

Aging and Housing Meeting 7.20.23

(Aging representative 1) – I couldn't get through it all but it's wishful thinking. It's nice to know there will be a group that is vigilant when building and construction starts. When will you have a final plan? How would you sell this to the aging population in the neighborhoods? I'm on the pedestrian advisory committee and aging committee, there's overlap between the two. If this is affluent with single family homes and people want to stay, they're going to be in favor of, it would be attractive to me to see more open spaces, green spaces, accessible sidewalks, transportation. I recently moved and I ask people why they moved to senior housing. They want Metro, accessible places, to be near their adult children.

(Aging representative 2) – I should voice my admiration. This is remarkable the detail you've gone to. Where do you see hopeful vs reality? How is the neighborhood accepting this generally speaking? We've studied the 10 year transit strategy. You're lucky with the timing because of the transit strategic plan. What about the GLUP and zoning amendments? It's good if you can keep heights down and then make deals. I've been through the Arlington negotiations a lot on increased densities and increased heights. Are you looking for opportunities for long term care facilities? You've got a facility at Langston not too far away that's seems successful. We need a definition of housing for aging in place. It's been harder than it should be. How do we initiate that concern? Disabilities or aging in place, things that can't be done to a normal place, making it wheelchair maneuverable, lowering countertops. Modifying an apartment to be appropriate for disability or aging is expensive. I hear that people don't want medians removed, that the elderly won't be able to make it across the road. There are excellent audible signals at crosswalks, but most of them are buzzers. People with sight problems, they don't know which side is open for crossing. Those kinds of amenities help with safety. With Langston, you've got an advantage, you can make a buzzer applicable just to Langston. Flashing lights for example, make them only applicable to major roads, not the side streets. Something needs to be done to make that safer. There's a lot of retail on your charts and retail is going belly up in a lot of places. Are you going to reconsider that? Do you envision LRPC activity here? Getting owners, commercial owners involved early on is great. You have 60% of people here use Metro to get to work, are you going to improve the last mile to get to Metro from here? Why no shuttle system from here to the Metro? You're laying the groundwork for the future. There are two things to take care of now – one is storm sewer. Its' already a problem. And the other is underground utilities. It's better to do it before you build. Those are both expensive.

(Housing representative) - Co location is a wonderful idea. If we want to broaden diversity and affordability it has to be through height. Without it, then there's less opportunity for people to come in. Unless something's being preserved, the buildings will all be new. Then we'd advocate for universal design. How do we incentivize private builders to incorporate in the design? The number of accessible units requested might be something to think about in implementation – will this plan be looked at every 5 years? 10? The senior demand may be going up in the coming years. It may need to be part of negotiations. On feedback, who is the feedback coming from? Who's coming midafternoon? Civic associations don't represent thousands of people. Are there examples of things you think may happen more immediately vs ones that will take longer? You mentioned flexibility, we learned from Columbia Pike that more flexibility is better. Are you putting a designation that it has to be residential with commercial at ground floor? It's an incredible plan. I hope enough people are telling you. It's comprehensive, its forward thinking, its amazing. I'm homing in on the housing part, but the vision, wow. It will be more of a transformation here than Columbia pike. The greenest, most pedestrian friendly. As it's built out it will be different and so much better. A lot of houses are happy. Some

advocates are saying how can we say we're happy when it doesn't achieve the AHMP goal? That piece feels like giving in now we'll lose ground by saying this is good enough. You're going to hear from housing folks, what can we do? The equity component, this is a place to reintegrate other socio economic groups. Is it going to be more white wealthy people? We have to think big. What will it look like in decades when many of us won't be there? We're hearing about stormwater concerns from opposition groups. I don't think people understand that we don't get the stormwater improvements without the development.

Housing and Disability Meeting 7.20.23

(Housing Representative) – during MM, people said you want to add density but current transit network can't handle it. I assume if you're adding more residents, then you assess transit needs. Is that not automatically happening? On providing additional density or height if its affordable. If it's a priority, exceptions should be made for affordable housing. I would support if there's bonus density or height if its affordable bc we're behind in our goals. Making sure they have adequate transit should be part of that. If you have new large affordable housing development, would County study at same time what transit would best serve them? What is CAF target? What will we get to? Do you have a sense of how many CAFs might be developed in 10 years? Has County looked at MARKs vs CAFs? When will we lose all MARKs? Can we have a presentation on MARKs for the Housing Commission?

(Housing Representative 2) – in the intro and key planning elements, it says "up to" 60% AMI and other places say "at" 60% AMI. Change to "up to" everywhere? With APAH, AHC, The Larkspur, if we know we're not reaching the affordable housing goal, what are opportunities down the line to get closer to 2500 goal? Can we add flexibility if it's for affordability? Are there things we can think of outside the box to maximize affordable housing on existing affordable sites. On implementation, how do we wring out of East Falls Church and Cherrydale everything we can get? Looking at those two, will that be articulated as next steps?

Public Facilities and Schools Meeting 07.26.23

(Arlington Public Schools) - Do you change plans as commissions provide input?

(Joint Facilities Advisory Commission) – JFAC is thinking about how to make sure we have flexibility and foresight. Uses that are necessary over time. The Lee Center, for example, has been underutilized. Can it be swing space? Has County or APS done studies about how many seats can be accommodated with redevelopment there? If we're adding 2500 affordable homes, those have a high student generation rate. We don't have to solve everything now, but it would be reassuring to know how many seats we could put on public sites.

(Arlington Public Schools 2) – we did a swing site study, we recommend school site study. If School Board wants alternates, then we'll work with County to do studies. For cost estimates, additional studies, that'll be done after October.

(Joint Facilities Advisory Commission) – if community wants to meet enrollment, it would be good to see an estimate of how long it would take and how many seats possible.

(Arlington Public Schools 2) – we do have what we need now. We also think we can absorb the incoming students as well. If this does provide a lot of population growth then we need to turn around and ask where can we build a school.

(Arlington Public Schools 2) – we're able to say for next 10 years we're ok

(Arlington Public Schools) – it would become important if community center sites are looking to take another direction. Can we have a conversation before anything else happens?

(APS Advisory Council on School Facilities and Capital Programs) – Cardinal did that.

(Arlington Public Schools 2) – Prince Georges County has a blueprint and we don't have that. we've discussed educational specifications. There's existing criteria the site would have to have.

(Arlington Public Schools) – after hours, schools are community facilities, fields are used, they're busy. We've looked at converting office space. There are some co-location complexities.

(Joint Facilities Advisory Commission) – I'm confident if APS projections change in the future. A lot of people who are less familiar but remember late 2000s where we had a massive surge north of Langston Blvd. Shouldn't we make sure if we get unexpected spikes in enrollment, we can serve those needs? Come up with a rough estimate of how many seats can be accommodated on sites.

(Arlington Public Schools) – The 5-year timeline is important- plans, breaking ground, opening school. We should be able to see.

(Joint Facilities Advisory Commission) – its helpful to have a menu of options. If this will be challenge in 5-10 years, here's option. If something else is a challenge, here's another option.

(Arlington Public Schools) – what about pre-k's, where should they be? Pre-k's are a growing priority.

(Arlington Public Schools 2) – flexibility piece is important. Priorities change over time.

(Arlington Public Schools) – I keep hearing that people feel projections, that impacts to students will be higher. That's data-free info.

(Joint Facilities Advisory Commission) – can we use specific examples as a case study? If you look at new townhome or condo or CAF development to say this is what we'd expect based on generation numbers and here's what's actually been generated.

(Arlington Public Schools) – have you found they vary?

Public Spaces and Environment Meeting 07.26.23

(Park and Recreation Commission) – we excel at small park, big open piece of land. Our focus should be on enhancing what we already have. While maintain principles of mixed use space. Woodstock Park, park behind Langston Brown.

(C2E2) – we're preparing a letter. Broadly, we need something in plan that condenses sustainability items. A one-pager that ties together this is what we want corridor to look like that integrates whole realm of things. Pervious/impervious surfaces. There's lots of opportunities on big parking lots and small buildings. Can we quantify that. There's concern that there are buildings that can be renovated and have good tree canopy and we should be preserving that. We can expand and make those areas denser. Lots having surface level parking lots. That ties together different things, can get into stormwater management. Needs to be articulated, we need retaining vault here. Be specific about what you want. A lot of buildings are MARKs. There's a huge carbon footprint when you tear down a building so we need to look at reuse. And the buildings themselves. We push very hard for highly energy efficient buildings. Stop burning fossil gas in buildings. Have EV charging., Buildings need to meet the highest standard of decarbonization, including in selection of materials. Transportation, PCP indicated traffic volumes would increase. How can you be bike and ped friendly with more traffic coming through? Requires better transit coming through, regionally, connecting corridor with region. And looking at micro-transit and micro-mobility. With implementation, County needs to be thinking of what they'll do. Piecemeal bike lanes isn't going to work. Same with stormwater. Is there a way you can make it attractive for developers to build what we want? Is it form based code? We lose when we go to site plan. We don't get enough open space, affordable housing,

(Park and Recreation Commission) – we've got drafts making things clearer. We have the guidelines. We recently got a briefing from planning staff in DPR. We have the right to ask for native species. I want it to be regular that we ask for this specificity at SPRC. Even in projects like parks master planning efforts, the level of specification is usually already decided.

(C2E2) – The assisted living facility, Artisan, is going to be independent living, more parking spaces. We need transparency in things being changed.

(Forestry and Natural Resources Commission) – we commented before on tree canopy and now there's nothing on tree canopy. You'll be hearing more about that. We want more detailed targets for tree canopy. On park acquisition there's not a lot of specificity and there's not a lot. We need to ask the developers for opportunities. We want overland relief areas to be parks. Not for recreation, but heavily planted with trees. Hit stormwater requirements, hit tree requirements. The County is buying property in Waverly Hills. What will happen there? The definition of greenway is undeveloped space. Pg 106. It's an opportunity. A great place to plant trees and other native vegetation. On TDRs we need reference to acquisition of open spaces. Do you envision anyone doing TDRs for open space on corridor? Once you have area plan, you still need to change zoning?

(Plan Langston Boulevard Community Forum Chair) – would parts of Langston Boulevard have a CO on it?

(Forestry and Natural Resources Commission) – only incentive is additional density, right?

(Park and Recreation Commission) – it’s hard to imagine change at this point. I want to echo there’s been properties along corridor that have revamped in last couple years and will likely have to again. And they’re not going to be recycled properly.

(C2E2) – we should build for the future.

(Forestry and Natural Resources Commission) – I keep thinking about Green Main Street and we need a lot of green and right now it’s not that. Besides green dots of public space. If it’s not in there, we’re not going to get it.

(Park and Recreation Commission) - A one-pager would help prove to us it’s not greenwashing.

(Forestry and Natural Resources Commission) – is there some basic infrastructure--I appreciate integration of biophilic principles—can we say, here’s Langston Blvd green building guide? “Moralsuasion” if we have no leverage.

(C2E2) – is there monetary or time saving offer to creatively incentivize?

(LBA) – why didn’t you identify spaces that could be green space where there’s excess ROW? Why didn’t we put a plaza next to an open space to make it a bigger public space? Why not extend publicly owned space?

(Forestry and Natural Resources Commission) – can you do three together?

(Park and Recreation Commission) – we should incorporate advances we’ve made through FNRP to PLB.

(C2E2) – its not clear, with this plan what is expected tree canopy coverage? I don’t think street trees will make up for trees lost.