amenities for the community. This is very disappointing
55	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	The Clarendon Sector Plan has proceeded for many years on the basis of encouraging high density near a Metro station. Things have changed in the past two years. People work from home. Metro is in decline and may never be able to provide service comparable to what everyone was used to before March 2020. Meanwhile, planning for Clarendon has proceeded as if nothing has changed. The Metro situation must be taken into account. The proposed buildings look as imposing as all the buildings in Rosslyn, Court House, and Ballston, with increasing density and heights, and they will add an unsustainable number of people and cars to the area. Clarendon will become just like those other areas. Is this really what we want for Clarendon? I would prefer for Clarendon to maintain some of its

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				distinction from those other areas by keeping the buildings lower and keeping the density manageable.
56	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	You are allowing an unhealthy, unlivable, unfeasible level of density. I live in the Beacon and the building going up to this one is going to be practically flush with our building. They are pile driving beginning 7:30 every morning and besides the deafening pounding, you can feel the vibration. From what I see of the sector plan, Clarendon will be simply a mini midtown Manhattan with every square inch filled with high rises. I saw the destruction of my beloved Miami as it was overdeveloped the same way you are allowing here. The reasons, excuses, were different as they are mostly Republicans so it was about jobs for construction workers, but rents are HIGHER than ever and the the roads clogged with traffic.
57	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. Affordable housing can be built in many locations including in the new buildings, there is not another viable site for reasonable sized park - open space For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan.
58	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Community Member	Please, please, please do not eliminate the plan for a 50,000 square foot park on 10th st. In my opinion the success of the entire plan depends on this bit of open space, to prevent a complete manhattanization of our neighborhood. Affordable housing has many other options throughout the county and even in this area (for example, in the new buildings going up) but this park is the only real chance for open space. Thank you for your consideration.
59	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	As a 26 year resident of Lyon Park, I am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan"

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
60	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I oppose the plan unless it includes a plan to develop the (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan.
61	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Lyon park, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
62	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space
63	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. Active recreational space is an important benefit and we are currently reaching a density where this is not an easy thing to find in Arlington.

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
64	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan. Open space is very essential in keeping our neighborhood good feeling . I am not opposed to change but we want to change for the better.
65	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I support the proposed changes. Much has improved in Clarendon since 2006, but the original plan, and much of Clarendon, is definitely in need of an update. Clarendon would be so much better with more activity and pedestrian-friendly buildings along 10th and Wilson/Clarendon Boulevard. Many are complaining about the changes in park configuration, but I believe the original park planned along 10th would have been difficult to make work well with all that frontage on 10th. Plus, retail likes to face other retail, so having building frontage on that street makes sense from an activation standpoint.
66	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space. In addition, the planned tree canopy is inadequate. I would strongly encourage an increased focus on improving the tree canopy coverage throughout the development area.
67	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am a resident of Ashton Heights and am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
68	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am a resident of Ashton Heights living near North 10th Street, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space, which will serve all of the residents of the MANY new apartments that have been constructed in the Clarendon area in the past decade. Don't give away our limited green space.
69	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	My wife and I live in Ashton Heights and raised our daughter here. It's been a fabulous community. We are strongly opposed to the proposed revisions of the Clarendon Sector Plan and are disappointed by the breach of faith it reflects given the lengthy discussions that took place when the existing Plan was developed. We certainly understand, and appreciate, the change in circumstances and the need to develop additional housing units, but this should not occur at the expense of the current residents and certainly should not result in the loss of the promised park area. The proposal must be modified to at least include the development of a new 50,000 square foot park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St. that was included in the 2006 Plan. Not only would this help serve as a buffer between the commercial and residential areas, the public open space with its active recreational areas would provide important social and community benefits.

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
70	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I believe Arlington should preserve its parks and green space. Existing parks and trails are very heavily used. Also, it might be time to put building development and zoning changes that increase density on hold. We have not absorbed development for Amazon yet.
71	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I have lived in Ashton Heights for decades and oppose proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to create a large, meaningful (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community, particularly as the density in our neighborhood increases. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. While I support affordable housing options, I believe it can be included in one of the other proposed development sites adjoining this area.
72	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
73	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I am a resident of Ashton Heights and am very concerned about retaining the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan requirement for a 50,000 square foot park on the County-owned property on N 10th Street. Open space is essential for all of us to live healthy lives in a densely populated area like Arlington, with an emphasis on our Metro corridors. Further, plans are made for a reason and the reasons for open space in this area have not changed. If anything, they have increased due to our greater density over the past 16 years. We all support more affordable housing, which should be considered for new residential buildings in our Central area -- and should have been throughout the past 16 years -- but not at the expense of long-

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				promised greenspace that contributes to livability in our area. Seizing promised parkland as a substitute for other options is a punishingly poor choice for our community. Recreational space at the 10th Street site remains essential.
74	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	As a resident of Ashton Heights, I am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space. No changes from the 2006 plan are acceptable to me.
75	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	As the owner of a house in Ashton Heights, I strongly support calls to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes); I am concerned that it prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is badly needed active recreational space.
76	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I live in Ashton Heights and strongly oppose the proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a significant (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Arlington is becoming more and more crowded, and we need to take what few opportunities we have to preserve or increase open and recreational space. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for undefined "community benefits" and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space. Also, I am very concerned about increasing rooftop public spaces. Already the noise from Don Tito, which the county has done nothing to alleviate, is intolerable to many neighbors; increasing the amount of such space will only make the situation worse.
77	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I do believe that the updated 2022 Clarendon Sector Plan is responsive to community concerns. Decreasing the step backs from 20 to 10 feet will result in more density & less light with no benefit whatsoever for the community. The

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				updated plan will make Clarendon look like Ballston or Rosslyn, and reduce promised green space. I am extremely disappointed in the County' staff & County Board's caving to pressure from developers for increased building height. Also, there is already pressure on parking on North Irving Street between 10th Street & Pershing Drive where people who do not live nearby park their cars for weeks at a time. Additional density without additional parking under proposed new buildings along 10th Street will exacerbate this situation. I believe the COUNTY BOARD HAS LEFT INSUFFICIENT TIME FOR THE COMMUNITY TO REVIEW AND RESPOND TO THE UPDATED SECTOR PLAN; APPROVAL MUST BE DELAYED.
78	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
79	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I'm a resident of Ashton Heights, and oppose the proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. It's very concerning that our representatives seem to believe it's OK to change agreements made long ago but unfulfilled. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space. It was the same in 2006 and it hasn't changed.
80	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St.,

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.</p>
81	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	<p>Really disappointed to see the fire station co-located with housing eliminated as an option. I feel like there were multiple advocates for that in the LRPC process and the staff did good work in service of that option. Feels like that has been conceded to the NIMBYs of Ashton Heights without good reason. I would have liked to see staff recognize that the conversion of Fairfax Dr to a linear park provides the public space envisioned on 10th street and prioritize the creation of more housing as the 2022 update seems to not focus on housing production and, if anything, reduces the possible number of housing units. Along with the step back requirements that put "light and air" way above housing on the priority list, it feels like the balance is way off on this plan and we need higher height limits or some other way of getting more housing into this plan. As we've seen recently with housing prices, housing construction is not keeping up with demand and we need to plan for fixing that.</p>
82	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	<p>Please do your best to keep the recommended park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Also, protected bike lines are always welcome.</p>
83	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	<p>I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
84	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Business owner in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
85	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I, a resident of Ashton Heights, am opposed to proposed revisions to the Clarendon Sector Plan, unless it is revised to include a plan to develop a significant and achievable (50,000 square foot) park on the County-owned property on N. 10th St., as currently specified in the 2006 Plan. Public open space, including active recreational space, is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The proposed revised Plan calls for new height and density increases in return for commensurate community benefits (to be determined during later "site plan" processes), and prioritizes multi-unit affordable housing on the 10th street site, rather than for park space as previously planned. For the 10th Street site, the most important community benefit is active recreational space.
86	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	The Clarendon Update process has been rushed and flawed. The premise for the review seems to be that the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan is somehow obsolete or irrelevant. That is not the case. The 2006 Plan involved hundreds of stakeholders, numerous public meetings, and took almost 4 years. During this recent review, outreach and participation has been minimal, and legitimate concerns expressed by businesses (e.g. parking at Northside Social), residents (e.g. parks, building heights and taper), HALRB (e.g. Joyce Motors), and others, have not been adequately considered. Since the planning process has been inadequate, I would recommend tabling adoption of any of the recommendations in this report.
87	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	I have lived on N. Irving Street since 1981 and know as a resident the value for all of or community of open green space for our physical, social and mental well being. I am opposed to any changes to the 2006 Clarendon Sector Plan, unless the plan includes an achievable 50,000 square foot park on 10th Street. Public

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>open space is essential for a vibrant, equitable and sustainable community. The revised Plan calls for new height and density increases without commensurate community benefits, and prioritizes affordable housing on the 10th street site. For the 10th street site, the most important community benefit is open space. Before any changes to the Plan are adopted, the Plan must include 50,000 sq ft open space on 10th Street, which was required as part of any development in the original 2006 plan.</p>
	March 2, 2022	Anonymous	Resident in the Clarendon Metro Station Area	<p>This is supposed to be brief, and I'll try, but I could go on: #1 Green Space! We need green space, now more than ever as density increases. #2 Keep your promises! The Clarendon Sector Review Plan achieved agreement on a 50,000 square foot park. Personal thought #1: The people who LIVE here can be trusted more than those who came to make money here. At a recent AHCA meeting, West Clarendon developers replied with a tin ear: one of the "community benefits" of increased building height would be a rooftop restaurant (!!! another Don Tito's?); the proposed new apartments didn't have balconies because they would be "too expensive" (what I heard: "less profitable.") Personal thought #2: the suggestion that multi-unit affordable housing (which I fervently support) should be realized at the expense of green space is like offering safe transit for Ukrainians to Russia. The gist of my comments was 1) we need green space, the more so as density increases, 2) the 50,000 sq.ft. park at Clarendon is a promise worth keeping (just check out the visitor load to nearby parks BEFORE all these apartments go up), 3) AHCA meetings with W. Clarendon developers show them to be deaf to neighborhood concerns.</p>