

Clarendon Sector Plan Update
Community Comments from October 5-13, 2021 Online Engagement

Note: The following table includes a complete set of comments received by staff following the October 5-13, 2021 Online Engagement. Staff will be preparing a summary of the main issues and concerns, along with staff responses as the process continues to move forward.

#	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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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> <p>It's a good demonstration of the value of having neutral professional assessments as part of a planning process.</p>
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	<p>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.</p>
6	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>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.</p>
7	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>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 connection on the St. Charles site, but if there is a compelling justification for a mid-block connection, I would</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
9	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>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</p>
10	October 2021	Anonymus	St. Charles Church	<p>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.</p>
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.</p> <p>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 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</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				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.
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 stepback, 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 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"> 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. 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. 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. Slide 21 - I like the cross-section of Wilson and think that will work well. 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 walkway with rarely used park seating that can occasionally be activated for community events. <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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				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
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.</p> <p>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 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 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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				I support the proposed changes in the Street Tree Map and the use of an approved street tree list.
20	October 2021	Anonymus	Community member	<p>Slide 12 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. 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 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 setback 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 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</p>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<p>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.</p> <p>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 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 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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<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 Wilson Blvd buildings provide important context. I think they could have easily been incorporated. I do appreciate the attempt to scale back the Bingham 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> <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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
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 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 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.</p>
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.</p> <p>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 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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<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. <p>https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/10/St.-Charles-AC-Block-Break-Images-210928.pdf</p> <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 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, 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;

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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> <p>It's a good demonstration of the value of having neutral professional assessments as part of a planning process.</p>
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 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>

#	Engagement	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
				<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 therefore can't be used by families bicycling and the like. The only safe bicycle facility are protected bike lanes. 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>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> <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

