

– back in 2019, Bicycle Advisory Committee did a ride with the LBA back then and we suggested third lane be transformed into two way cycle track. We were disappointed to not see that in this plan. We think that would encourage mode shift and encourage safety. I think safety is crucially important. What improves safety is for fewer people to be taken by car. For that, you need more transit, more biking, more walking. By improving trail, by increasing density, you enable bus service to be more frequent and more reliable.

W[REDACTED] – you can't put that location on the same side as a grocery store. You can't move that location to same side of Metro. We're on a number of hills. You don't always want to bike. It's not ideal location to bike. If you have an e-bike, that's different. Its not ideal place to bike to get groceries. Look at geography of that particular site. It's not ideal for biking. Jimmy Carter said let's reduce parking space at government buildings. Were going to force people to take public transit and people didn't. It became a fiasco. We already have a homeless situation in that grassy knoll next to Marriott. We have big tents, people living there, a new graffiti problem. We have risk that Marriott not tenanted, plants overgrown. Now you're going to add low-income rental with homeless and ugly fences? How much are they going to lower my taxes? My place will be worth nothing. I apologize that I sound harsh. This is an apology with self-motivation. I don't want comments to be dismissed because I didn't say them nicely. You have a vacant building with overgrown fence, urination, homeless situation and then you're putting in rentals and increasing density.

W[REDACTED] - The place I'm concerned about is at the corner N Oak and Langston. Lots of backups. If Marriott goes forward, that traffic will come out that way. All the bus traffic, deliveries, cars, I don't see how it's going to work or funnel through. Easiest thing is to cut off our access and I think that's what's going to happen. It's a horrible plan. That's what will happen. Parking ratios, it's all changing. 2019 trip generations, it's all different now. Are people taking Uber? All day long I see delivery trucks coming on the street.

W[REDACTED] – we haven't spoken a word about green space. Our townhouses, we have tiny little yards. There's not much practical green space in our area. We have the conservancy. Arlington is not doing a good job with it. Then there's park services. It's the feds, what can I say? Park Georgetown has green space through, we are already limited. If you add density, they have nothing, and I think it's going to be a mess. We need more green space.

W[REDACTED] – our landscaping is an embarrassment. Overgrown trail. What our grounds look like is an embarrassment.

W[REDACTED] – I want to go back to trail. We love the trail and would love to expand the trail. This discussion enables able bodied, and I can't tell disabled family members to cross the road. Notion that we can't cross the road to get to grocery store is wrong. We are doing disservice to neighbors that have disabilities. We have access to transit, but there are ADA issues in our neighborhood. We should think of this as a landlocked community with ADA problems.

W[REDACTED] – from what I've been hearing it sounds like where you are, aside from what the developer's proposing, this community has not been heard. Id like to hear that you're going to step back and evaluate what we're going to do based on feedback from this community.

Palisades Park Rep 3 – I want to echo her question. I'd like this to be more than a listening session. I'd like action. An especially salient comment – I think communications strategy that I've heard was to wait for people to sign up for an email list and to turn to civic associations. I hope the 133 signatures sends a clear signal that whatever it was that was communicated out didn't reach us and now we're aghast. There was a communication breakdown and I hope we can own that. I think there are serious questions about inputs weighed and methodology used. I think it's time to revisit that. 133 signatures represent the neighborhood. There's not a lot of dissent on this topic in this neighborhood. How does this go from angry people ranting?

Palisades Park Rep 10 - I look forward to the County doing more research, more data. Presentation is great. When we talk about density, the information is not great. The approach should be more data driven. Things about supply. As an immigrant, taking part in my community is important. Use that to your advantage. Information should be presented in a more concrete form. Should I take your word for it? I need to take a step back and analyze that diagram. Who drew the diagram? I see private companies care about profit, they don't care about communities. KPI's should be included so I know exactly what to expect. I love KPIs, show it to me. I see my neighbors taking care of their gardens. I appreciate these things. I identify as an environmentalist. We're voicing our opinion. I can voice my opinion without fear.

Palisades Park Rep 4 – I've been a resident in our location for 20 years. I view Palisades Park as an oasis. We talk about density. I understand Arlington wants to increase density but time and money has been put into commercial. We expect you to take livability into consideration. We want to maintain or get better. We're looking for sound decision making from the Board and from all of you.

LBA – thank you everyone. I'm glad we were able to have this meeting. I would strongly encourage you to stay involved. Staff will think about what they heard tonight. There were specific questions about policy. Come to the design studio. There will be more staff. There are many design studios during the day and in the evening. There's time. It will go to the County Board in the fall.

North Highlands – AFA is one site in the North Highlands area. I take the blame. I didn't have the mechanism to reach out to you. I'm trying to rebuild the board. Please reach out if you'd like to help in some way. Going forward I'm open to figuring out better ways to communicate with people. Previously we used Nextdoor. Some places have no solicitation rules. I wish we would've had this conversation years ago, but I'm glad we're having it now.

Area 3 Neighborhoods Meeting 07.12.23

(Waverly Hills) – WHCA exec board sent letter opposing 10 stories in area 3, near Lee Heights. In PCP, it was 7 stories, now it's 1 and 10. We feel its clarendon density without Metro. Waverly Hills floods so we're concerned about stormwater. We've heard that height helps landowners provide stormwater management. There's Glebe Lee Shopping Center (shows 10 stories), so Ralph John's apt and Dom Terr condos and APAH buildings and Lee Heights shops. We'd like height to go down to 7. We'd like to see CIP promote stormwater promoted now. Can't tie flooding issues like we have to redevelopment bc we're all in trouble without redevelopment. We support affordable housing, We've talked to APAH, Lecky Gardens at 7 stories could get 200 units. They have 42 now. That's quadrupling of aff units at site. With preservation, consider perhaps keeping Lee Heights shops, we think that's not a preservation issue. Owner of site said 6-8 stories could develop if they wanted to. Even if people want to preserve it they don't need 10 stories. 20 people from exec board signed this letter.

(Donaldson Run) – our concerns are Waverly Hills' concerns squared. It's been well known to staff for many years. I know we're here to talk about area 3. We have always felt that we love lee heights the way it is. We want more Lee Heights. That would be the aspiration. They wanted to stop MOMs Market. We've ceded rights to developers. Pg 47 of PCP depicts the canyon we fear. There's a disconnect. The concern has been, I remember stickies process, we've been trying to get staff to engage with us. 7 years ago, during visioning study, there was a difficult to understand table at the charette. More tables favored less than 7 stories. I get that you want to incentivize developers. But our members like Lee Heights the way it is. If we can't get more Lee Heights without bribing developers, then too bad. There are other concerns, more troublesome because we've been saying this for years and not getting the message across. I'm putting aside MM concerns (schools, traffic, stormwater, etc). Those should be looked at first. Concern about height, we've taken Cherrydale out of picture bc they have own plan. Cherrydale has been redeveloped at 4 or 5 stories. Lee Heights is the center and the center has to be the highest. We focus on Lee Heights as a hub because that's where most people go. You say we can focus height bc this is big place to go. From Donaldson Run's perspective, we are car oriented. Donaldson Run residents don't bike to places, they drive. We can't say yay bikes, bad cars. Nobody seems to be listening. On process, we have same mess as MM. I have personal problems with report. I haven't had chance to—people are on vacation—I need time to make sure members understand this. My concerns don't come across. I feel I'm speaking for members, but I don't know bc I haven't asked them. We've been talking about MM. I'm flagging things I've been hearing. We've moved in the wrong direction since past. Civic associations don't feel they have adequate control of process. I have major problems with public private process. Also it's quickly moving to the final stages. My participation today was to acquaint myself. There needs to be more chance for dialogue. With Missing Middle, we didn't allow a consensus to develop and it tore the community apart. Potential for same thing here. This is a corridor with no Metro. Focus on infrastructure, parking, parks, stormwater. People want parks and parking. I wouldn't expect a private developer to put it in.

(Old Dominion) – we have not yet spoken with our members on this Draft. One thing that looked new were real buffered bike lanes. One thing to consider is what are trade offs in terms of pedestrian space and outdoor dining. Buffered bike lanes on N Glebe, there's no existing space unless sidewalk is replaced. We have Glebe addresses and if bike lanes are added without road shrinking that would be a concern to us. Point on parking is one that will emerge in ODCA, a process for discussion of zone parking in our area. Retail blue vs gold designation – within our area, it's curious how it was designated. There

are areas along the intersection of LB and Glebe, then frontage on LB at Truist site that doesn't have it. But that's more appropriate than upper parts on Glebe near single homes. A park at N Albemarle, perhaps frontage of buildings facing park, could have gold designation as well. That would be nice. The proposed T intersection of Old Dominion and LB, if it can address speeding cars, that would be great. Can we keep right turn lane in that spot? Overall southern end of ODCA is crying out for something more than a parking lot and the Truist site.

(Donaldson Run) – build on what was said before. In 2015, when County wanted to move Fire Station 8, County began thing in summer. This is common in County. Our CA is not pleased with it. There was a charette held at Yorktown auditorium. There were lots of sticky notes that said don't make this another Clarendon. Apparently those notes weren't read. Next iteration of plan still showed high buildings. We wrote to County when PCP came out, we stated opposition to 10 or higher. We felt 7 was adequate. However, there are many aspects of the plan that our community appreciates. We're not opposed to increased density, but it has to be carefully managed. We appreciate and feel stormwater management should be done prior to development. That should be County responsibility, not developer responsibility. We know tales of developers who promise this and this. Promises fall by the wayside. No way to ensure it will be done. With climate change, heavier rains, less permeable surfaces, people like Waverly Hills will suffer. This should be carefully managed.

(Donaldson Run 2) – glad to be part of engagement. I echo that having more time would be helpful. It's a massive document and it's hard to absorb and think about the implications. I think about spill over into neighborhood. If something's 7 stories, will it step back all the way to where houses are? There's a cross street 23rd between Glebe and Old Dominion that people skip through. We get fast cars going through there. There's a half moon rain garden. That could be traffic circle. If goal is to keep as residential street. We already have some parking from nearby businesses. Worth thinking about the implications of parking in neighborhoods. I like idea of having restaurants nearby. With bike lanes on LB, I wonder if there's been thought of alternative routes. Is LB appropriate to bike on? Can side street be enhanced that might be better without being on LB for safety? If we're improving bus on LB, how do you fit it all in?

(East Falls Church) - There's a wormhole for bikes from EFC to Rosslyn. It takes about 6 mins. It has hills, but you can get off at Wilson. We have an existing bike infrastructure. If new bike lanes don't happen immediately, they have an option. We live in only neighborhood where the bike trail breaks up. It comes to Langston Boulevard, and it ends, then goes through the neighborhood, then get back on for 4 blocks. It can get hard to live with bikes, pedestrians, buses, etc. When you propose parallel lanes through neighborhoods, there are speed bikers. It's not an innocuous thing.

(Donaldson Run) - A theme of this is that County policy says cars are bad. Pg 78, "our car-oriented design must change"

(East Falls Church) – Will businesses want to stay in space? When you make changes like this, you're opening a new world. You don't get to pick and choose what goes in there. None of the retail that went in is nothing I'd use. You get these things that people want to use and it may not be what you want to use. You can't control that. You can control the character of the neighborhood you're hoping for. Some things you have to let go of.

(LBA) – Lee Heights wants option to preserve.

(Donaldson Run) – my point about cars, we're extending the contract of Metro corridor to Langston Boulevard. CA's that cannot walk to Metro or Langston, they have to be able to drive.

(Old Dominion 2) – where he lives, it's not practical to walk to Lee Heights, where I live it is practical to walk. Plan should be open minded to that.

(Old Dominion) – my read of the plan is that it's going from 1960 auto centric, to some improvements so that some areas can walk. Thinking of streets as not just moving cars, but serving the community which is some people walking and biking.

(East Falls Church) - Where grocery stores are is vital. We don't have grocery store within walking distance. We need a car to deal with daily life. I want to talk about buses. We need to think about the mass transit network and how to connect the corridor. Make the corridor transitable so that it doesn't require a car. If I could hop on ART bus and knew it would come every 10 mins, I'd use it.

(Waverly Hills) – I asked about ART, the TSP. It appeared that there's no recommendation for north-south routes for ART. We want better service north-south. The Plan doesn't seem to include north-south. Plan doesn't include dedicated bus lane. Make a bus lane part of the vision.

(Old Dominion 2) – We need a better connection from here to Ballston. North-south bus service is lousy. You can't rely on 23 bus. It's never on time. Small part of that is served by ART. It's ok to get to Rosslyn, but if you want to get to Ballston, you can't.

(LBA) – On parking. What we do have is small businesses. It's important to remember those businesses are being sustained by people north of corridor and they drive. It's important that we recommend north-south transit improvement. And we also need adequate retail parking. It's essential for small businesses to have the same customers that they've had for the last 5 decades. We need easy street parking and pickup/drop off. Our corridor is a service corridor. We're the first stop for ½ of County geography.

(Donaldson Run) – there is amazing potential for development but you've got to get it right the first time. Given that we have different neighborhoods, can we use nodes for parking? It might foster more like Lee Heights, more of a village. If you want to walk, eat outside, talk to your neighbors, you can do it. If you gave people along the corridor the luxury of villages along corridor.

(Waverly Hills) – Bethesda government did that. They have public private areas.

(LBA) – it's an important concept that should be promoted in plan

(Old Dominion 2) – you have density in mind, what changes? what is now to what would be? Is that scalable? Is there a target for density?

(Donaldson Run) - I thought there was a target for 11% more affordable housing. Donaldson Run is the strongest supporter of mature trees. I'm not against street trees. To return to visioning study, it did not support more than 7 stories in Area 3.

(Waverly Hills) – County staff did listen to communities. Areas 2 and 3 said they support 7. To comment on stormwater, on overland relief, it has to be open so water can run across. Why do sites have to become smaller? Because the County is asking developers to bear the brunt of the cost. If County pays for vaults, then developers only need 7 stories. It's a complicated issue.

(LBA) – if we want successful retail and restaurants, you need parking ratios that support that retail. Parking is expensive, building it is expensive. Lee Heights has 110 spots, if rebuilt you need 80 more spots. It's a cost we need to think about in calculations. Where do we want parking built and how do we get that if we want restaurants?

Area 2 Neighborhoods Meeting 7.20.23

(Leeway Overlee) – as a LBA board members and CA member, I remember when Natsha was hired and its been a long and arduous process. I've followed the good work many others have to shape the discussion and the content to this plan. I've voiced my thoughts on a number of occasions as a resident along LB, in terms of traffic and some proposals related to density and building height. One location of concern is LAC at Lexington. It's a significant interest. I'm hopeful as someone who's lived in 37 years that I live to see something positive happen, fewer 711s, few gas stations, and used car lots. With heights, those are important considerations, but developers will determine the outcome of this thing. Most of what we're talking about along the corridor is by-right and is not something property owner would be locked into. Hopefully there would be flexibility and the County would help guide things in a positive way. I'm thankful for the time and effort that's gone into this thing.

(Leeway Overlee 2) – in our CA, our main concern is the park at LAC and ideally saving the building and I realize that's not realistic. Concern about reducing size of green space there. We could have ally in Rivendell School but they don't respond well to other people. They have an agreement with County to use space. I know it's the County not LBA that will decide what happens with that space. I am concerned about some building heights but not in our area. I wouldn't object to 6-7 stories along Langston but not two blocks in. You've done good work for a long time must be exciting to see it come to fruition.

(Yorktown) – I formerly was on LBA years ago. I'm CA pres. From a planning perspective, the reasoning of greenway walkways. I don't understand it from urban planning. Wouldn't it be more continuous along the street. We have proposed streets CA members are opposed to. Height on 6 stories at garden city shopping center is excessive. 3, 4 5 would be fine. Garden city shopping center, it's a condo. Little support from the county on trash and garbage, building's falling down, traffic, parking. Want county to think creatively about this and nothing has changed in 20 years. There are establishments, Charga in WaPo, owned by immigrants. We love the workers, places. We have other areas where things are being protected, but what about other businesses?

(Yorktown 2) – main issues has been Garden City. There's concern from those living in the area. Is there incentive to try to achieve goals laid out in plan with these commercial vendors? There are homes behind shops that are in the plan, are there going to be plans to buy people out? That's an area of concern for residents. Personally, I was curious about bike lanes and pedestrian walkways and tree canopy, but there's an emphasis on them at the expense of the free flow of traffic along LB.

(Yorktown 3) – personally, I live behind Harris Tetter, there are culs de sac. Why the extension of 25th rd? I distributed an informal survey to neighbors and asked do you support heights and street extension. Many people oppose extension and want more information. Many oppose heights as well.

(JM Langston) – I'm not CA officer but I've been an LBA member. I know what the end goals are but its going to extremely hard to maintain community environment, and traffic calming with bicycles. It's a major east-west thoroughfare. To maintain a friendly neighborhood environment while doing all this is going to be very hard. Often the feedback you get is not respectful.

(JM Langston and Calloway Church) – I'm a member of CA but also LBA Calloway rep. A lot of concerns from our community have been addressed. Last night there was fire station 8 meeting, I thought

someone said 10 stories would be behind fire station. Has something changed? I'm ok with what's going on. Keep communicating like you've done all along.

(JM Langston 2) – our primary concern has been height and its impact on our stretch of LB especially on the corner of GM and LB where bank building was. We were asked to support 7 stories there, but more than 4 or 5 stories is too high. It changes boulevard from being neighborhood to being Ballston or Courthouse. LB is only so wide. Traffic is only going to increase especially with additional buildings. Need to make sure you address parking. Really think about this. Biggest impact is corner on GM and LB.

(JM Langston) – from Edison to GM, that could be developed. Unless owners decide to sell to developer and then they could do the whole thing. We need to be careful how we say things. Could be helpful to people who want to sell their home.

(Yorktown) – I'd like to reiterate that. In the beginning this was not communicated properly. People thought the government was going to seize their home. Level setting, it's highly unlikely county will seize home using eminent domain. Someone waving a check, that's capitalism.

(Tara Leeway Heights) – in Westover, County purchased places. When we as a civic association talk about the plan, we are one layer back from street so we have less strong opinions but we are huge users of Blvd. we care a lot about LAC. That community center is a big interest of tara leeway bc we use it a lot and lots of potential for that site. Make good use of open space while taking advantage of publicly owned land when we have it. Potentially cross purposes. Personally, looking at co locating uses on a site like that. County owns so few properties and we need so many things. We should be doing as much as we can on that land. Public property, affordable housing could go in stories 2-5. Can be considered for colocation? I know it can be left out of convo. Arlington Mill community Center is good example. As GM is coming down, we have the hospital. GM then becomes an important corridor itself for transit and bus stops. Could be beautiful tree lined corridor itself. Don't forget about places like that, places that offer connection between activity on Langston and activity on GM. Patrick Henry will also be impacted by LB too. Cell tower site – I remember there were open questions about whether anything could be done there. What is the status of that site and how does this plan envision that connecting with everything else?

(Leeway Overlee 2) – that cell tower is inadequate already.

(Yorktown) – what goes on there?

(LBA) – it's a telecom site, it's a corporate entity. Don't know if anything will happen. It's a REIT. Technology changes. Could we put it in plan as potential green space?

(Tara Leeway Heights) – that as 5 story site, that's how we get housing units. So we need to weigh cost benefit of considering housing and green space on this site.

(JM Langston 2) – long term plan for green space. Have huge corridor of changes and everyone thinks it's going to happen in their neighborhood tomorrow. Can we have a phased approach? Tell people we're going to focus on this area now, that area next? People think this will happen overnight.

(Leeway Overlee 2) – this is not an implementation plan, that will come later. Don't you have to get approvals from the US highway commission?

(JM Langston 3) – use of community centers, we want the community centers to remain community centers. it's written that it can be used for a school. We voiced that it was a concern because if more school space is needed, that community center space could be taken away

(JM Langston) – many Arlington school facilities are joint facilities

(Yorktown) – I haven't been contacted about Garden City for 4 years. Chikwe has my contact info. Haven't heard anything. Unless something's happening behind the scenes, I don't know. Who should we talk to? The County Manager? County Board? Are lower-level departments and groups not talking to each other?

(JM Langston 2) - County incentives don't work unless developer wants to work with neighborhood and county. There has to be monetary incentive. With public private cooperation, developers won't come unless there's money there.

(Yorktown) – by right is 30 ft at that site. There's no incentive right now. Getting people interested is what I'm asking for.

(JM Langston 2) – to get affordable housing, you need tax incentives. 60% AMI, that's not affordable.

(JM Langston) – affordable housing here is not affordable

(Tara Leeway Heights) – the plan doesn't get to 2500 CAFS and that's partially because East Falls Church and Cherrydale are not included. Can we say updating those plans is a necessary next step to meet 2500? You can make the tie that we'd expect to meet the 2500-unit goal with those areas? A lot of what we're going to get that's affordable is on property that's already affordable or on public land. Make sure owners of affordable housing can do whatever they need to do to add more units. Those affordable housing developers can acquire property.

(Leeway Overlee) – when you say affordable housing, do you mean ownership or rental?

(Tara Leeway Heights) – the language in the policy statement says affordable housing has to be “at” 60% AMI. What we want it to say, “up to” or “below” 60% AMI. We are trying to deepen and spread out affordability to touch on income points where the need is. Plan is not consistent on that language now.

(Leeway Overlee 2) – is subsidized housing affordable?

(Tara Leeway Heights) - Arlington Community Foundation is advocating for housing for 30% AMI and below

(JM Langston 4) – the county isn't making the hospital settle issues during site plan now. to say it will get settled at site plan, it's BS. If you talk to people going through site plan now, that's not happening.

(Yorktown 3) – intersection is currently chaotic. It would be worth looking into it.

(JM Langston 3) – McDonalds area is same. Need to consider that area too, the area near 711 and Preston's, people crossing street,

(JM Langston) – I mentioned traffic in the neighborhood. 22nd is a cut through. There will be added traffic in the neighborhood.

(Yorktown) – in this room, many people are over 50, having difficult time getting around. People need a car. Looking to the future, I encourage my kids to use transit and bikes. I also helped get bus passes to high school students. Near Yorktown, after school there are dozens of kids that take the bus. As we move away from car culture, the way to get cars off road is to build urban areas and have very good public transportation. ART buses are breaking down. A lot of investment is needed to increase reliability. I hope we can work towards changing the culture. How do we change the culture?

(Tara Leeway Heights) – does the plan do anything about hoping for a change in designation to be a premium transit as opposed to current status which is primary? Would plan have that in it?

(Unknown in Area 3) – I am transit dependent. I'm really interested in what happens with walkability and with public transit. You won't get people out of their cars with 20-30 min headways. We've got a ways to go.

(JM Langston) – there's a cost increase for transportation.

(JM Langston 4) – 6 stories is too much. We don't want any more affordable housing. We have more than other places in North Central Arlington. We only want 4 stories. We don't want affordable housing. Take it to East Falls Church.

(JM Langston) – you need to listen to the neighborhood. You're asking for input and it's not respected.

(JM Langston 5) – they're asking for it to be equitable. Throughout 22207, not just Halls Hill. Equity is what we're looking for.

(JM Langston 4) - N Emerson St, 2200 block, we want it closed. Was it green? That half street is used heavily. You can't make a clean left turn into Wendy's from Langston.

(JM Langston 3) – can we advocate for East Falls Church? That would help with the housing goal. Rather than trying to squeeze in more height. Let people know how you're coordinating with other projects and site plans. A community member said they don't think there's enough coordination between this process and other projects going on. How are we going to be informed?

(Leeway Overlee) – at the corner, your net gain is 10 units. You're only going to get 10-15 units with another floor and you're going to have a lot of angry neighbors. One story makes a huge difference. It does change your neighborhood, especially for those who live behind it.

(JM Langston and Calloway Church) – affordable housing, some people have it and some people don't. we have our share.

(JM Langston 4) - we have 100 apartments in our neighborhood. We've done our part. 1/6 of our neighborhood is affordable. Until other neighborhoods can say that, you need to leave us alone. I don't think anyone else has as much affordable housing as we do.

(JM Langston 5) – With the hospital and this, it's not right that our community has not been respected.

Area 5 East and West Neighborhoods Meeting 07.26.23

(North Highlands) – In terms of general discussion, we should focus on community input received. There's a difference between my personal opinion and opinion of residents. We are somewhat divided on things like density. We have consensus on traffic safety. Day to day life, traffic feels like most dangerous thing we face as a community. Traffic, pedestrian, bicyclist safety.

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – There are differences of opinion. In PP, there's no difference of opinion that's materialized. I know three people who are supportive of the plan. They believe we need taller buildings on our residential edges.

(North Highlands 2) – what's issue with those opposed to plan?

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – traffic safety at Oak and Langston Blvd. 1.3 acres, .2 is conservation land. Current zoning says 72 units per acre. Current plan recommends 10 stories, not 70-90 units. Concerns about context sensitivity of the design. There are full throated concerns about traffic safety. Intersection on County list of most dangerous intersections. There are general livability concerns. More than 130 people expressed themselves in a petition. Mental health from eclipse of fun, of doubling height, concerns about vegetation, to decreased setbacks, construction, congestion, on street parking for visitors and anyone coming by.

(North Highlands 3) - How are opinions being listened to? Are Board members listening?

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – I don't know if they're listening.

(North Highlands 3) – say they want green space and then they're taking green space. We have fantastic parks, people use them, this is just commercial development. It's for developers. It how it looks.

(North Highlands 2) – Surprised to hear stuff from CA. When Verde Point was built particularly members on east side of I66, members supported that 10 story building. Surprised association has changed on that.

(North Highlands) – there's been several different board members since then.

(North Highlands 2) – at site plan, CA announced support of 10 story building. On the west side, I wish we had your problem. There's 3000 people in west, more dense than east side. Maybe we should have separate CA. If you've seen plans, there are those kinds of buildings everywhere. Density isn't problem. There aren't enough parks. There's about 3000 people. McCoy park is not enough for existing people, let alone the increase. Plan says we'll have new open space, but many of those are already existing. Corner of Potomac Towers is green and used publicly. Maybe it'll be larger, but that's not a new park or space. There are areas of Manhattan that are dense, if you have amenities in neighborhood to support it, parks, shopping for quality of life. I think it's way too tight in some of the areas listed as new. The RPA, that's really good, I have to commend you for not developing in that area. I think that area is bigger than what's in the maps. VA law says it includes steep embankments adjacent to it. Some buildings are encroaching on that area. This is extremely dense. Right now this area is as dense as anything along orange line and it looks like it would be 3x that if it's fully built out according to plan. Parcels of park land are not nearly sufficient for population planned. It's not close now, let alone for the density planned. Looks like biggest pop increase in is Area 5 west. Why are some areas so high in terms of density and others are stacked townhouses which doesn't give those property owners the ability to contribute to

housing. For example, Verde Point, 10 stories. Our block has a number of houses, most over 100 years old. Our neighbors say let's develop this. That's 45,000 sq ft. Yet you've got in the plan discussion about stacked townhouses. That's appropriate under SF neighborhoods. We believe the height should be higher at our houses. My family's lived there for 100 years. Our family lived through development. It seems like the plan you have is constricting compared to massive increased in height and density on properties like Park Adams. Some townhomes were built in the 1980s. It's getting time for them to think about redevelopment. They want an opportunity too. In the future, it's best to look at whole thing, not just pick some winners. Give people opportunity when time comes to develop their property. That area is close to Metro, close to Moms. Because of type of ownership and age, it might be time. We put a lot of money into our house. We're not desperate to sell, but we need the same incentives. I've seen the letters from Potomac Towers requesting more floors. Many look at this and think it'll happen next year. There'll be more paperwork, meetings. Investment for some of those properties, it's difficult to make it work. There are very few owners on our block. Just 8 SFH owners. Only three that have permanent residents that live there.

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – it sounds like you can achieve CAFs in that spot.

(North Highlands 2) – we can add more CAFs here. We're well within walkable distance from Metro. Townhouses on Vance, they're not individually owned. One company owns them all and they're all rentals. When it was developed, the County Board planned it, gave it a direction, so there'd be a pass through. There are places for a pass through there. There's also underground parking. Underground parking for our half of the block could come from that property if they were interested. I think you're underestimating. There are three apartment buildings on that street at only 5 stories. If there was consolidation with townhomes to the right. All the way around is 45,000 sq ft. I think we could build 160 units.

(North Highlands 4) – House at end of 21st street was sold to developer.

(North Highlands 2) – another opportunity at end of Area 5 west on north side of Langston. Adding some shopping there makes the density more livable. McCoy Park gets a lot of use.

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – I think Joe is making powerful argument. How can PP help Joe with this vision?

(North Highlands) – the idea of TDR in Arlington today is extremely underutilized. **Ben explains TDR to group** I'm curious how TDR could play into any contemporary master planning exercise. There are a lot of possible fluctuations in market. It would be game changer in situation we're talking about today. How does master plan control for TDR. You're looking 30 years ahead. This will generate site plans. It'll take 30 years. In several years TDR market could look different. Generally talking about heights and density, we need to say community benefits more than we do. When I hear about stormwater upgrades, I think community benefit. Theoretically, stormwater fixes are community benefit. Maybe more park contributions.

(North Highlands 2) – In terms of community benefits, all the developers that have to make community benefits, the roads, affordable housing, that costs money. Ultimately it's the market renters that pay for those benefits unless they get a tax credit. These buildings, their source of revenue is rent and rents will increase. Rent has gone up in buildings that renovate. When you say let's add more community benefits,

it comes out of renters pockets. If affordable housing is good for Arlington, it should be good for all of us to pay for it.

(North Highlands 4) – I want to mention looking at this like it inevitable, we want to work with the County rather than against the County. We like where we live.

(North Highlands 2) – sentiments have changed in the community. there'd be no curb cuts if you make use of existing garages. At end of block on Wayne St, as those people change, they would like to have opportunity in the future to look forward to. Once GLUP is put in place, you need big bucks to get things changed.

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – this is encouraging.

(Maywood) – here representing myself. Most of our neighborhood is not affected by this bc they're in Cherrydale Plan. Our strip has concerns about dramatic change in height of buildings. The strip is one story and the plan envisions up to 15 stories. With thought that its lower elevation, you have route 66, and Thrifton Hill park as a buffer zone. I think conception of buffer zone is not what you all think. It's a nice buffer zone now, but with 15 story building, it would be drastic change. During summer with lots of trees you cant see much, But other seasons, you're close to it. Our house looks down to roof of Italian Store. I can't get my brain around 15 stories. Understand need for housing, And there's a stormwater problem that needs to be taken care of. If you allow dev, you have better chance to have it fixed. I wonder if out taxes can pay for more and not have that trade off of such a huge change of architecture in area. Plan envisions, LB/Spout Run, remediation of safety challenges. At Pawn Shops those are lower. I wonder whether it's a good thing to have something so different. My concern is balance of benefit and burden of people that live on that edge of park. We can't take any more density. Beyond 15 stories for sure. County is contributing funds to Thrifton Hill and some people are concerned about how development will affect that park. The plan talks about stepping back.

(North Highlands) – this exhibit looks like big boxes will be going up. But a residential tower are usually about 70ish ft wide. I think one of the points, there's opportunity in those masses. If building became C-shaped, there could be public space for public to benefit from. Especially for AFA site, it would be mean it developer did Texas Doughnut—courtyard for only residents. A doughnut vs C vs E shape

(Palisades Park, North Highlands) – can we talk about process. Doubling tripling height. How are we weighting sentiment from people who live there? How does that factor into models? Someone from distant zip code is weighted same as someone 40 ft away?

(North Highlands 3) – I'm new to this. I understand building height is big conversation and Im prononent of lower heights. What analsys has been done for traffic? It's already incredibly dangerous—highland and spout run—it's frightening. I get the positives, but the negative side is very concerning. Cars come flying through. With more people and more retail there will be a lot more people on the roads. I also understand a new road will be built behind us so people can get access. Can't that be a bike path? Why would we build a road? We've trying to save the environment. I think people ae fine walking down the street. We should be considering bike path.

(North Highlands 2) – new road will be used by people coming off Spout Run and that'll be like a commuter cross through. It'll make traffic worse.

(North Highlands 3) – if we get neighbors to draft something, will it be considered? We need to address traffic problem that already exists. We've asked for trees to be cut down, better visibility. There are two sides to every story, I appreciate that. what are steps for getting decisions made with plan and something getting started?

(Unknown) – came across new info, are there architects or environmentalists here? There's new movement underway with building. Considering embodied carbon in actual building materials. Why are we doing massive development? These carbons don't disappear easily. We're endangering health. What's more important economic development for Arlington County or people? There's big environmental impact for this. When materials are created, their carbon footprint. People are encouraging retrofitting. Using existing materials. I'm going to suggest an assessment of embodied carbon. Especially with climate now. my concern is affordable housing, everybody agrees we need more aff housing there will be a lot of development along LB. up to 60% AMI. My concern is with people at 30% AMI. According to County, there's 6500 deficit of houses at 30% AMI. can you incentivize CAFs at 30% AMI? Acknowledge in plan that the greatest deficit is at 30% AMI.