

Site Plan Review Committee

Community Engagement Comments and Responses
2025 Clarendon Boulevard (Wendy’s Site) – SP #435

Project Contacts

SPRC Chairs

Leonardo Sarli, Chair
lsarli@me.com

Nia Bagley, Co-Chair
niabagley@yahoo.com

LRPC Chair

James Schroll
jmschroll@gmail.com

County Staff Contact

CPHD Planner
Adam Watson
703-228-7926
awatson@arlingtonva.us

DES Planner
Robert Gibson
703-228-4833
Rgibson@arlingtonva.us

Applicant Contact

Greystar
John Beinert
john.beinert@greystar.com

*Represented by Walsh,
Colucci*
Nicholas Cumings
703-528-4700
ncumings@thelandlawyers.com

Site Plan Project Information

Project Name: 2025 Clarendon Boulevard – Wendy’s Site

Items Requested: Site Plan Amendment

Engagement Session: September 7 – 16, 2021

Review Focus Topics: (All Topics) Land Use, Building Massing/Height, Architecture, Transportation, Open Space, Other



Contents

About this Document	1
Responses to Common Topics.....	2
SPRC Comments: Land Use.....	6
SPRC Comments: Building Massing and Height	6
SPRC Comments: Architecture	7
SPRC Comments: Transportation	8
SPRC Comments: Open Space and Landscaping	9
SPRC Comments: Other	9
Community Member Comments.....	10

About this Document

This document contains all the comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee’s online engagement for the “Wendy’s Site” project between September 7 – 16, 2021. Additionally, the matrix below includes some comments that were directly emailed to staff during the engagement period. The comments are categorized by the topics that were highlighted in this review, with SPRC member comments appearing first in the document. All comments not pertaining to the above topics are categorized as “Other.” Use the table of contents to easily jump to a particular section, or click on the “Return to Table of Contents” link at the bottom of each page to return to the first page of this document.

Responses to Common Topics

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

- **Land Use**

1. **Generally, few objections to residential use**

Most respondents did not object to residential use (instead of office use) on the site. Many respondents supported the proposed residential use, citing a need for greater residential supply.

Staff Response: The Rosslyn to Courthouse Urban Design Study (RCUDS) established a preference for office use on this site, but also recommended residential use as an alternative. Residential use is consistent with the provisions of the site zoning district and the General Land Use Plan designation. Staff is preparing an analysis of the proposed conversion from office to residential use using the [Administrative Guidance for Office Conversions](#). Staff's analysis and the topic of land use will be discussed further at the first virtual LRPC/SPRC meeting.

Applicant Response: Acknowledge and agreed. As noted in its October 7th memorandum discussing the proposed conversion of office space, the Applicant is responding to a significant demand for additional housing in the County, particularly in areas proximate to Metrorail and other transit opportunities. The proposed conversion will increase economic activity during the daytime, nighttime, and weekends, and will provide extraordinary community benefits (including affordable housing commitments) that will significantly further County goals. Additional residents in this area so close to the Metrorail station will increase activity in the area and further diversify the land use mix.

- **Building Massing and Height**

2. **The proposed building height (16 stories) drew mixed comments**

The proposed building height was the most-mentioned topic, with respondents split on whether 16 stories is an appropriate height. Those in favor of the proposed height generally cited a need for more housing supply and options close to Metro, while those opposed generally supported lower heights of approximately ten stories or less.

Staff Response: Staff appreciates the feedback on this topic, and we look forward to discussing the building height further at the virtual SRPC meeting. The RCUDS recommends a maximum building height of 95 feet; however, it also allows for flexibility in height to accommodate affordable housing, community facilities, special design considerations and/or new streets. Moreover, the proposed 16-story building is consistent with the zoning district requirements. Staff also would like to note that additional density (104 dwelling units),

above the base density, is vested at this site given the County Board's previous certification of transferable development rights for the historic preservation of Wakefield Manor and Courthouse Manor.

Applicant Response: The Applicant agrees with Staff's conclusion that the RCUDS permits additional height for the property beyond the 95-foot recommendation. Similar to the previous approval, the additional height is appropriate here due to the following:

- The site's existing C-O-2.5 zoning district permits up to 16 stories in height;
- The context of the site as a prominent site in the heart of the Court House Metrorail station area;
- The fairly small and unusually shaped property;
- The creation of the new public plaza, a community facility;
- A required 15-foot setback from the eastern property line which was required to create a public alley;
- The Courthouse Study's recommendations that the greatest heights be concentrated on the eastern and western edges of the Courthouse Study area; and
- The context of surrounding development.

3. **Concerns over building massing stepbacks and the relationship to neighboring buildings**

Several respondents shared concerns about the lack building height tapering towards the eastern end of the site. Some respondents also expressed concerns about the building cantilevering or lack of stepbacks along Wilson and Clarendon Blvd.

Staff Response: As with the topic of height, staff appreciates the feedback and we look forward to discussing further. Staff is working with the applicant to explore potential options for increasing, or creating additional, stepbacks adjacent to the 2001 Clarendon building.

Applicant Response: The Applicant also appreciates the feedback and will be working with Staff to assess their comments and potential changes. The video presentation prepared for the first live SPRC meeting addresses this matter in detail, but briefly, similar to the previously-approved office building, the tallest portion of the building was placed towards the apex of the site, and the Applicant has created a step back along the east façade to provide an appropriate transition to the lower-rise building to the east. Further design methods, including material treatments, have been discussed with County Staff to relate to the historic buildings across Wilson Boulevard.

- **Architecture**

4. Refining the design of the glass “prow” (west façade)

Some respondents expressed concern about the glass façade and large marble columns at the western point of the building. Some respondents found the glass design to be overly minimal or “incomplete”; others felt the design should be more “traditional” and referenced the Flatiron Building in New York City. Some respondents expressed concern that the marble columns were too large.

Staff Response: Staff is working with the applicant to explore design alternatives and/or revisions to the glass prow and the supporting columns below. Architecture will be discussed further at the first virtual SPRC meeting.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will continue to work with Staff to address their comments and assess potential design options for the “prow” element. The design of this portion of the building is addressed in detail in the video presentation prepared for the first live SPRC session. The building was designed to improve on the architectural statement made by the previous office building in terms of visual attractiveness and constructability. The complexity of the building’s massing increases with its height in order to provide visual interest at this key location. The focal point of the façade design is the full height glass sculptural element at the intersection of Clarendon and Wilson. This unifying feature sits at the apex of the building on these two streets. The sculptural columns will provide support for the residential building above while transitioning the architecture into functional seating areas in the plaza.

- **Transportation**

5. The proposed parking ratios drew mixed comments

After building height, parking was one of the most-mentioned topics. Those in favor of the proposed ratios, generally supported them based on the site’s proximity to Metro and other transit options; some even expressed a desire for lower ratios. Other respondents expressed concern that the proposed parking is insufficient to meet demand.

Staff Response: Staff appreciates the robust feedback on the proposed parking ratios. This topic, along with other transportation matters, will be discussed at the second virtual SPRC meeting. While staff will continue to evaluate the parking through the public review process, we note that the site is well-served by multi-modal transportation options and is within approximately 300 feet of the Court House Metro Station entrance. Moreover, the proposed residential parking ratio is consistent with the [Residential Parking Guidelines](#). The requested parking ratio is also consistent with ratios approved for site plan projects elsewhere, adjacent to Metro.

Applicant Response: The proposed parking ratio is appropriate and strikes the right balance for a transit-rich site. The Applicant has sized the garage to accommodate the anticipated market demand, but not provide extra parking that incentivizes more people to drive. The proposed parking ratio is in-line with recent County policies supporting significant parking reductions for residential development in close proximity to transit. Retail parking will be available at the Applicant’s project across the street.

- **Open Space/Landscaping**

6. Desire for more open space area, and/or a more “open” design for the plaza.

Several respondents expressed a desire for more public open/park space in and around the site area. Several respondents also noted that the proposed plaza design should feel more “open” or expansive and discouraged the proposed building overhang and large columns.

Staff Response: Staff is working with the applicant on potential revisions to the proposed plaza design with the aim of increasing the permeability and “openness” of the area. Staff has also encouraged the applicant to explore increasing biophilic elements, reducing the footprint of the supporting columns, and increasing the range of façade materials at the retail entrance to create a more human-scale design. We look forward to discussing the plaza and landscaping further at the second virtual SPRC meeting.

Applicant Response: The Applicant echoes Staff’s comments and welcomes additional feedback from the Community. Further optionality for the plaza design will be presented at the second live SPRC meeting.

SPRC Member Comments

SPRC Comments: Land Use

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-LU-1	David Howell	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	This project appears well thought out and a reasonable use of the space, given guidelines that date back nearly two decades. I have no major objections to what is discussed in the presentations and staff report.
SPRC-LU-2	Stuart Stein	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (RAFOM-alternate)	I have no objection to a residential use.

SPRC Comments: Building Massing and Height

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-B-1	Stuart Stein	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (RAFOM-alternate)	I object to the very large increase in height and massing. This site plan does not conform with the RCUDS. This site was meant to transition from 95 feet down to 55feet on the eastern side. The office building represented a major compromise. The flexibility on the plaza and western front was to among other things allow for statement architecture at the gateway. To the east there was much more set back from the adjacent development. Many of us were not happy with the results, but it represented much more of a allowance for context with its neighbors. As to the co2.5 this was used to provide for the increased density called for in the RCUDS. WHEN CONCERNS ABOUT THE HEIGHT were raised, we were told it was not something that was being planned to be used and that no other zoning tools existed to allow for the desired density. The added height along with the additional massing make for a much less elegant design.
SPRC-B-2	William Ross	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	I don't have a problem with the proposed addition of stories. However, given that this is a drastic change from the original approved plan and involves residential units, I believe that it's important to consider the impact and requirements involving a few hundred new residents. One thing to consider is the need for additional or improved open space or parks in this area. The envisioned Court House square would benefit considerably from a community benefit contribution for future open space improvements.
SPRC-B-3	Elizabeth Morton	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I am not comfortable with the deviations from the RCUDS, e.g. stepback and reflection of historic character, and the height, especially since I do not what the rationale is for exceptional considerations. The 12" recess is very high up and am not sure it will make a difference to those in the public realm. Cantilevers can be fine, but they seem like the opposite of the stepbacks in the guidance.
SPRC-B-4	Rebecca Meyer	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (HALRB)	Per the RCUDS, the massing along Wilson Blvd is not in line with the surrounding buildings that have the 20' building massing stepbacks above the second floor. I believe it is worth keeping the design in line with the RCUDS recommendation for the area-wide guideline based on the scale and direct proximity of the historic buildings.

SPRC Comments: Architecture

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-A-1	David Howell	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	What design and landscape features will be used on the various roof and balcony surfaces? What architectural features/materials might be planned to provide natural analogues or natural elements and a biophilic experience to the interior and exterior of the building?
SPRC-A-2	William Ross	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	Would the requirement for a notable statement be improved by some type of vertical linear design or element in the middle of the western glass facade? It would break up the relatively flat glass facade there and perhaps help to draw the viewer's eye up towards to the top of the building. Also, related to this there might be some opportunities for creating some more bird friendly solutions. Also, I would refer you to other comments submitted by David Howell concerning biophilic solutions. I would fully support biophilic solutions to the penthouse rooftop area.
SPRC-A-3	Elizabeth Morton	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The overall vision of "people friendly, strong identity, etc." would be reinforced by attention to a strong pedestrian relationship on the lower floors, ideally including multiple entrances and flexible spaces. I appreciate the attempt to retain the gateway gesture, but it looks incomplete, especially compared to the prior version. More variation in form, shape or height would be more dramatic than just variation in materials. I also like the dramatic entrance, but the stone base seems a bit heavy and at least in these renderings the contrast between white stone/marble and other materials does not always seem graceful. I do like the multiple ways the site is permeable on the "gateway" side and the variety of "views" into the building as you move west on Wilson Blvd. (even though I am not sure what that eastern most fenestration is like).

SPRC Comments: Transportation

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-T-1	Stuart Stein	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (RAFOM- alternate)	Even with the guidelines and the location of the site I feel the parking ratio is much too low.
SPRC-T-2	Chris Slatt	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (TC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking Ratio - I strongly support both the automotive and bike parking ratio. It's great to see an automotive ratio this low & a bike ratio this high in the Metro corridors. 2. Loading - I'm concerned about only a single residential loading dock for this many units. 3. Pedestrian Circulation during Construction - closing both sidewalks (Clarendon & Wilson Blvds) simultaneously will be a major issue for pedestrian circulation. Ideally, this would not be allowed. If it is an absolutely necessity, applicant should provide additional assistance crossing Wilson & Clarendon Blvds (like RRFBs) to aid pedestrians in safely reaching Ace / Tupelo Honey / Burger District / etc. This crossing assistance could be at added temporary crosswalks immediately east of the site or a permanent upgrade of the Troy street crossings. 4. Potential Bike & Transit Infrastructure - Given this development's parking ratios, and Clarendon & Wilson Blvds' designation as Primary Bicycling Corridors in the Bike Element of the MTP, improvements to the bike facilities on Wilson & Clarendon Blvd seem like important community benefits for this development to construct. This development should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade the shared bus/bike conflict area on Wilson Blvd to a floating bus island similar to what was done in front of the new H-B Woodlawn building. This would remove bus/bike conflicts, speed transit operations, and provide a place to put a bus shelter for a stop that would otherwise struggle for sufficient space given the limited sidewalk width. 2. Upgrade the existing paint & plastic protected bike lane on Wilson Blvd along this development's frontage to higher quality, permanent materials that require less maintenance than bollards such as curbs, crash-rated planters, etc. 3. Convert this block of Clarendon Blvd bike lane to protected bike lane to match the section being built just west of here in front of the Landmark block. Provide a bus island at the Clarendon Blvd & N Courthouse Rd bus stop to speed transit operations & reduce bus / bike conflict. <p><u>MMTIA Questions/Concerns</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why does the MMTIA give bus boarding & alighting numbers for the bus stops at Vietch & Uhle, instead of the much closer bus stops at N Courthouse & Wilson and N Courthouse & Clarendon? (TABLE 3-3, PAGE 21) 2. Why are the "DES-provided" average weekday bus boarding & alighting numbers and the W&A observed specific weekday numbers so incredibly different? (TABLE 3-3, PAGE 21)
	William Ross	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	There is a real opportunity to have this very small square as a practical and visual oasis for the many people crossing Wilson and Clarendon at this location. Some type of seating at the Western side of the plaza, screened somewhat by plants, might work well. It will be very important to consider the pedestrian experience at this location. Should we make the crosswalks at this location more prominent and visibly attractive?

SPRC Comments: Open Space and Landscaping

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-OS-1	Stuart Stein	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (RAFOM-alternate)	The plaza is very interesting and I feel that it should have a significant public art component.
SPRC-OS-2	William Ross	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	It will be good to get a clarification on the amount of publicly accessible open space that will be created at the plaza. Does the square footage include the obvious pedestrian walking area that people will use as they move through the crosswalk? If so, perhaps we shouldn't include this square footage in any presentation. Is it anticipated that there will be a food retail business here? If so, will there be any limitations on public access in this square area? This should be clarified.
SPRC-OS-3	Elizabeth Morton	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The strong form of the stone base columns may create the perception of carving out the space for private activity. It would be important to make this as welcoming as possible. The proposed expansive vegetation looks welcome but with the stone columns and the landscaping I am not sure how much space is left for activity.

SPRC Comments: Other

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-O-1	David Howell	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	What exactly will make up the GBIP features offered to achieve LEED Gold? What plan is offered for glass type or pattern to mitigate the likelihood of fatal bird strikes?
SPRC-O-2	Stuart Stein	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (RAFOM-alternate)	There should NOT be just a contribution to a fund. For any affordable housing bonus I feel the units should be onsite.
SPRC-O-3	William Ross	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	As stated, the RCUDS calls for increasing building heights to accommodate other community other benefits to the community, such as "community facilities" We would consider open space as a community facility and thus argue that the future residents and owners of this building will both need and benefit from expanded and improved open space in the Courthouse Area. In line with recent projects we strongly support a community benefit contribution to open space in line with recent Courthouse and Rosslyn projects. Using our rule of thumb of \$10,000 per unit, at 231 units, a contribution of \$2.3 million would appear to be appropriate.
SPRC-O-4	David Cheek	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCA)	3 concerns with this development. (and all CC developments) 1) due to no proffer system, taxes have increased in Arlington at among the highest rate in the nation, while developers keep most profits from upzoning approval. How can Arlington adopt a proffer system for this project to pay for 2nd order effects, such as the next two points? 2) Due to the large amounts of upzoning, there has been a significant rise in reckless driving and Google Map cut throughs that Arlington has not addressed. This development will add to this issue, but DES-TEO and Complete Safe Streets do not have the means or funds to fix more reckless driving in a timely manner 3) There is not enough park space to accommodate these new developments and parks/rec budget is not sufficient to keep up with population increase.

Community Member Comments

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-1	Hannah Follweiler	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X			Hello Arlington County Staff, I think the building is beautiful and is the right height for the neighborhood. I like that it's housing instead of office. Housing is badly needed in our area. I would like to see the units be for sale instead of for rent. The amount of parking spaces aren't bad. I would like to see less parking since it is so close to the metro. Added bike parking and bike lanes are a must for this project. Thank you for your time.
CM-2	Stephen Repetski	Community member or neighbor							<p>General</p> <p>This project looks like a great addition to the Courthouse neighborhood. The building colors look nice and the way the red breaks up the glass is great. Housing throughout Arlington, especially in the R-B and PC/CC/PY corridors, is still quite constrained and costs are high and unaffordable for many, so the addition of a good amount of new residential units is more than welcome.</p> <p>Parking:</p> <p>On vehicle parking, I would like to see A) if the applicant can go lower, given the site's proximity to Metrorail, Metrobus, and ART, as well as the local walking/biking network, and B) how many parking spaces will be EV ready vs EV capable (preferably above Arlington minimums). As the Staff report notes, the applicant is able to go down to a 0.20% parking ratio given its transit proximity and the need to reduce car usage for climate concerns is here and now.</p> <p>Plaza:</p> <p>The renderings of the "plaza" space in front of the building appear boring - it doesn't appear to be a space that one would want to sit and congregate at (where are the benches, for instance?). An earlier rendering of the plaza (https://twitter.com/StephenNParker/status/1418618402684473345) looks much more inviting with benches, what appears to be outdoor lighting, and wide walking areas.</p> <p>I also hope to see a percentage of these new units be designated affordable at AMI levels that Arlington staff might deem appropriate, and/or a significant cash contribution towards other affordable units in the Courthouse area.</p>
CM-3	Jane Green	Community member or	X	X	X	X	X		I think the land use, height, architecture, and open space are all fantastic. This building will be a great addition to the neighborhood. I would like more detail about the transportation improvements. Will

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							we get a protected bike lane on this block of Clarendon? How wide will the sidewalks be? Will there be leading pedestrian intervals and sufficient crossing times at the stop lights? Can you reconstruct Clarendon to slow down cars as the head down the hill?
CM-4	Stephen Howard	Community member or neighbor			X				The "glass prow" is generic, lacks privacy for residents, and a loss opportunity for installing something truly unique and culturally vibrant. Architectural ornament has a long tradition of conveying meaning. Such a corner site is a rare opportunity! Why not hire local architects, sculptures, and/or artisans to make the most of this area, and create a memorable, meaningful, space-defining feature?! The greatest buildings of New York, Paris, and London look to tradition and context and make the streetscape something fun to explore and contribute to vibrant urban living. Ornament gives a building something to say. A "glass brow" says not much more than "I'm a fragile, beached boat."
CM-5	Bruce Arthur	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X			X	I think the building as designed looks pretty cool and would be a welcome and refreshing addition to Arlington's cityscape. And I like the proposed use for housing: Arlington needs more housing and high-density infill development is the best way to do it.
CM-6	Daniel DeMuria	Community member or neighbor				X	X		This area needs condos with in unit laundry that are under 500k. This is a need in the area and there would be ample demand. Also the parking rate needs to be above 0.32 spots this is far far to low. An open space on the ground floor for community use would be nice but the bigger need is for 1 to 2 bedroom condos that are below 500k and have a HOA fee less than 700 a month with parking included. Dont just make this a money grab, the board should put in requirements to meet these needs.
CM-7	Kevin Ryan	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X		X	YES- to taller buildings. Redo the "study" if you must with updated criteria. NO- to more residential. Pull offices/ commercial up from Rosslyn and push residential down the hill (as with ~1500 Wilson). MOST IMPORTANT- get it done quickly, no closing the sidewalk for YEARS (as with 2000 Clarendon).
CM-8	Xavier Domenico	Community member or neighbor		X	X				This site has so much potential to become the equivalence to Arlington's own mini Flat Iron building that I am left disappointed with the current design. Though I find the massing suitable for the site, the glass, brick, and metal facade appears rushed and is identical to new construction along the corridor. A design that does not look dated or cheesy within a generation is ideal for the community. Please consider a design that emphasizes place-making that is appropriate for a "3 mile an hour pace" rather than a 'Rosslyn-esque' soulless approach. Examples of new construction that achieve this Flat Iron signature look and timeless quality (that is not simply a clone of New York) can be found in Austin, TX and in Arlington the new construction at Glebe and Wilson achieves that as well.
CM-9	Erika	Community member or		X	X				I very much like the architectural vision for the building and the concept of retail/dining with the open patio space on the ground floor. However I think that the height is so disparate to the buildings next to

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							it that it will make the street feel very boxed in by the building, particularly as it is on the wedge part of that intersection. I would think something closer to 12 stories (still more than the original 10) would look a bit more contiguous, while still giving the building a bit more height.
CM-10	Davis Rajtik	Commission Member (TC)				X		X	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terrific Parking ratio. The R-B corridor has many mobility options and while cars are part of this, they are not central to it. Greystar should be commended for recognizing this. 2. Loading dock. The alley is an elegant way to keep loading/garage entrances off Clarendon/Wilson, this should work well while also keeping curb cuts to a minimum. The only concern I have on the loading dock is that one dock for 231 residential units strikes as inadequate, which may lead to less than ideal double parking of trucks. Perhaps staff or a member of the SPRC know more as to whether this is adequate. 3. Sidewalks during construction. The applicant's slides appear to show sidewalks are to be closed during construction. I understand this is a tight site and there needs to be room for construction staging/activities. The concern is that this block between Clarendon and Wilson has high foot traffic due to the 7/11, Ace, and restaurants (all good things). Pedestrians are likely to walk next to the proposed jersey barriers in a traffic lane. Drivers regularly speed through Wilson and Clarendon at this point (further assisted by the hill). Therefore, I would strongly encourage keeping at least one sidewalk open on either Wilson or Clarendon, along with N. Courthouse Rd. N. Courthouse's greater width should be able to facilitate a sidewalk throughout construction. This would balance pedestrian safety (recall the county's Vision Zero policy) with the needs of construction.
CM-11	Barbara Souders	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	I fail to see how a building height that is 150% of the max height stated in the Rosslyn-Courthouse Urban Design Study is appropriate, even if they are trying to trade other development rights. Why even do a study, if we're not going to follow the guidelines? Also, having a parking space for fewer than 1/3 of the apartments AND no retail parking at all is just not acceptable. The location is convenient to Metro, but it is too optimistic to assume that more than 2/3 of the building occupants will not want/need to have a vehicle and ridiculous to assume that 100% of the retail clients will walk or use mass transportation.
CM-12	Bill Bukowski	Community member or neighbor		X					Proposed building, as designed, is much too tall. Please stop trying to turn the Courthouse neighborhood into Rosslyn or Ballston.
CM-13	Carson Wood	Community member or	X					X	I'm in favor of it being a residential spot and not offices. I would prefer more housing options.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							
CM-14	Spencer MJ	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X		X	As rents skyrocket in Arlington County, we should build as much housing as possible on this site. In fact, the county should encourage the developer to build even higher, as this site is located in a highly accessible spot right by the metro entrance. Parking in the area is not an issue, so the county shouldn't require the builder to add any parking spots the plan. Overall looks good! Hope we see more buildings like this with more housing for our county.
CM-15	Ken Gross	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X				I believe that the 16 floor proposal is excessive given the country plans limiting the height to 10 stories and the height of the nearby buildings. The developer likens the building to a ship, but this project would be too top heavy. I submit that the site be approved for this use with a building no higher than 10 stories.
CM-16	Cory Waldron	Community member or neighbor			X		X		How they managed to take the original boring, ugly, site plan and made it worse took some work but they pulled it off. They can absolutely make a Flatiron-esque building work here that would be architecturally appealing and in line with the height plan preferred by the county, but right now the building is more of an eyesore than the empty lot. It also appears there is zero public space included in the design, when it should be a statement building that flows with the rest of the proposed Court House redevelopment.
CM-17	Joyce Adams	Community member or neighbor		X	X		X		This building is out of proportion to the historic Colonial Village units that it adjoins (and would keep in perpetual shadow for much of the year). Furthermore, the building does not incorporate any green space suitable for dogs. Colonial Village already serves as the de facto dog park for people living in the high-rise apartment and condo buildings around Court House and this new building will only exacerbate this problem. The building height should be lowered and the developers should be required to put in an area for use by pet owners.
CM-18	Laurent Cartayrade	Community member or neighbor	X			X		X	Looks like a good use of this parcel, which has been empty for too long. Consider reducing the parking ratio more given the proximity to transit.
CM-19	Bradley Harmon	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X		As a resident of Colonial Village and frequent user of the Courthouse Metro Station, I strongly support the proposed construction. A lot this close to existing transit in an already dense, walkable neighborhood is vital to meeting the county's affordable housing goals and environmental sustainability targets. This location - close to the urban core directly across from transit is exactly where we should be putting taller buildings, and the already-existing and planned development in the area would make the proposed 16-story building a great fit. I absolutely support the reduced parking requirements for the building given its proximity to both Metro and reliable ART routes. Given the size

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									of the lot and its location between Wilson and Clarendon Blvd, the public plaza presented in the staff presentation looks excellent, and so long as it does not impede use of the crosswalks at North Courthouse Road, I strongly support it.
CM-20	William Buschur	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X		X	Please limit the parking space per resident to no more than on parking space for every three residents (1:3), and do everything you can to encourage the developer to add as many stories and dense residences and ground floor commercial as possible. The only way out of the godawful housing shortage is to spam density, and this is a fantastic way to do it. Let's see how dense we can make this half acre - I want to see it in Wikipedia.
CM-21	Alexander Goyette	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X	X	0.32 parking spaces per unit for a building located right next to a metro stop and near significant bike infrastructure is way too many! This should be decreased as much as possible, ideally to 0. Adding cars to the road is harmful to everyone in arlington - build in a way that encourages transit and active transportation instead. The building's height should be maximized to allow as much housing as possible in this prime location, taking pressure off other areas of the county and alleviating Arlington's affordability crisis. Open space should be designed for public and pedestrian use, and improved bike infrastructure like protected lanes would be very welcome
CM-22	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor	X		X	X		X	I'm super excited about this project as a whole. I think the developer has great ideas on the building architecture, parking ratio, bike parking (!!! - a one ratio in a new construction!), public plaza area. My only concern is people cutting through the alley from Clarendon Blvd to Wilson Blvd and harming pedestrian traffic- maybe add a speed bump in both ways? Developer should consider adding a grocery store as the primary tenet of the retail area to support the somewhat food desert that exists in Courthouse-Rosslyn area.
CM-23	Michael Brinley	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X		X	The building and its design are ideal for this space. There could potentially be fewer parking spaces given the proximity to the metro and bus lines.
CM-24	J Pence	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X		X	I think this land should be uses for residential housing (apartments) and there should be a priority to make these affordable or market rate (not luxury). Parking for residents should be limited because of the proximity to public transportation and a desire for a walkable neighborhood. The building height is acceptable as proposed but care should be taken to ensure there is enough sidewalk space to ensure trees can be planted.
CM-26	JD Birks	Community member or neighbor		X				X	I strongly support the proposed construction. We need more housing in Arlington. I'd support the developers building taller if desired.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-27	Frederick Short	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	This development is a no-brainer. It adds lots of new houses within a block of a metro station without excessive parking. The developer is proposing improvements to the surrounding area to offset increased density. The increased density will not be detrimental to the area, which is already well suited to handle tall buildings as it is in the core of the R-B corridor.
CM-28	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor		X	X			X	16 stories is way too high and awkward in context of the surrounding buildings. Even the newest buildings next door are no higher than 10 levels. Otherwise it's very pretty. Make sure the residential bike room is close to the sidewalk so people can roll out.
CM-29	Roxann Dzur	Community member or neighbor		X	X				Hell no! This is too large and overpowering for the area. It would destroy the charm and green space of the neighborhood. It should be no more than 4 stories high.
CM-30	Max Greenberg	Community member or neighbor				X		X	Commenting in support of 1:3 resident to parking spot ratio! Love Arlington, trying to afford moving. Support affordable housing!
CM-31	Brian Newman	Community member or neighbor				X		X	More parking is needed. .32 spaces per unit is too little for what will likely be a luxury rental property. At a minimum, the garage should be expanded to include parking for restaurant/retail staff.
CM-32	Robin Cook	Community member or neighbor		X					The Rosslyn/Clarendon corridor density isn't high enough already? The last thing we need there is another 16-story apartment building, especially on such a small footprint.
CM-33	John Seal	Community member or neighbor		X					Stick to the 10 stories in height as recommended in the County's planning. Sixteen stories is way out of proportion to the rest of the neighborhood.
CM-34	V B	Community member or neighbor	X					X	The former Wendy's lot was zoned for office space and should not be approved for more residential units and especially not 16 stories. There is already so much residential density, from Rosslyn to here, that children living just blocks from the nearby elementary school have been reassigned to schools not one school further away, but all the way to Taylor much further away. No additional residential units should be approved until there is a new elementary school serving Rosslyn to here.
CM-35	Evamarie Socha	Community member or neighbor		X			X		I work in that neighborhood. The last thing we need is another high-rise. How about a green space or park for people who work there to relax?
CM-36	Heather Curcio	Community member or		X		X		X	The 231 units don't appear to have at least 1 parking space per unit within the building which means they will seek parking in zone 4 which is already overcrowded - will there be a limit to car ownership or

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							a discount for not parking in the area? We cannot sustain parking an additional 200+ Vehicles. In addition, the height of the planned building seems to create a “canyon” like effet similar to Bethesda, which is not ideal. Would prefer a lower building/fewer floors (maybe 6 max).
CM-37	Thomas Cynkin	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	With respect, disappointed in the Greystar proposal for 2025 Clarendon Blvd.: Courthouse already has plenty of apartment units for transient residents, how about another high-quality condominium like the Odyssey to promote community stability and family atmosphere? Parking congestion is a real concern; even with a parking outlet on a side street, this building will become a traffic chokepoint on two major arteries, namely Wilson and Clarendon, as vehicles line up to enter and exit. Also, a mere 70 parking spaces - including for guests! - for 231 units, and with no retail parking, seems impractical. An apartment building with retail will bring tenants with cars, and their visitors with cars, and retail customers with cars, further clogging the already overcrowded streets and scant street parking. It's nearly impossible to stop by Courthouse CVS to pick up medicine, as it is. RCUDS 10-story maximum is far exceeded by the proposed 16-story building. Greystar's characterization of this 60% increase in floors as a "modest amount of additional height" seems misleading, and the additional height seems likely to crowd the horizon, leading to a claustrophobic atmosphere. The cantilever design of the small plaza seems oppressive. Public space should have open sky, not a massive and unwieldy structure overhanging it. As a frequent pedestrian, I'd scrupulously avoid walking under the cantilever overhang - I certainly wouldn't want to stand there during an earthquake! Greystar says this feature will "improve the pedestrian experience," but this feature seems intended to maximize building floor space at the expense of pedestrians. Disappointing that Greystar even proposes eliminating the vertical fin, virtually the only feature of genuine architectural interest in the proposal. Thank you for considering these comments.
CM-38	Katherine Roberts	Community member or neighbor				X		X	Please be sure to include level 2 electric vehicle chargers in your plan. Electric vehicles will quickly become the norm in the near future and you don't want to have an outdated building. Having level 2 chargers for the parking spaces around the building and underneath in the parking garage would actually end up being a plus and an incentive for people looking to move in to a residential building and for people who are shopping. It will set your building apart from all the rest.
CM-39	Geoff Hart	Community member or neighbor	X	X					Shifting from low demand office to high demand apartments is brilliant. It solves a need for the “missing middle,” and allows 100 year old nearby single family home neighborhoods to stay intact. However, allowing 16 stories comoelty disrupts the character of the corridor and goes against the current land use designation. Wakefield Manor should be developed instead - there are high buildings close to 50 and none in the middle block between Wilson and Clarendon. This sets an incredibly

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									dangerous precedent. Thank you.
CM-40	Benjamin Larson	Community member or neighbor		X				X	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. After watching the staff video, I get the impression that the decision on this building has already been made. Can the Arlington County Staff please take into account how granting this site extra density and height will impact the County's tree canopy, public school overcrowding and underground water mains? Additionally, after this precedent is set to grant this site additional height and density, how will this influence other sites across the County outside of Rosslyn? Will you be granting these kinds of exceptions now going forward?
CM-41	Elizabeth Schill	Community member or neighbor		X					I believe that the building height is too tall. I think that when looking downhill toward Rosslyn, many of the buildings in that block are lower in height. I love the 'neighborhood' feel of Courthouse and that the buildings aren't too tall. I would like to limit it (also for sunlight purposes) and say let's look at a 10-12 story building. I feel like we're losing something in our community in the Rosslyn-Courthouse area in building all these massive buildings over ones that emit a more suburban feel. I've lived here for 15 years, but don't like the Board's decisions as of late for massive density.
CM-42	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor	X				X		The last thing this area needs is another high priced apartment complex. Please consider using the space for something that could prove more useful, such as a place for kids or adults to gather and enjoy. We already have apartment complexes in Arlington that can't fill vacancy, we are not wanting for more.
CM-43	Kevin Farrell	Community member or neighbor	X	X					I completely support the building of additional housing units, and the height of the building is a suitable match with those in the vicinity.
CM-44	Pia Ulrich	Community member or neighbor	X			X		X	Parking underground; three or four stories of „Eataly“ (combining eating and drinking, shopping, high end groceries, community space (classes!); a few floors of residential on top of that.
CM-45	David Gao	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	1) The building is too tall. The rule for this part of Arlington is 10 stories. 2) There should be a higher ratio of parking spaces. 3) Too big of a building on too small piece of land.
CM-46	Brian Elsts	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X		X	First, it's too tall for that block, and should be at max maybe one story taller than the neighboring building. Second, the design looks like a hotel, and brings no originality to that location. Lastly, it needs more parking spaces. People don't use their cars daily, but they own them. As someone living nearby, every week people are looking for spots to rent as they have more than one car. Look on that block, and the same cars are parked on the street day and night because they have more cars than the parking lot accounts for. Also, if electric vehicles are the future, then each parking space needs to

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									have a charger available, at least half.
CM-47	Hans Dreyer	Community member or neighbor	X					X	I'd like to see retail/restaurant space along Wilson and Clarendon Blvd's to continue the retail that exists next to the property. I like the continuation of retail along the Blvd's. I'm concerned (even though it's not a huge gap) this could break up the feel of the streets for pedestrians.
CM-50	Patrick Williams	Community member or neighbor	X					X	What I would like to better understand is how this new project will also provide affordable housing? Has that been considered to have a % of the units be available for those in the county that need to have below market rental rates?
CM-51	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor				X		X	Underground garage should have TWO (2) spaces per unit, not just .32 paces per unit.
CM-52	Joshua Marcley	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	This is exactly the type of development that the community needs in locations that are proximate to metro stations. Sixteen stories is modest for the area and not sufficient if the county is serious about reaching 2050 climate change and environmental goals. The approval of this project will be a small step in the right direction, we need many more like it.
CM-53	Cindy Nelson	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X		X	X	This building is massive and too high with too much density. It looks out of place as pictured. It creates a dark tunnel, where no wind or light will be able to get through. It will be like walking at night all the time and incredibly hot. Why can't the space be used as a park instead, such as the park space in Clarendon? There are no nearby parks in that area. There are too many buildings in Arlington. Please take a look around and notice the hundreds of spaces available for lease in Arlington. We don't need anymore vacant buildings in Arlington! Please, stop overbuilding where it's not needed.
CM-54	George Stavrev	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X		X	I am in favor of the building height or even higher, as it will make the neighborhood more dynamic, accessible and dense. The retail space however is backwards thinking. We don't need a single massive restaurant's but instead spaces that will allow more businesses (mostly restaurants I hope) to enter the area. It would be great to encourage local entrepreneurs to do business in the community without needing hefty investment. The number of public bike racks also appears to very low such a centralized location.
CM-55	Steve Zykoski	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X		X	Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. As a neighbor of this building, I find the significant deviations from the RCUDS very objectionable and urge the SPRC to reject the current design. The deviations in height, step-down on the Eastern side, set-back on the Eastern side, lack of step-back on all sides, and parking ratio all create significant issues. If the builder wants to compare the design to ship, then the only image that comes to mind is an overloaded cargo ship trying to dock in too small of a port. The height and set-back deviations create far too massive of a structure that are inconsistent

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									with the neighboring buildings and aesthetics. Rather than adding set-back for height, the builder does the opposite. The building will creating an imposing presence on the open air space from the road, the sidewalks and neighboring building that is inconsistent with the RCUDS. The minimal set-back on the Eastern edge appears to create a window-to-window distance of less than 30 feet. A resident in the adjoining 2001 Clarendon building can actually be closer to someone in the proposed building than someone in their same apartment unit. This is more problematic with the shift to a residential building, as it will create significantly more privacy issues from 7pm-7am. A walk around the Courthouse/Rosslyn area seems to indicate a window-to-window setback of 40-50 feet in most cases. And finally, the additional units proposed with all of these height/set-back deviations will put significant pressure on the parking ratio for this building and the impact on the surrounding community. A ratio of 0.32 spaces/unit is far lower than 2001 Clarendon (over 1/unit) and lower than even 2050 Wilson (0.39/unit). I would like to see the SPRC reject the current design and require the builder to submit a plan which is far more in line with RCUDS, addresses the Eastern set-back, and improves the parking ratio. Piling on so many exceptions/allowances/deviations into one specific building structure will have a negative impact on community.
CM-56	Sarah Will	Community member or neighbor				X		X	I think that residential buildings on urban thoroughfares need to have an off-street short term pull-off to facilitate car-based pickups & dropoffs, like taxis, Ubers, food delivery, etc. As someone who regularly walks and drives down Clarendon and Wilson between Courthouse and Rhodes, I know the frequent chaos that already exists because of places with entrances directly on Clarendon, like Sushi Rock and the 19Nineteen apartments, with cars blocking the main street when they stop for a pickup or drop off, creating dangerous situations for drivers, which in turn makes the drivers more likely to ignore or miss pedestrian crossings.
CM-57	Jon Obenberger	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X		X	The requested additional 4 stories of height along with the associated density and impacts that will come with the proposed development are unacceptable for this site. There is no step back to the max height of the building and they are even cantilevering over the sidewalks. No need for Arl Co to bear the burden at the sole expense of the developer to grant approval of the extra 4 stories. The proposed extra four stories also creates an untenible situation and adverse impact to the development that is immediatly across the street to the north. 4 additional stories will adversely impact the views, environment, visual appeal, and overall value and desirabiity of the properties to the north of this development and those who use the sidewalks and streets in this corridor.
CM-58	Miles Mason	Community member or		X				X	I am opposed to the new proposal increasing the density of the project and the height by an additional 30% without any justification other than for developer profit. There is no benefit to the neighbors or

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							to the community. The proposed transfer of density does nothing to help the immediately adjacent neighbors so is worthless to them. Approval of this would be an abdication of the duties of the staff and the county board. Nothing in the materials shows financials as to why the extra height is needed and what the difference in revenues/profits would be to the developer. In addition, it is already a highly congested corner and this would only worsen that without any shown benefit. Further, neither staff nor the developer show the impact on APS of the additional proposed affordable units, further concentrating all affordable housing in the same area (much like they do along Columbia Pike) without any consideration of the impact on the makeup of the schools or equity throughout the community. This would seem to be in direct conflict with the County's expressed goals of creating diversity and equity. At the very least, a study should be done before approving this project in an area where there is already a concentration of similar projects. Schools in this area are overcrowded, while schools in N. Arlington further up Langston Blvd are empty. If you continue to approve projects like this in the same locations, the impact on costs and diversity will be tremendous. Neither the developer nor the staff materials show any benefit to the community of such an extreme change in zoning or the area plan.
CM-59	Chaz Papa	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	The proposed 16 story height of the Wendy's Vacant Lot building is absolutely unacceptable. A building of such height is out of proportion to that section of courthouse. This building should be no taller than six stories, eight at most. Furthermore, this building is going to create massive issues with traffic on both Wilson and Clarendon boulevards. The garage access location will create bottlenecks. The allotted public space area is insufficient for any real public purpose. The design fails to consider the neighbors and ruins the look and feel of the neighborhood. That the construction overlaps with the 20 story development on Clarendon is another reason this project timeline has no viable reason to exist. The Arlington County Board favors development for the sake of development, continuing to prioritize tax revenue over the real needs of citizens. This vacant lot would be better utilized as a park or city plaza. This project will be an eyesore in Courthouse.
CM-60	Nancy Iacomini	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X		X		LAND USE The request to change the use from office to residential is not surprising. In the past, sector and other plans tried to balance office and residential uses for a variety of reasons, including supporting retail during the day as well as in the early morning/evening. However, given that a work-from-home culture is going to be with us in some form going forward, it is probably no longer necessary to think day time retail use would be linked only to office. Plenty of those who work from home welcome a break to go and get coffee, or walk and do an errand.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>HEIGHT AND MASSING While the proposed height is greater than that fully contemplated in the In Between Study, it is probably not inappropriate at this site – as long the height is the result of fulfilling sector plan goals, like on site affordable housing – and historic preservation/preservation of market rate affordable housing through the previously recorded TDR. The proposed cantilevering over the public realm is not something to be desired in general. I would like to explore how residential floorplate is driving the request for the cantilevers.</p> <p>ARCHITECTURE While this site is part of the In Between Study, it is directly adjacent to properties in the Courthouse Sector Plan. It is the centerpiece of what is a lively retail area. As noted in the staff report, there had been a stated goal of having the first floor retail façade be in character with the existing historical retail to the north. Right now, the first floor treatment of the proposed building is too much like that in the middle of DC rather than being reflective of old Courthouse. I seem to recall the same comments about the initial Greystar proposal for the Landmark Block – and hope staff and SPRC will be able to work with them once again to harmonize the first floor retail of the proposed building. The proposed mix of red brick (a nod to the garden apartments to the north) with glass is interesting and pleasing. (A mix also found in the previous Carr proposal.) The propose glass “prow” does not seem to be as elegant as the front of the Carr office building. The “monumental stone” support for the “prow” seems too heavy and awkward for the site. While described later in the applicant presentation as “sculptural” its design seems to be more like a utilitarian support used for a ship in drydock rather than an elegant base for an expressive focal point. Again, I’m hoping staff and SPRC can continue to work with the applicant on this aspect of the building.</p> <p>OPEN SPACE/PLAZA The applicant noted in their presentation that the plaza would be a good spot for outdoor dining, and I agree. But it is also meant to be a gathering place for passersby not dining. More conversation will need to be had concerning how to organize and dress this space to make it welcoming. Lightening the base of the “prow” (see above) will certainly help.</p>
CM-61	Loria Porcaro	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X		X	<p>Land Use - Balance between Apartments and Office Buildings: All the Sector Plans, Urban Design Studies, Revitalizing Courthouse Square, etc. tried to keep a balance between the volume of apartment/condo space and office space. This was intended to limit the burden on transportation (of various types) and to keep retail businesses and restaurants engaged throughout the day, evenings, and weekends. How will this switch impact this balance, especially since so many other buildings are doing the same thing in the R-B corridor? (Note: See Transportation, below.)</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>Building Height: The original, approved office building made use of the TDR and was allowed to go to only 12 stories. The proposed apartment building wants to go to 16 stories and uses the TDR, affordable housing units (although I can not find the number of affordable units being proposed), and allowed zoning heights as rationale. However, the apartment building should be capped at 12 stories for the same reasons the office building was capped at 12 stories. Additionally, I know from the Revitalizing Courthouse Square project, the heights of the buildings in Courthouse impact the skyline as seen from DC. How will this building impact the skyline?</p> <p>Architecture: Because the glass prow faces west, it will create a lot of glare throughout the afternoons, which could impact drivers and pedestrians headed east on Clarendon Blvd, as well as helicopter pilots who frequently fly through the area. Has a study been completed on the impact of glare to traffic and pedestrians? Has the FAA been contacted regarding a glare analysis for helicopter pilots? Additionally, as part of the LEED certification, will solar energy-creating glass panels be used in the prow?</p> <p>Transportation: Please see comments on Land Use - Balance, above. Additionally, by providing so few parking spots, residents will be expected to take public transportation, which could overburden the Courthouse Metro station should the area return to pre-pandemic ridership levels.</p> <p>Other - Schools: Allowing the project to be built as an apartment building instead of an office building puts an additional burden on local schools. This will be the third large-scale apartment building in the Courthouse area that was not factored into the last round of school redistricting. Local schools in the Courthouse area are already projected to be over capacity in two years, without including the children from these three buildings (and any other buildings that are built).</p>
CM-62	Marlo Wade	Community member or neighbor	X					X	Bring back Wendys, Mcdonalds or Tropical Smoothie. Cheap fast food.
CM-63	Bernard Berne	Community member or neighbor		X			X	X	There is too little open space. The only open space is a small mostly paved area at the west side of the site. The applicant claims that the project will contain a "New Public Open Space". However, the size of the open space is so small that it is insignificant. It appears that developer is not interested in obtaining bonus densities by taking advantage of the County's Green Building Incentive Policy (the

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>Policy), which the County Board amended for site plan projects on December 12, 2020 (https://environment.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2020/12/Board_Report_35-FINAL.pdf). The site plan lacks a Biophilia Narrative, which the Policy requires. The County should not award any bonus density for this project if the applicant does not comply with the requirements of the Policy, including the submission of a Biophilia Narrative. Further, to reduce stormwater runoff, the applicant needs to replace most of impermeable surface in the open space with permeable surfaces (especially planting areas). Site Plan Sheet L502 shows that the applicant will remove eight trees but replace these with only nine trees. The number of replacement trees is too small, as they will take a long time to reach maturity. Further, some replacement trees may die before reaching maturity. The site plan should state that the applicant will replace all trees on site. The applicant can accomplish this by replacing much of the impermeable pavement in the “new open space” with planting areas. Site Plan Sheet L504 contains a section entitled “Ground Cover and Perennial Planting”. However, the section contains no information. The site plan needs to list the species of ground cover and perennials that the applicant will plant. To conform with the County Board’s 2016 Monarch Pledge (https://countyboard.arlingtonva.us/monarch-pledge-day/), plant species should be mostly or entirely those that support pollinator populations, including monarch butterflies. The plantings must include milkweed, especially common milkweed (<i>Asclepias syriaca</i>), which monarchs prefer when reproducing. The plantings should not include grasses, as these are wind pollinated and do not support pollinators. To adequately comply with the County Board’s “Monarch Pledge”, the applicant’s landscape architect should consult with Alonso Abugattas, the natural resources manager for the County’s Department of Parks and Recreation, when selecting the species on plants that will best support pollinator populations, including monarch butterflies.</p>
CM-64	Thomas Piwowar	Community member or neighbor		X				X	<p>Every time the County approves a new development, awards bonus density, or grants a developer's request for a reduction of requirements, the County is taking on an obligation for the indefinite future to provide and maintain services and infrastructure to support the project and to deal with the environmental impacts of the project. The staff reports do not account for any of this. Staff does not define any of the obligations the County is undertaking. It does not estimate the cost of those obligations. It does not estimate how those costs will be met. Instead it takes the attitude of a profligate child with no care that the bills will ever come due. The county should not be signing any blank checks and should demand a thorough analysis and accounting of the obligations the County is undertaking. The developer’s proposal should be suspended until such time as a full accounting of impacts and costs to the County is provided by County staff.</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-65	Tony Poole	Other					X	X	I am commenting regarding the Compassion sculpture that sits in the island between Wilson and Clarendon boulevards – an island that may be impacted by road configuration resulting from the 2025 Clarendon Blvd. – Wendy’s Site development. The Compassion sculpture was gifted to Arlington County by the Jaycees in the late 60’s and was installed in 1969. The sculptor, Una Hanbury, is world renowned. Una’s sculptures are in over 500 collections across the globe and includes seven portrait busts in the National Portrait Gallery. Her works were executed in bronze, cast aluminum, cast stone, terra cotta and marble. She also painted, and she did portraits of such figures as Andres Segovia, Georgia O’Keefe, Laura Gilpin, Rachel Carson, Robert Oppenheimer, Edward Teller, R. Buckminster Fuller and S. Dillon Ripley. She did life-sized works for buildings, parks, and gardens in such far-away settings as Yugoslavia and Malaysia as well in Washington, Baltimore, Arlington, Springfield, and McLean. The Compassion sculpture is worn from decades of rain, snow, sleet, and road pollution, etc. – and has extensive cracking resulting from a poor foundation. It is in dire need of resurrection, to preserve it for future generations to enjoy. Arlington County has examined its condition with an eye to restoration and found that the work would be very extensive and would require moving it to an offsite studio location to conduct the work. Because of the cracking, such a move could damage the sculpture to irreparable condition. Preservation of this valuable and historical sculpture is very possible. The most efficient, cost effective, and permanent solution is to re-cast it in bronze. This would involve capturing the existing sculpture in 3D digital format, from which a cast is manufactured. This process would enable re-creation of the original textures of the sculpture that have been worn down over time. A bronze statue would be less expensive than renovating and would last for hundreds of years. Arlington Country has received a very reasonable proposal to conduct this work from Una Hanbury’s grandson, who himself is an accomplished sculptor and painter. My interest is in seeing this sculpture live on - in a much more permanent durable way - as a welcoming beacon to the Courthouse area for generations and generations to come. As a part of the site panning process for 2025 Clarendon, I request that public art funding be provided by the developer to address this important need.
CM-66	Alistair Watson	Community member or neighbor				X			The need for a dedicated passageway on the road that is at least 8 feet wide is paramount to allow the safe commute of cyclists, scooters, joggers, etc going both ways.
CM-67	Benjamin Nichols	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	I think this project looks really great, love the low parking ratio and the expansions of the sidewalks. I'd love to know more about the vehicle parking and bicycle parking situation for residents to know if electric car and electric bicycle charging will be supported in the garage, both of which seem like

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>necessary parts of reducing the county's transportation emissions. I do wish this building were taller and had more units, the building catty-corner from it is 210' feet so it seems a bit odd that this building, which is starting down the hill from there, would be restricted to fully 45' less in height. This currently empty lot, less than 500 feet from a metro station, seems like one of the best possible places for the county to add more residents, so additional height and density should be considered and I'm not sure I understand the necessity of forcing the use of TDR to achieve the desired density. Lots like this should be allowed significant density, even without holding down development elsewhere in the county (an effective subsidy from high density residents to low density residents).</p>
CM-68	Curt Cultice	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X		<p>The proposed 16-story building on the Wendy's vacant lot is unacceptable, as its height is way out of proportion to that section of Courthouse. Moreover, it goes against the Rosslyn-Courthouse Urban Design Study that limited building height to 10 stories, why not follow the plan? The building should be at most eight stories. Also, this proposed building will flank part of Colonial Village across Wilson Blvd. Just a few years ago, the County spent much time and effort on making sure the redevelopment along Wilson Blvd. facing Colonial Village blended in with Colonial Village's historic presence. The design worked because the new building height was limited to six or so stories, with some of the upper levels set back further from the street. Why add a 16-story-building to the mix? Do we really need more density? How about some green space? And then there's the 20-story way-too-tall building going up almost adjacent to the Wendy's lot on the old Summer's Restaurant/Boston Market site just across the street.</p>