

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

List of Acronyms

CPHD – Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development
 DES – Department of Environmental Services
 DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation
 AED – Arlington Economic Development
 PC – Planning Commission
 LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission
 TC – Transportation Commission
 PAC – Pedestrian Advisory Committee
 PRC – Park and Recreation Commission
 FNRC – Forest and Natural Resources Commission
 PDSP – Phased Development Site Plan
 CCBN – Crystal City Bicycle Network

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
GENERAL					
1.		What is driving the increase in tree canopy which seems to become more aggressive with each version of the Sector Plan?	Comment noted, no changes proposed.		In order to mitigate existing low tree canopy levels within much of the study area, future growth needs to deliver a higher level of vegetation to meet the vision for Pentagon City and Arlington County as a whole. With Arlington becoming a Biophilic City, increasing the integration of natural features into the built environment has become more of a priority in recent years.
2.		The plan needs to incorporate a process to ensure larger sites continue to meet the Plan’s goals and deliver on the expected community benefits over time.	Staff concurs.		The revised Sector Plan includes language requiring larger properties (RiverHouse, Fashion Centre, and Westpost/Pentagon Row) to submit a Phased Development Site Plan (PDSP) for community benefits which will enable long-term monitoring and tracking of how incremental progress is made to ensure the Plan’s goals are achieved with each phase of development. The PDSP is not intended to re-envision what is possible on those sites, but instead will serve as a long-term implementation tool for the Sector Plan.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
3.		In recognition some pivotal sites may find it challenging to meet all of the Plan’s obligations, the plan could benefit from including potential financial tools that can provide the incentives necessary to encourage owners to pursue redevelopment and implement key elements of the plan	Comment noted, no changes proposed.		While the Plan does not suggest any new financing tools for further consideration, implementation Matrix #19 and the 4 th bullet on page 108 speak to the need for future maintenance and funding that will require coordination between the County, study area property owners, and the NL BID to achieve the Plan’s goals. Staff has not yet identified any near-term projects which would not be able to fulfill their Sector Plan obligations.
4.		Given the standard affordable housing commitment is only for 30 years when negotiated with developers who gain enhanced density, and therefore indefinite market value, the ability for residents of all incomes to afford this neighborhood should not be so short term.	Comment noted, no changes proposed		Staff does not consider a 30-year commitment as “short-term”. Furthermore, potential changes to the standard 30-year commitment for affordable units needs to be considered at a County-wide level and will not be resolved at a Sector Plan level. Increasing the length of the commitment involves a higher cost and would therefore likely result in a lower quantity of units. While extending the duration of CAFs is preferred by all and such an effort will certainly require innovative approaches, CAFs can become reclassified as Market Rate Affordable Units (MARKs) given their age, condition, and relationship to the surrounding real estate market once the initial 30-year commitment expires. Staff considers MARKs an equally supportive element in the County’s overall housing inventory.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
5.		<p>The Plan has made mention of some potential to develop an expansion of the Regency Care site along Fern St. However, the new GLUP map includes the Claridge House in the increase to High Medium Residential. It is important to not incentivize redevelopment at Claridge House, which provides unique and badly needed committed affordable senior housing. Any change should explicitly be stated to sustain the long-term existence of this important community feature, while development should primarily be infill or around the Regency Care site</p>	<p>Comment noted, no changes proposed</p>		<p>The recommended GLUP change reflects several elements associated with the Claridge House site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First, the over 300-unit building currently exceeds its existing GLUP designation so the recommended GLUP change would ensure the existing improvements would at least be compatible with the site’s GLUP designation (even if no changes to the site were to occur). 2. Second, the Sector Plan already establishes pathways where modest expansion could be possible for sites like Regency Care and Claridge House by designating them with a much lower Floor Area Ratio (density cap) when compared to the rest of the study area. This becomes critical as both buildings were constructed in the late 70s and at some point may need to consider significant renovations that will require unique phasing opportunities – that permit a continuation of existing operations while the necessary maintenance work can take place. The incremental increase to the next residential GLUP designation further reinforces this vision by not permitting significant densities (as those found in the neighboring High Office-Apartment-Hotel designation for example). <p>Beyond those recommendations, however, the Sector Plan is not able to restrict future growth to solely represent only potential expansions of the existing use.</p>
6.		<p>Biophilia and nature should be more explicitly mentioned throughout the Development Framework when discussing sustainability, biophilia, public spaces, and site standards regulating private properties.</p>	<p>Comment noted, no changes proposed</p>		<p>Updated Sector Plan includes a number of changes to reflect this guidance and has heavily relied on suggested changes provided by Mr. Howell in this regard.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
TRANSPORTATION					
1.		The Draft Plan would benefit from recognizing the broader downtown context in its approach to mobility (such as referencing County’s Transit Development Program or connections between Pentagon City and Columbia Pike.	Comment noted, no changes proposed		<p>The project team and DOT leadership reviewed current planning documents governing bicycling in Crystal City, including the Crystal City Sector Plan (2010) and the Master Transportation Plan Bike Element (2019). It was determined that these plans provide sufficient long-term vision for bicycling in Crystal City, and they extend beyond the 2024 timeline for the Crystal City Bicycle Network (CCBN).</p> <p>Arlington DOT affirms its commitment to delivering safe, effective bicycle facilities through all our program efforts, from resurfacing to capital projects to development services. Staff will continue to deliver on this promise beyond the delivery of the CCBN and ensure that we resolve any conflicts between guidance documents in a transparent and reasonable manner.</p> <p>Based on this and similar comments, the third (and subsequent) draft of the plan incorporated reporting on existing county documents, including transit plans and other efforts in the broader area.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
2.		ARCA continues to be concerned about the pedestrian safety, mobility degradation, and traffic congestion implications that multiple aspects of the plan will have on the area surrounding the entrance to the Pentagon City metro station. The plan acknowledges and highlights the unresolved safety and mobility concerns including the clustering of many users and multiple modes of travel directly at this location, creating conflicts and safety concerns. It also identifies the area as a High Injury Network Corridor and the Army Navy Drive and S Hayes Street intersection as a known “Bicycle Hot Spot”.	Comment noted, no changes proposed		These issues are proposed for further study via the follow-up Hayes Street study. It is impossible to address traffic congestion, mobility degradation, and pedestrian safety without clustering high density trips around major transit anchors, removing as many vehicle trips as possible using Transit Oriented Development (TOD), and providing as direct-as-possible access to the transit anchors for multimodal trips. We acknowledge that the Hayes/12th intersection area requires further study, but failing to act in the ways proposed will exacerbate the cited problems more than acting as proposed.
3.		Could the Plan clarify how future bike connections can be accommodated adjacent to/as part of the Green Ribbon segments?	Comment noted, no changes proposed		The term “separated bikeway” is used in these instances intentionally as it could represent a range of design options (including both on-street or off-street). Along sections of the green ribbon where bikeways are not specifically shown, the intent is to prioritize pedestrian mobility while still accommodating bike travel (albeit at slow speeds). Along sections of the green ribbon where parallel dedicated bikeways are shown, the intent is to prioritize both, including higher speed and volume bike travel via a wider or otherwise dedicated facility. Narrative in the transportation section of the Development Framework speaks to this further.
4.		Is it presumed that all future connections within the study area will be vehicular (as larger blocks begin to redevelop)?	Comment noted, changes proposed		The updated Plan specifically relies on the term “public access ways” in this regard as the exact nature of future connections would be determined at the time of the site plan review.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
5.		The plan's aggressive shift away from cars is not clearly defined in the Plan and lacks specifics as to how exactly Arlington will influence this needed mode shift as development arrives. As solutions are identified, the monitoring of any approaches also needs to be considered to ensure they are in fact successful.	Comment noted, no changes proposed		The plan does envision (but does not focus on) enhanced Metro facilities and dramatically improved bus access. Much of that planning is accomplished in other County documents, particularly regarding buses. Improved pedestrian access to Metro via improved quality and quantity of connections is a major component of the plan. Although compromises are inevitable, the plan also includes the most aggressive bikeway network ever proposed in an Arlington area/sector plan. Several tasks regarding these issues are explicitly noted in the transportation section of the Implementation Matrix.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
6.		<p>The Plan notes that the transportation network impacts of increased density in residential, commercial, and retail establishments will require an evolution in the multi-modal transportation network in order to effectively serve existing and future community members. This is addressed within the transportation section of the plan, however the recommendations in the Implementation Matrix fall short of identifying a means to achieve this evolution. Transportation modeling needs to be supplemented with analysis of all transportation modes for a full picture of what travel behavior will change and what will remain the same. Metrics for success should be developed with risk-mitigation plans and strategies for resolution - to include an additional entrance to the Pentagon City Metro Station, traffic cameras, additional stop signs, speed bumps or other traffic calming devices, and/or temporary cessation of future growth.</p>	Comment noted.		<p>It is not practical from a planning or engineering standpoint for plans at this level of detail to design streets in the manner being requested. We do not support temporary cessations of future growth as they have significant negative consequences on the environment, affordability, and equity. An item in the implementation matrix to identify future capital projects is reasonable.</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
Section 1: Vision					
1.	6	Draft Sector Plan does not include any recognition of the National Landing area.	Staff concurs.		New page (6) has been added to recognize the National Landing BID as well as the broader regional geography associated with the name National Landing.
2.	8	Vision Statement should also reference the National Landing area as a cohesive downtown that Pentagon City is part of.	Staff does not concur.		Staff believes the vision statement works well as currently constructed, following addition of multi-modal priorities into the second sentence. The term National Landing requires and benefits from further context and introduction which is accomplished on new page 6 of the Plan.
3.	8	Vision statement does not reference transportation while acknowledging several other fundamental aspects of this plan.	Staff concurs.	Previous 2 nd sentence of the Vision Statement stated: "The redevelopment of Pentagon City will strengthen the entire 22202 community, diversify housing options, and embrace biophilic design that makes nature a universal part of the everyday experience of the area."	Revised 2 nd sentence states: "The redevelopment of Pentagon City will strengthen the entire 22202 community, diversify housing options, prioritize robust multi-modal transportation options , and embrace biophilic design that makes nature a universal part of the everyday experience of the area."
4.	13	Equity Principles should include an additional performance metric referencing access to community facilities.	Staff concurs.		Additional bullet added to the list of performance metrics (Equity Planning Principle): "Equitable access to new or improved community facilities"
5.	13	The Sector Plan needs to further encourage community integration by highlighting the importance of information sharing for all residents. This is particularly challenging in multi-family (elevator) projects where building management is not always open to permitting bulletin boards or other means for posting notifications regarding the many engagement efforts underway in 22202.	Comment noted, changes proposed.		Final bullet added to the list of performance metrics (Equity Planning Principle): "Broad awareness of local engagement opportunities (public and private) that encourages community integration and is supported by building management in multi-family complexes, through both digital and physical means."

ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
Section 3: Development Framework					
1.	43	Illustrative Plan maps should better distinguish between existing buildings to remain and where future redevelopment is depicted	Staff concurs.		Throughout the Sector Plan, illustrative maps now include a legend to distinguish between the two colors showing existing/future buildings more clearly.
2.	46	Community center and library expansions needed to be noted throughout the Plan to ensure they can be considered during future redevelopment opportunities.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous Section 1.2 stated:</p> <p>“Due to the variety of sites, existing uses, and property owner goals, there is significant variability in the feasibility and the likely phasing of reinvestment across Pentagon City. The Plan focuses in greatest detail on near-term redevelopment sites that will provide proposed physical improvements, including improved and new public spaces and infrastructure, that help enable redevelopment that fulfills the planning principles and vision. Sites that redevelop in later phases will be responsible for greater funding contribution towards community benefits and future infrastructure needs to achieve the planning principles, including future resiliency needs.”</p>	<p>Updated Section 1.2 states:</p> <p>“Due to the variety of sites, existing uses, and property owner goals, there is significant variability in the feasibility and the likely phasing of reinvestment across Pentagon City. The Plan focuses in greatest detail on near-term redevelopment sites that will provide proposed physical improvements, including improved and new public spaces and infrastructure, that help enable redevelopment that fulfills the planning principles and vision. Near-term opportunities will also help implement sustainability and affordable housing goals and could help identify new locations for expanded community facilities such as a library or community center. Sites that redevelop in later phases will be responsible for greater funding contribution towards community benefits and future infrastructure needs to achieve the planning principles, including future resiliency needs.”</p>
3.	48-49	Pavilion structure depicted on the Grace Hopper Park portion of the RiverHouse property should be further explained with clearer guidance for upcoming processes.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous RiverHouse (North & South of Green Ribbon/15th Street) bullet stated:</p> <p>“Expansion of Virginia Highlands Park and improvements to Grace Hopper Park.”</p>	<p>Updated RiverHouse (North & South of Green Ribbon/15th Street) revised bullet states:</p> <p>“Expansion of Virginia Highlands Park and interim improvements to Grace Hopper Park to coincide with S. Joyce Street realignment (Pavilion structure is not anticipated with redevelopment but should be considered further as part of the VHP Park Master Planning effort)”</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
4.	52	Affordable housing requirements should be further clarified for new development.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous Policy Approach stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to maintain a mix of new and existing affordable CAF units within the RiverHouse site, as well as the overall study area, the affordable housing on-site contribution shall be located in the newly developed building(s). The total target is subject to negotiation with County staff for project feasibility. The CAF unit mix resulting from the provided square footage will be finalized on a case-by-case basis, with family-sized units encouraged. The CAF units shall be rent- and income-restricted to households earning up to 60% Area Median Income (AMI) for a period of 30 years. 	<p>Updated Policy Approach states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to maintain a mix of new and existing affordable CAF units within the study area, there is a preference for the on-site affordable housing contribution to be located in the newly developed buildings. However, locating all or a portion of the affordable housing contribution in the existing buildings may be considered if at least 20% of the net new residential density is contributed as CAF units. The total target is subject to negotiation with County staff for project feasibility. The CAF unit mix resulting from the provided square footage will be finalized on a case-by-case basis, with family-sized units encouraged. The CAF units shall be rent- and income-restricted to households earning up to 60% Area Median Income (AMI) for a period of 30 years. CAF units provided in new condominium projects shall be income-restricted to households earning up to 80% Area Median Income (AMI) for the life and use of the residential dwelling unit.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
5.	53	Unique phasing anticipated for the Fashion Centre site seems incompatible with limited flexibility to achieve the Green Ribbon segments along S. Hayes Street. Near-term projects will need to require the use of the existing service drive as current tenants will continue to operate (prohibiting the implementation of the full width of the Green Ribbon segments along west side of S. Hayes Street).	Staff concurs.	Previous Fashion Centre Site requirements stated: <u>Large Sites with Near Term Development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the pedestrian passageway through the Mall and connecting to Metro, including access along the west side of the mall • At least 10% on-site committed affordable housing units <u>Large Sites with Mid Term Development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of Green Ribbon and public space on S Hayes Street • For longer-term development, new public space and new street access as indicated by the plan • At least 10% on-site committed affordable housing units 	Revised Fashion Centre Site requirements state: <u>Large Sites with Near Term Development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the pedestrian passageway through the Mall and connecting to Metro, including access along the west side of the mall • Interim improvements to Green Ribbon segments along S. Hayes Street (while still accommodating a reduced service drive) • At least 10% on-site committed affordable housing units <u>Large Sites with Mid Term Development:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of Green Ribbon and creation of public space on S. Hayes Street • For longer-term development, new public spaces and new public access ways internal to the block as indicated by the Plan • At least 10% on-site committed affordable housing units

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
6.	60-61	Tree Canopy and vegetation requirements should be clarified to ensure accurate interpretation	Staff concurs.	Previous Policy Approach stated: “The requirements for planted area are cumulative. Sites must achieve at least 20% tree canopy when combined with adjacent right-of-way in addition to meeting the requirements for planted area on site.”	Updated Policy Approach (with associated visual exhibit depicting updated illustrations of this language) states: “The requirements for planted area are cumulative, must be achieved within the private property’s limits of disturbance (specific to each phase of development) and may rely on associated segments of the Green Ribbon delivered with each phase. To help achieve the larger Pentagon City and Arlington County Forestry and Natural Resources Master Plan goal of at least 20% tree canopy, sites may include adjacent right-of-way, Public Plaza’s associated with each phase of development, or commitments to preserve existing tree canopy/add new tree canopy elsewhere on their property.”
7.	64	Draft Sector Plan fails to mention need for expanded community facilities such as community center and library or that they could qualify as community benefits with future private redevelopment	Staff concurs.		Additional text added to Policy Approach under Section 1.6 Public Facilities: “Beyond a new elementary school, Pentagon City’s existing library and community center will need to expand to accommodate its growing population. The Plan encourages opportunistic pursuits of such community uses within the ground story spaces of near-term private redevelopment which may qualify as alternative means to achieving community benefits. However, should those efforts prove unsuccessful, (either due to economic feasibility or a willing partner) the park master planning effort for Virginia Highlands Park should include a commitment to siting these facilities in a coordinated approach that considers other uses VHP will also need to accommodate.”

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
8.	69	Language referencing the MTP amendment could be mis-interpreted to suggest all future connections will be vehicular.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Extend the areas designated for new streets (represented in dark blue with diagonal stripes) from S Hayes Street west to S Lynn Street, between Army Navy Drive and 15th Street S, to incorporate the Fashion Center, Pentagon Row and RiverHouse development sites. Specific locations for any new streets can be identified later, likely through the site plan review process as new developments are proposed.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Extend the areas planned for new streets (represented in dark blue with diagonal stripes) from S. Hayes Street west to S. Lynn Street, between Army Navy Drive and 15th Street S. to incorporate the Fashion Centre, Westpost (Pentagon Row) and RiverHouse development sites. Actual need and specific locations for any new streets can be identified later, likely through the site plan review process as new development is proposed.”</p>
9.	72	Hayes Street recommendations seem premature at this stage to indicate specific dimensions absent of further analysis which is already noted in the Implementation Matrix for this road.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Recommendation: 60’ public easement along western edge at Green Ribbon, in place of existing service drive.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Recommendation: S. Hayes Street study will determine specific long-term public easement needs along the western edge of the Green Ribbon, where the existing service drive is located. Near-term infill-development may result in interim improvements to the Green Ribbon if service drive is required for operation of existing tenants.”</p>
10.	74	Future 11 th Street, between S. Hayes Street and S. Fern Street, may not be able to accommodate all elements of a “complete street” considering required loading accommodations for the southern block which likely to redevelop first.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Between S Hayes and S Fern Streets, redevelopment of both the Brookfield and CALPERS parcels should each include public passage of both pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles along the 11th Street S corridor, and in a manner that accommodates a conventional “complete street” upon redevelopment of both parcels.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Between S Hayes and S Fern Streets, redevelopment of both the Brookfield and Lincoln Place (DEA Site) parcels should each include public passage of both pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles along the 11th Street S corridor, and in a manner that accommodates a conventional “complete street” upon redevelopment of both parcels. An interim condition prior to redevelopment of both parcels may be necessary.”</p>

ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
11.	91	Future Bike Network map should reflect Separated Bikeways along the entire 15 th Street corridor	Comment noted, changes proposed.		Future Bike Network map has been updated to reflect Separated Bikeways along 15 th Street, between S. Hayes Street and S. Eads Street (where they were previously shown as existing (sharing roadway with vehicular traffic).
12.	106	Section 3.2 Tree Canopy and Biophilic Plantings in Public Spaces should reflect additional references to nature in its initial principles.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Principles for Pentagon City Public Spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize plantings across public and private properties in areas that are not heavily programmed. • Prioritize pedestrians and cyclists, and provide generously sized, inviting facilities. • Make public spaces welcoming and engaging from the street. • Encourage casual use spaces for impromptu use and connection with nature. • Create spaces that fit different age groups, needs, and experiences.” 	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Principles for Pentagon City Public Spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize plantings or other natural features across public and private properties in areas that are not heavily programmed. • Prioritize pedestrians and cyclists, and provide generously sized, inviting facilities that contribute to a biophilic environment. • Make public spaces welcoming and engaging from the street by relying on a nature to establish an inviting transition. • Encourage casual use spaces for impromptu use and connection with nature. • Create biophilic and diverse activity spaces that fit different age groups, needs, and experiences.”
13.	106	Biophilic Design Guidelines could benefit from additional information alluding to changes in topography as suitable design solutions.	Staff concurs.		<p>Additional bullet has been added at the end of the list of design guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Creative use of modest topographic variation proportionate to the size of spaces, that assist in naturalizing otherwise flat areas, managing water, providing protection for plantings, and better defining spaces. <p>for example: surface contours, mini-berms, small mounds or ridges, natural boulders, and stone outcroppings.”</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
14.	108	Further clarity is needed to better understand how future parks/plazas will be achieved. Future maintenance of all public spaces needs to be prioritized further in the Plan.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“The spaces may be designated as privately-owned public spaces (POPS) or Arlington County property. The design, program, and facilities of public parks and plazas should be consistent with Arlington’s Public Spaces Master Plan.”</p> <p>“Ensure an adequate management plan and maintenance funding is in place for all public parks and plazas, including the Green Ribbon. The County, property owners, the National Landing BID, and/or other stakeholder organizations may all have roles to play across the study area’s range of parks and plazas.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Most of the spaces will be designated as privately-owned public spaces (POPS) but some may become Arlington County property. Design of these spaces should occur through a park master planning process held concurrently with the review of the associated site plan. The design, program, and facilities of public parks and plazas should be consistent with Arlington’s Public Spaces Master Plan.”</p> <p>“Ensure an adequate management plan and maintenance funding is in place for all public parks and plazas, including the Green Ribbon. The initial integration of nature into all spaces will have a positive result, but one which may be compromised if ongoing maintenance and attention is not regularly provided. The County, property owners, the National Landing BID, and/or other stakeholder organizations will have a shared responsibility to ensure this urban habitat has ongoing benefits for all.”</p>

ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
15.	108	The pavilion building depicted on illustrative plan modeling within the Grace Hopper park could benefit from additional guidance to adjust expectations for its future.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Grace Hopper Park should be improved to be more visible, more obviously public, and function better as a public space and center of place identity around the intersection of 15th Street S and S Joyce Street with the addition of a plaza. The diagram at right demonstrates a proposed swap of land area with RiverHouse property and new pavilion building within the park as a means to advance this goal. The pavilion building could contain publicly accessible amenities, like dining, or community uses like a library, and provide public restrooms.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Grace Hopper Park should be improved to be more visible, more obviously public, and function better as a public space and center of place identity around the intersection of 15th Street S. and S. Joyce Street with the addition of a plaza. The diagram at right demonstrates a recommended swap of land area with the RiverHouse property and new pavilion building within the park as a means to advance this goal. The pavilion building could contain publicly-accessible amenities, like dining, or community uses like a library or community center, and provide public restrooms. <i>It’s ultimate need, function, and location should be confirmed as part of the Virginia Highlands Park master planning effort which would include the expanded park area secured through the RiverHouse land swap.</i>”</p>
16.	109	Build-to lines/zones need to be revised on the RiverHouse site to more closely resemble the future growth depicted on the Illustrative Plan modeling for that property.	Comment noted, changes proposed.		The Parks and Plazas map has been adjusted accordingly.
17.	113	Green Ribbon design guidelines should reference a coordinated effort (preferably involving the National Landing BID) to ensure a cohesive branding and wayfinding approach is developed and implemented across all segments of this pedestrian network.	Comment noted, changes proposed.		<p>Additional bullet has been added at the end of the list of design guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Initial development proposals should coordinate closely with the National Landing BID to ensure wayfinding signs are consistent and help link unique segments the Green Ribbon network. Once established, subsequent proposals should match earlier designs.”</i>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
18.	114	Green Ribbon segment approaching S. Lynn Street on the RiverHouse property may prove difficult to implement given the existing topography changes that exist in that western edge of the property. This could become particularly challenging given the expected accommodation for bicycles within the same area.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Green Ribbon includes a segment—along the incline from Grace Hopper Park to Lynn Street— where a parallel trail for bicycles and other micromobility, or other design strategy is needed alongside the Green Ribbon to safely accommodate different speeds of travel given the grade of the path.” 	<p>Revised language states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Green Ribbon includes a segment—along the incline from Grace Hopper Park to Lynn Street—which will safely accommodate different modes of travel given the grade of the path.”
19.	115	Green Ribbon network should more closely resemble what is depicted on the Illustrative Plan modeling on the RiverHouse property.	Comment noted, changes proposed.		The Green Ribbon network map has been updated accordingly.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
20.	120	The introductory paragraph to Sustainable Design section 4.1 is very brief and could benefit from other elements that more clearly define this objective and state preferred outcomes that could guide public review of future site plan applications.	Staff concurs.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Achieving global standards for sustainable, resilient, and biophilic design is one of the planning principles for Pentagon City. All future site plans in Pentagon City will address the goals of the Arlington County Community Energy Plan. New buildings will maximize energy efficiency, lower carbon impact, and include elements of biophilic design. Development sites will address stormwater, heat island effect and needed climate adaptation. Innovative strategies specific to the site and program of development are encouraged, and continual improvement in stringency of green standards is part of the plan. All site plans must comply with all appropriate environmental regulations, including stormwater mitigation.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Achieving global standards for sustainable, resilient, and biophilic design is one of the planning principles for Pentagon City. Sustainability, within the context of redevelopment, involves a strategic coordination of mutually reinforcing design features that effectively address issues such as energy conservation, bird safety, and storm water management. Beyond just buildings, creating biophilic pathways and incorporating nature into each development site provides cross-benefits that address multiple Planning Principles. Site context will need to inform unique approaches for each site plan resulting in a customized micro-environment that properly responds to airflow between buildings, direct and indirect sunlight, and need for successful robust natural spaces (delivered at grade and through elevated terraces or green walls).</p> <p>All future site plans in Pentagon City will address the goals of the Arlington County’s Community Energy Plan. New buildings will maximize energy efficiency, lower carbon impact, and include elements of biophilic design. Development sites will address stormwater, heat island effect and needed climate adaptation. Innovative strategies specific to the site and program of development are encouraged, and continual improvement in stringency of green standards is part of the plan. All site plans must comply with all appropriate environmental regulations, including stormwater mitigation.”</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
21.	124	Additional clarity would be helpful regarding the intended purpose and objective behind the Plan’s “build-to” bands, particularly as they may relate to taller buildings.	Staff concurs.		Additional bullet has been added at the end of the list of design guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Build-to-band is intended to regulate the base section of future buildings (generally first 1-5 stories), recognizing other architectural treatments, step-backs, and facade articulation will occur above, which could place upper sections of the buildings outside of this band.”
22.	125	Building/Public Realm Edge Map is too prescriptive and difficult to interpret.	Staff concurs.		Building/Public Realm Edge Map has been updated for clarity and simplicity by removing a number of redundant layers that still allow the map to serve its originally intended purpose.
23.	126	Glass transparency language should reflect bird-friendly glass considerations.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	Previous language stated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Provide transparent glazing that allows for views in and out of space following the recommendations in the County Retail Plan.” 	Revised language states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Provide transparent glazing that allows for views in and out of space (following recommendations in the County Retail Plan) while addressing bird safety challenges where possible.”
24.	129	Future Retail Map should adjust several sections along Army Navy Drive from “gold” to “blue.” The eastern half of S. Eads Street should also be incorporated for helpful context (referencing the County’s Retail Plan).	Comment noted, changes proposed.		Future Retail Map has been adjusted accordingly.

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
25.	133	Bird-friendly glass considerations should also be reflected in Section 4.7 Upper Floor Façade Variation.	Comment noted, changes proposed.		<p>Additional bullet has been added at the end of the list of design guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Buildings should consider bird-aware design to mitigate the threats of fatal bird strikes on building glass. Areas of particular emphasis involve spaces where reflectivity and invisibility can present threats including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ building glass below 50 feet on most facades, ○ glass on building corners, and ○ glass throughways.”

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
Section 4: Implementation					
1.	139	Implementation item 5 should more broadly reference other aspects of this Sector Plan with regards to future monitoring.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Monitor performance of initial development projects to ensure they are achieving biophilia objectives, and use lessons learned to inform improved approaches to achieving biophilia objectives in mid-term/ long-term development proposals.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Monitor performance of initial development projects to ensure they are achieving housing, biophilia, public space, transportation, and sustainability objectives, and use lessons learned to inform improved approaches to achieving such objectives in mid-term/long-term development proposals.”</p>
2.	141	Implementation item 17 should not presuppose specific locations of future public facilities within the Virginia Highlands Park area.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“A follow-up park master plan of the Virginia Highlands Park (VHP) should consider its potential expansion to the west and the improvement/potential reconfiguration of Grace Hopper Park with an active plaza element. The VHP park master plan should also occur in conjunction with a school siting process given the consequential impacts of such a facility on future availability of VHP open space and amenities. Since a new elementary school is most likely to be sited on the current Aurora Hills Library and Community Center site, the school siting process must presume that both uses will need to be incorporated into the final mixed-use development as independent facilities from the new elementary school.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Follow-up park master plan of the Virginia Highlands Park (VHP) will need to utilize its recommended expansion to the west and the resulting potential for a reconfigured Grace Hopper Park to address the general vision of the Sector Plan and community input received during the master planning process. The VHP park master plan should also occur in conjunction with an elementary school siting process, given the consequential impacts of such a facility on future availability of VHP open space and amenities. This resulting process must also consider how necessary expansions of the library and community center uses can be accommodated as independent facilities from the new elementary school.”</p>

**ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
 Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan**

ID	PG.	COMMENT	STAFF RESPONSE	OLD TEXT (if applicable)	EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)
Section 5: Appendix					
1.	152	Branding and Wayfinding for the Green Ribbon network should be closely coordinated with the National Landing BID and other stakeholders to ensure cohesive approach is implemented throughout the network.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Signage or branding could also be located as part of paving in select locations.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Signage or branding should also be located as part of paving in select locations. Early site plan applications utilizing this Plan should coordinate closely with the National Landing BID to ensure consistency between otherwise unique segments of the Green Ribbon network.”</p>
2.	155	Green Ribbon lighting should acknowledge opportunities with adjacent buildings and identify additional guidance to signal appropriate levels/typologies.	Comment noted, changes proposed.	<p>Previous language stated:</p> <p>“Lighting will be needed throughout the Green Ribbon to ensure safe access and use throughout the evening. Lighting may also be deployed as a design feature to enhance the Green Ribbon experience. Lighting placed upon trees or other vegetation must be removed and re-mounted annually where necessary to prevent plant damage.</p> <p>In the public right-of-way, lighting will need to meet County standards for construction and maintenance.”</p>	<p>Revised language states:</p> <p>“Lighting will be needed throughout the Green Ribbon to ensure safe access and use throughout the evening. Lighting may be deployed as a design feature to enhance the Green Ribbon experience and, in some cases, may be accommodated through lighting proposed with adjacent buildings. Green Ribbon segments should rely on downward facing outdoor lights which avoid high intensity/high temperature lights which are problematic for wildlife and for humans.</p> <p>Lighting placed upon tree or other vegetation must be removed and re-mounted annually where necessary to prevent plant damage. Primary sections of the Green Ribbon should utilize consistent approaches to lighting.</p> <p>In the public right-of-way, lighting will need to meet County standards for construction and maintenance.”</p>

ATTACHMENT 10 [DRAFT]
Comment/Response Matrix (as of 1/26/22) for Draft #3 of Pentagon City Sector Plan