



# Site Plan Review Committee

Community Engagement Comments and Responses  
10th & Irving (Joyce Motors Site) – SPLN19-00006

## Project Contacts

### SPRC Chair

Stephen Hughes, Chair  
[stephenthughes@gmail.com](mailto:stephenthughes@gmail.com)

## County Staff Contacts

*CPHD Planner*  
Adam Watson  
703-228-7926  
[awatson@arlingtonva.us](mailto:awatson@arlingtonva.us)

*DES Planner*  
Dennis Sellin  
703-228-4805  
[dsellin@arlingtonva.us](mailto:dsellin@arlingtonva.us)

## Applicant Contacts

*Orr Clarendon, LLC*  
David Orr  
703-594-8022  
[David.orr@orrpartners.com](mailto:David.orr@orrpartners.com)

*Represented by Walsh,  
Colucci*  
Andrew Painter &  
Nicholas Cumings  
703-528-4700  
[apainter@thelandlawyers.com](mailto:apainter@thelandlawyers.com)  
[ncumings@thelandlawyers.com](mailto:ncumings@thelandlawyers.com)

## Site Plan Project Information

**Project Name:** 10th & Irving – Joyce Motors Site (assemblage)

**Items Requested:** Site Plan

**Engagement Session:** June 16 – 27, 2022

**Review Focus Topics:** (All Topics) Land Use, Building Massing/Height, Architecture/Historic Preservation, Transportation, Streetscapes/Landscaping, 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 & Historic Preservation.....	7
SPRC Comments: Transportation .....	7
SPRC Comments: Streetscapes & Landscaping .....	8
SPRC Comments: Other .....	8
Community Member Comments.....	9

## About this Document

This document contains all the comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee’s online engagement for the “Joyce Motors Site” project between June 16 – 27, 2022. 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 to provide an overview of the common themes and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual commenter.

- **Land Use**

1. **Ground-level retail use and retail equivalents**

Several respondents inquired as to what type of retail tenant the applicant envisions occupying the proposed retail space. In addition, there were several comments/questions regarding the Retail Plan/Sector Plan recommendation of “retail equivalents” along North Irving Street.

*Staff Response:* The applicant’s proposed retail location along 10<sup>th</sup> Street North is consistent with [Clarendon Sector Plan](#) recommendations (Map 2.6, Retail Frontages), and appropriate retail uses would include sales, food, entertainment, service, or repair establishments (among others permitted by the [Zoning Ordinance](#)). The proposed residential units along North Irving Street are also consistent with the Sector Plan. The North Irving Street frontage within the site area is designated a “Side Street B” frontage and the Sector Plan states that “Side Street B frontages could accommodate a range of ground-floor uses, from residential to retail, retail equivalents, personal and professional services, studio space, cafes and galleries.” Retail equivalents are not required along North Irving Street. However, staff is working with the applicant to discuss opportunities for more functioning pedestrian entry points along the east and north building frontages.

*Applicant Response:* The Applicant concurs with staff’s response, above. The building’s retail program has yet to be finalized, but the Applicant is exploring potential uses and tenants for this space. The Applicant is focusing on uses such as a coffee shop, restaurant, and experiential retail. A tenant would not be formally selected until the building is constructed and residents are beginning to move in, and retail tenants will change over time depending on market conditions.

- **Building Massing and Height**

2. **The proposed density and building massing drew mixed comments**

While several respondents, including most SPRC members, had no objection to the proposed density, other respondents felt that the proposed density was too great, and the building massing was too “blocky.”

Staff Response: The “C-3” zoning district allows for the County Board to approve additional density (above 3.0 FAR), in the form of additional floors, consistent with ACZO §9.2.5. Map 1 - Maximum Heights Limits and Step-backs Map, and §15.5.9. As illustrated on slide 7 of staff’s Online Engagement presentation, the applicant’s proposal is consistent with these height and step-back requirements. Moreover, some of the proposed step-backs are under the maximum allowable height. At this time, the applicant is engaged with the County Manger on a proposal for earning addition density (above 3.0 FAR), consistent with adopted Policy and Sector Plan goals. The proposal includes green building commitments and credit for preserving the historic facade, as prescribed in the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is not finalized and may be revised to include additional commitments, such as the provision of affordable housing and/or transferable development rights for preservation of other historic buildings within Clarendon. Staff welcomes SPRC feedback what kind or types of community benefits are desired for fulfilling County policy objectives (note: this topic will be discussed further at the final SPRC meeting in October 2022).

Applicant Response: The Applicant agrees with staff’s response, above. The proposed density is consistent with the provisions of the Clarendon Sector Plan, and a community benefit package will be negotiated to earn the additional density. At the moment, potential community benefits include participation in the Green Building Incentive Program, preservation of the Joyce Motors façade as called for in the Clarendon Sector Plan, and a transfer of density rights for preservation of the “Clarendon Barbershop” building at 1407 North Garfield Street, which is identified for historic preservation in the Clarendon Sector Plan.

- **Architecture/Historic Preservation**

3. **General concern for the applicant not providing a single, 10-foot step-back directly above the relocated historic façade, as recommended in the Clarendon Sector Plan.**

SPRC Members and many community respondents expressed concern regarding the proposed glass atrium and two-tired step-back above the preserved historic façade.

Staff Response: Staff appreciates the feedback on this topic and is working with the applicant to better understand the design opportunities and constraints. Architecture and historic preservation will be discussed further at SPRC meeting(s) in the fall. Staff acknowledges that while the proposed design deviates from Sector Plan guidance, it prevents/lessens conflict with other provisions of the Sector Plan and Zoning Ordinance, such as the required interior clear (slab) height for the retail space. We look forward to continued discussion on this topic.

Applicant Response: The Applicant has revised its proposal to include the 10-foot step-back directly above the historic façade as recommended in the Sector Plan. This change is addressed in more detail in the Applicant’s presentation for the upcoming SPRC meeting.

- **Transportation**

- 4. The proposed parking ratios drew mixed comments**

Parking was one of the most-mentioned topics among community respondents. 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, particularly for the proposed retail.

*Staff Response:* Staff appreciates the robust feedback on the proposed parking ratios. This topic, along with other transportation matters, such as bike and EV parking, will be discussed at an SPRC meeting(s). 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 close proximity of the Clarendon 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 Applicant agrees with staff’s response, above. In the Applicant’s experience, the proposed parking supply is sufficient to meet demand at this location, particularly due to the close proximity of Metrorail and desirable neighborhood amenities like grocery stores within walking distance of the site.

- 5. 10<sup>th</sup> Street North median and enhanced bicycle facilities**

Several respondents expressed interest in the median and planned bike facilities along 10<sup>th</sup> Street North.

*Staff Response:* No improvements or changes to the current configuration of 10th Street North are anticipated to be delivered as part of this site plan project. For the present, County staff are requiring that all site plans and other developments occurring along 10th Street North maintain the existing curb line along 10th Street, so that, in the future, County staff can use that consistent curb line to develop a uniform multimodal design. We recognize that any future design would need to balance the needs for all users, and that there is some desire to maintain the center median, as well as some of the on-street parking once the new bicycle lanes are accommodated. Regarding those bicycle lanes, in the Master Transportation Plan, County staff have identified a project for a bicycle facility on 10th Street between Fairfax Drive and the Arlington Boulevard Trail (which is slightly under a mile). This project will go a long way toward providing an important connector in our bicycle network, connecting the Clarendon neighborhood to the regional bicycle network. This is proposed to be an ‘enhanced’ facility, which, when built, will provide an added layer of vehicular separation and thus protection for cyclists. The next step in the process is to develop a plan for the bicycle facility, which would be done by County transportation staff, in coordination with the community, involving the civic associations, members of the cycling community, and other interested community members. In that plan, it would be determined the type of bicycle facility to be designed and built, and the final street profile for 10th Street. In Arlington County’s recently adopted Capital Improvement Program, the Arlington County Board has identified funding for a multimodal corridor study of Fairfax Drive and 10th Street North. That study will evaluate potential options to include an enhanced bike facility along 10th Street North, and will develop recommendations for capital project investments. Once that study is complete, we

would need to identify funding for whatever level of construction would be required to build this project. This work would likely be done by County staff.

*Applicant Response:* The Applicant will maintain the existing curb line on 10th Street N. as requested by staff in anticipation of future efforts to create the bike lane.

- **Streetscapes and Landscaping**

- 5. General concern for the applicant’s proposal to place the historic façade beyond the recommended Build-to-Lines**

Most respondents were concerned about the applicant’s proposal, which reduces the minimum clear sidewalk widths on both North Irving Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Street North by approximately 2 feet.

*Staff Response:* Staff appreciates the feedback on this matter and is working with the applicant on design revisions for achieving the recommended clear sidewalk widths. This topic will be discussed further at SPRC meeting(s) in the fall. We look forward to continued discussion on this topic.

*Applicant Response:* The Applicant has revised its design to move the historic façade back to the recommended build-to lines and provide the Clarendon Sector Plan’s recommended sidewalk clear width. This change is addressed in more detail in the Applicant’s presentation for the upcoming SPRC meeting.

- **Other**

- 6. Desire for (on-site) affordable housing and more “family-size” dwelling units.**

Many respondents expressed a desire for affordable housing, particularly on-site units. Separately, many respondents expressed a desire for a greater number of two- or three-bedroom units, and concern for the percentage of proposed studio and one-bedroom units.

*Staff Response:* Staff appreciates the feedback on this matter. As previously mentioned, we welcome SPRC comments what kind or types of community benefits are desired for fulfilling County policy objectives, and we look forward to the discussion at SPRC. The provision of affordable housing is one of several items under consideration for earning additional density. The specifics of any affordable housing commitment will be finalized after SPRC concludes, but prior to County Board consideration of the site plan. While staff also welcomes a greater percentage of multi-bedroom units, the County cannot require a specific percentage of unit/bedroom types for market-rate projects. However, staff will seek family-size units for any affordable dwelling units associated with this project.

*Applicant Response:* The Applicant also appreciates community feedback on this issue, and will take it into account as it continues to negotiate the community benefit package with County staff.

## SPRC Member Comments

### SPRC Comments: Land Use

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-LU-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I have no concerns about the land use for this site.
SPRC-LU-2	Collier Cook	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (BVSCA)	-Explain how ground level residential units are deemed "retail and/or retail equivalent". If these are to be permitted then they should at least be more engaging with the street with private stoops & entrances. -The 10th Street retail space is very shallow in depth. What businesses could work in this space? Any ways to enlarge that space?

### SPRC Comments: Building Massing and Height

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-B-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I have no concerns about the height or massing.
SPRC-B-2	Joan FitzGerald	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Ashton Heights CA)	Building design is not consistent with an urban village. It's a big block, instead of something that relates to the surrounding street. This is actually pretty bad.  The step backs are not sufficient to create high quality experience for pedestrians. Again, this building is a block - like an office building in Tysons. Not what we want in Clarendon.
SPRC-B-3	Zack Gold	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCA)	The density is great, though I would prefer more 2- and 3-bedroom units for families.
SPRC-B-4	Collier Cook	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (BVSCA)	No issues.
SPRC-B-5	Omari Davis	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (HALRB)	The provision of a step-back of at least 10 feet immediately above the preserved portion of the project is extremely important. The intent of the 10' step-back is to continue the building's one-story design and enhance the pedestrian experience at the corner of 10th Street North and North Irving Street. This recommendation in the ACZO/Sector Plan should be accepted and executed.

## SPRC Comments: Architecture & Historic Preservation

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-A-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	While it won't change anything for this project, I continue to object to not keeping a building that is at this level on the county historic register in situ. For other sites going forward, I advocate that height and massing be modified to encourage in situ preservation.  I do not support the two tier setback. A full setback at the top of the gas station facade will better emphasize it. Especially because I do not support the encroachment on the sidewalks. The sidewalks should remain 10' and 6'.
SPRC-A-2	Joan FitzGerald	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Ashton Heights)	Insufficient. No relationship to architecture of building to historical Joyce Motors.
SPRC-A-3	Collier Cook	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (BVSCA)	-The single step-back would be better than the proposed two. A single step would be more respectful to the historic facade. -Unclear how the facades' rollup doors will function as some have structural columns behind them. -How will the glass guardrail systems used through the project be bird friendly?
SPRC-A-4	Omari Davis	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (HALRB)	- It is the HALRB's opinion that historic preservation for the project should be centered around preserving Joyce Motors in situ. However, this position was not adopted. - With this planning process we should come to a consensus around education components. - The HALRB requests that the developer work closely with the HPP staff & the DRC as well as reference the Historic Preservation Plan (2020) when developing preservation approaches to the character defining features of the historic façade.

## SPRC Comments: Transportation

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-T-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I agree with the reduced parking and wonder if it can be dropped further. What provision will be made for EVs both now and for future needs? I'd like to see a discussion of a PBL on 10th St. I do not yet have an opinion on the reduced loading dock. I'd like more discussion on its expected use and whether that means more delivery vehicles parked on the streets. Where is the proposed PUDO? I'd like more info on the design of the alley. How will it present to pedestrians?
SPRC-T-2	Joan FitzGerald	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Ashton Heights)	4 parking spaces for retail is COMPLETELY INSUFFICIENT. I can't even imagine what the developer is thinking here -- other than we'll have empty retail so why bother with parking.
SPRC-T-3	Zack Gold	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCA)	I'm fine with the reduced parking request. I would like more, and specific, details from the developer as to the "enhanced bicycle facilities" that will be provided in exchange for other variances. For example, this site is prime for a new Capital Bikeshare station; the developer should pay for that station (and for adding bikes into the system).
SPRC-T-4	Collier Cook	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (BVSCA)	-Staff needs to provide more info on how enhanced bicycle facilities could be provided on 10th St and how this project could impact those facilities. -What would trigger the knockout of the panel that could connect this parking garage to the adjacent properties garage? -I like the ground level bike room but worry about the number of vertical bike racks with the growing use of heavier e-bikes & cargo bikes. -The alley crossing along 10th St should have a raised "continuous sidewalk" across it.

## SPRC Comments: Streetscapes & Landscaping

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-OS-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I do not support the encroachment on the sidewalks. The sidewalks should remain 10' and 6'.
SPRC-OS-2	Zack Gold	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCA)	My family walks by this lot regularly, and I'm concerned by the loss of 2ft of sidewalk on both 10th St and Irving St. Arlington just received high honors for its walkability, and we should maintain wide sidewalks for our residents and visitors. I do not support narrower sidewalks than the County recommends. Indeed, as retail may include dining--which may take additional sidewalk space for seating--I would desire wider sidewalks on 10th St than the recommended 12'.
SPRC-OS-3	Collier Cook	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (BVSCA)	Both streets need a full width sidewalk. the placement of the historic facade should be adjusted into the site to allow for this space. Also as the Landscape drawings are cut off its unclear what outdoor cafe space is proposed on 10th Street.

## SPRC Comments: Other

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-O-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The 10th St median will need to be a topic as will the geometry of 10th. I'd like info on storm water management since this is in the Spout Run watershed. Also, what is the plan for street trees? Will there be any affordable units on site?
SPRC-O-2	Joan FitzGerald	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Ashton Heights)	I'm quite sad that this building is so ugly. It belongs in Tysons (or no where), not in Clarendon.



## Community Member Comments

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-1	Chris Webster	Community member or neighbor	X	X				X	This is awesome! Build it! As dense as possible! Sure, that's fine with me, just build the apartments! Looks great! More apartments, the better! I love this project! I just want more housing in Arlington, and this is an amazing way to do it! Build, baby, build!
CM-2	Hannah Follweiler	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X		I think the best use would be housing. I also like that the building is mixed use. The only thing I would change is to maybe make the tallest part of the building taller. I like the current setbacks. Signage looks nice. I think that we should make more room for the sidewalk. Take away the space for cars and give it back to people. Protected bike lanes and bike parking is a must. Cycling is exploded during the pandemic and it's only going to get more popular with gas prices rising. Please make a low stress bike network.
CM-3	Eric Malpeli	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X			The site is appropriate for mixed use and residential. Higher density and building heights are appropriate in this location. The proposed height is good and could be even higher! Preservation steps are adequate. Monitoring will be needed to determine if more parking is needed in future similar projects. 0.58 sp/unit seems low.
CM-4	Dave Schutz	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X		I have no problem with the land use for this site. 5.92 FAR is an enormous increase from the automatic allowance. I haven't seen anything like the level of community benefits which would convince me that it's been adequately compensated. I'm by no means against 5.92, but I want to see community benefits commensurate. I was fond of Frank Joyce, lovely man. I am glad to see his name preserved here. I think it's silly to try to force big expense on the developer to retain the setback of the original building - the proposed placement at the build to line is fine with me. I would like to see some kind of documentation of the site inside the building - photos of Joyce and family, etc. They had a collection of letters from happy customers on a bulletin board - if could get that, it would give some context. Each of the projects on this site has its own entrance for parking/loading. This seems wasteful, if the County could somehow do a 'matchmaker' function and get this to be shared. I think it is daft to call for only four parking spaces for the retail - severely limits what kinds of businesses it can attract, and in addition will result in spillover parking into the neighborhood across Tenth. My guess is, that with four spaces, all will be devoted to employees, only walkers will be customers. Functional median strip on tenth will be important, this is not something to glide past. Also, functional median strip on Wilson would be a huge plus for the whole area, for pedestrian back and forth.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-5	Michael Bruce	Other: President Waycroft-Woodlawn CA	X	X	X	X	X	X	Need actual affordable units provided. Not simply a cash contribution. Units need to include 3 bedrooms for families / children, not just for singles. Building is too high and massive for the location. No amenities provided to community. No added density without major benefits such as - green roof, provide under ground Stormwater retention facility, Stormwater retention for a 50 or 100 year storm. Irrelevant to this development. Would like to see space reserved for small entrepreneurs or locally owned retail at lower than market rates to enable businesses to thrive. Need more open air balconies for resident units. Need greenspace at street level and a green roof. Need tall deciduous tree plantings around property with sufficient soil to grow. As a former Manhattan resident. Being close to metro make these true urbanite residents with no parking spaces. Make units part of the missing middle solution by enabling units to be condos or coops rather than rentals.
CM-6	Casey Nolan	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X		X	While the overall land use is appropriate, it would be good to see more service commercial/retail uses along 10th Street similar to what done at The Ten at Clarendon. Those live-work units have remained occupied with a variety of small businesses serving the community. The height is appropriate given the planning guidance and proximity to Metro. While the decision has been made to keep elements of the existing service station, this seems like a poor use of resources from all for this building. Since the County has required keeping the historic facade, it seems reasonable that whatever variations are needed to do so are appropriate. The plan proposed looks reasonable. Parking should be market driven and not a County requirement. Arlington has a housing crisis which requires approaches from multiple fronts - increasing overall supply, incentivizing on site affordable units (i.e. through bonus density) and streamlining permit processes to get units built. This case has languished for 2+ years. Recommend moving this project along now that the sector plan is done and this is in the spirit of the plan, helps address a top priority and cleans up an overlooked block that could generate more use for the County and community.
CM-7	Bradley Harmon	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	The idea that we even need to discuss putting residential and retail land use this close to a metro station is ridiculous, particularly during a housing shortage. My only objection to the proposal is that there are any massing restrictions this close to a metro station. This is a fantastic project, we desperately need these new homes, and I hope it gets approved as quickly as possible. I really don't understand the value to the county of preserving any part of an ugly car service center that isn't even 75 years old, but I think the project does an admirable job of conforming to the requirements anyway, and any delay to the project on this front, again, is unjustifiable during a housing shortage. Losing sidewalk isn't ideal, but 10 feet is plenty wide, and even for someone who walks regularly in this area, I don't find this a major concern. The reduced parking should absolutely be granted, and indeed, this

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									close to a metro station there shouldn't be parking minimums at all. As for bike infrastructure, the primary bike route in this area should be the St. Charles church development, that should be a much higher priority.
CM-8	Tom Petty	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	Land use OK, but ground floor space (not just the retail) should be made more adaptable - most notably is that there appears to be no individual, exterior, ground floor entrances to the residential uses on Irving. The lack of ground-floor, individual entrances on Irving means that for the entire time that this building exists, it would present a lifeless wall to pedestrians walking along side. This decreases safety and misses the opportunity to provide a more inviting pedestrian experience. I like the stepback at 2nd story, rather than directly above preserved facade. Staff should do a shadow analysis to see what shade is cast on the park at all times of the year and that should drive the specifics of the step back. For Clarendon, a 6 FAR is I think highly unusual, and although I don't have an issue in general with the FAR or maximum height, it is a massive gift to the landowner/developer - so commensurate community benefits must be required. Compared to the renderings of the other projects proposed in this area (Bingham and Wells Fargo), this architecture seems less articulated and pretty plain and boring with little facade details that would be interesting at the pedestrian scale. Therefore, material quality will be critical. The developer asserts that they have quality material but then mentions materials, some of which are high quality (real stone) and others not as much (precast). Please enforce high quality materials! Having ground floor, individual unit entries and stoops along Irving, and perhaps balconies would make a world of difference (in a good way) to the experience a pedestrian would have walking along this building. Individual entries make the sidewalk safer and enhance interest for pedestrians. As it stands now, the frontage along Irving street looks pretty awful. Landscaping won't fix that problem either. With this and other projects on this block, and with Irving street closed on the North end and only right hand turns from the alley on 10th, it seems like a traffic light will be warranted at 10th and Irving. Does staff have a comment on that? Has a traffic study been conducted? This project in the renderings looks like a big beige box that is more at home in Ballston. Hope I'm wrong about that. My priorities would be to greatly enhance the frontage along Irving with individual unit entrances and enforce the use of high quality materials on the facade like real limestone block, for example. And, better detailing, articulation on the facade would be nice. They are r getting a huge bonus in height and density over recent expectations so need maximum community benefits.
CM-9	Peter Evans	Community member or	X		X			X	I'm not convinced the Joyce Motors design are sufficiently valuable to warrant historic preservation, but I've only lived in the neighborhood for 12 years. Adding dispersed low-income housing should be a

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							top priority, should be included as a portion of every new residential property development approval.
CM-10	Richard Rortvedt	Community member or neighbor			X	X	X	X	Where are the community accessible amenities? This plan utilizes all land for a massive structure without gardens, fountains, sculptures, patios or any green space. What green and community space do we get in return for allowing this massive structure, both in area and height? This attempt at historic "preservation" is the only redeeming feature for this otherwise oversized, unimaginative structure. Retain recommended walkway width of 12 feet on 10th St. N and 8 feet on N Irving St. Should be one parking space per unit. Parking in the surrounding neighborhoods is already inadequate for community needs. Maintaining an atmosphere of an "urban village" has been sacrificed to maximizing land density in this plan. Arlington should be able to do better than this!
CM-11	Tabitha Nichols	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X	X	X	Like it, no complaints, like the centering of the retail frontage to the more major street. Looks great! Don't feel the stepbacks are necessary personally and I wish the building were taller and could have more units, but about as good as the Sector plan allows imo. Hate the narrowing of the sidewalks. Would much prefer to see an 8ft step back but full sidewalk width maintained. 6' is just not wide enough here. Love the retail parking ratio, think the residential could be a bit lower for this close to there metro. Would like to see a commitment to allowing charging for EVs in the garage, convertible to support all spaces. This building should outlast consumer ICEs.
CM-12	Sean Kilduff	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X			Seems like this cluster of 110' buildings is a pretty drastic departure from the adjacent neighborhood. Why is this eyesore considered "essential" and "historic"? Is a traffic light envisioned for the corner of Irving and 10th St? Seems like building 10th Rd will naturally increase traffic flow on Irving. Better yet, why does Irving exist at all?
CM-13	Beatrice Camp	Community member or neighbor	X			X	X	X	We are concerned about any rooftop use that would create excessive evening noise that would disturb residents in the area. What does the community get in return for the additional density given to the developers? Please include as many trees and other greenery as possible. Enough parking should be provided that the local community is not inundated by parked cars from the new residents. Or the nearby streets should be zoned for residents only 24/7.
CM-14	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor		X					I oppose the proposed design because density and setbacks do not align with the original GLUP guidelines for development of this site. The original plan for stepping-down so close to a SFH residential neighborhood has been compromised.
CM-15	Xavier Czerewko	Community member or neighbor					X		Keep the protrusions as it adds character and separates new from old.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-16	Celeste Szewczyk	Community member or neighbor				X	X	X	Please do NOT allow the narrow sidewalks. Arlington will have more people, more pedestrians (and dogs and scooters and strollers) so if anything, wider sidewalks should be encouraged. I have read that families want to stay in Arlington, but cannot find places to live with 2 or 3 bedrooms. This plan has 5% 3 BR units, 20% 2 BR units, 58% 1 BR units and 17% studios. Rethink and redesign this for what will help families stay in Arlington. It is easier to double the # of 3 bedroom units, then to build SFH units elsewhere. More parking should be available to renters. If preserving this means narrower sidewalks, or other concessions, I am not in favor of all the time, money, and energy being put into this. More parking should be available. In any large building parking is at a premium, and should be available to residents. Also, more parking needs to be available to shoppers. Four spots will not encourage consumers to use these businesses.
CM-17	Elizabeth Stein	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X		X	Far, far too dense-why is county allowing doubling of density over standard? Far too generous with the offsets for "good" thing like green construction and historic preservation. Far, far too few parking spaces, especially as there will be some retail. Such a massive building will adversely affect the character of the neighborhood and push clarendon toward the -to me less desirable and pleasurable Ballston model. Far too much credit for historic preservation. This is similar in character to what was the NTB building on Wilson and fortunately that building was preserved without sacrificing the lower rise character of the neighborhood. Big and blocky despite tiers. No mention of reserving some apartment spaces for seniors or disabled persons so what if they want to live in apartment building? The county is basically saying we only want young people who walk or bike and too bad for those who need to have a car who would like to live in building. Far too few parking spaces and there will be congestion caused by reduced loading dock. Bad trade off to decrease parking and loading dock while increasing density. What about stress on metro ridership?
CM-18	Katherine Gunther	Community member or neighbor	X			X		X	The proposed ugly rectangular building you are permitting is in total contravention of the expectation of an urban village look. It is too high, and too dense. There is insufficient parking. A hotel would be preferable to an apartment building. You have already deprived the Clarendon area of a larger promised park on 10th Street near the First Station. Now you are blocking out more space. No, no and no! Too high. Too close to side walk. Too few parking spaces. The Joyce Motors sign is ugly. No reason to preserve it. Instead, preserve air space. Build an attractive light and airy structure. There don't seem to be many "design" elements. You're permitting a towering gray rectangle with a few step-ups to 11 stories. This should be something light and airy. What happens to that recent, costly and over-long project blocking off the intersection of N Irving and Clarendon between Silver Diner and the Wells Fargo parking? Will it be razed after a few years? Is no one who makes these lavishly

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									wasteful decisions a resident of Arlington County, subject to its burdensome taxes? Arlington streets are already too dangerously blocked with abandoned rental scooters and bikes. Bike racks will not help. People drive and need a place to park. Residents in Ashton Heights and Lyon Park have enough trouble parking in front of their own homes. This will make it even harder. What Arlington does best is waste tax dollars, make life too expensive to live here for any but the wealthiest and then pretend it wants diversity. Pay attention to what you're permitting!
CM-19	Barbara Taylor	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	The density is too great for the site and deviates from the sector plan. The developers' proposed compensation (green building, preservation of facade) are not nearly enough to make up for what they're getting. What the developer proposes to give is well short of what is appropriate. On the one hand, they preserve the Joyce facade, but on the other hand, they violate the step back and sidewalk requirements of the sector plan. Again, more givebacks and exceptions for the developer with no real returns to the community. Four parking spaces for retail? Reduced loading space? Don't we have enough trouble filling and keeping ground floor retail across the county without making it impossible to park? What is the point of having a sector plan if the county agrees to virtually every deviation, with almost no compensating community benefit? So far as I can see, the developer gets increased density, decreased setbacks, encroachment on sidewalks, and inadequate parking in return for preservation of a facade. That makes absolutely no sense.
CM-20	Melissa Whitlock	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X		That seem like it will be towering over the sidewalk, reducing site lines and access to natural light. With increased density, and desire for more pedestrian friendly spaces, loss of any amount of sidewalk is unacceptable. Between people, dogs, strollers, small scooters for children, and accessible walkways for people with mobility issues, sidewalks should be widened, not narrowed! There is never enough space for parking, and reducing retail to 4 spaces is absurdly insufficient! I also doubt 144 spaces will be enough for all residents, staff, guests and other. What about mail trucks, deliveries (ie Amazon, fed ex, USPS) not to mention food deliveries. All of these are vehicles that will need to occupy space when delivering. The proposed parking is insufficient.
CM-21	David Summers	Community member or neighbor			X	X	X		The park, as envisioned in the GLUP is essential. I recently have made visits to densely-packed old Philadelphia and have experienced first hand how the many small parks there give life to the neighborhoods. Strangers become friends in the public spaces and children have a community. Clarendon already feels sterile in comparison. Do for people what the Clarendon Dog Park does for dogs! A walk down the block of Highland Street between the Phoenix and the Reserve shows what maximum building heights do to the feel of a place. The concept of "trading" additional height for some other presumed benefit doesn't ring true. I would like for Clarendon to remain a livable oasis

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>between the Rosslyn and Ballston mountain ranges. The "historic preservation" gambit is at best disingenuous. When the Joyce Motors Site Plan was introduced at an AHCA meeting, I asked the presenter why the apartments didn't have balconies. The answer was "They would be too expensive." What I heard was "they would be unprofitable." Balconies bring the outdoors in and bring people out. (Balconies are a key plot point for a 1930s Danish public housing project in the PBS series "Summer Hotel") At least keep the build-to-line requirement. It isn't a surprise to the people who made the plans.</p>
CM-22	Deena Ackerman	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	<p>This building is too big. The additional height makes this massive structure even more massive. The setbacks from the curbs, permitted or not, are insufficient to support reasonable greenspace and healthy trees. It will be crowded and frustrating to walk past this building and the echo will be intense. They want height? Maybe ask for a serious amount of housing and amenities appropriate for families, instead of just one-bedroom apartments suitable for high earning 20-somethings. The Joyce sign is nice. IT IS ABSOLUTELY NOT WORTH THE PRICE WE ARE BEING ASKED TO PAY FOR THE SIGN. See below. We could also put the sign on the building without giving up precious sidewalk by moving things a foot or two back. We just won a platinum award for walkability. Let us continue to build in a way that enhances this. The building is not in keeping with the style of other buildings. It is ugly, and industrial without any Mid-Century or Art Deco. Even the Joyce sign won't help. The Joyce sign is nice: ABSOLUTELY NOT WORTH THE PRICE WE ARE BEING ASKED TO PAY FOR IT. There is no need whatsoever to give a variance for a smaller sidewalk in crowded Clarendon. We could put the sign on the building without giving up precious sidewalk. We just won a platinum award for walkability. Let us continue to build in a way that enhances this. A 6 foot sidewalk is ridiculous. Too small for two handicapped people to pass. Too small for a stroller when someone leaves a random scooter. We are already short of parking. 4 spaces of retail is not useful at all and a laughable amount of spots. 4 spaces suggests a lack of commitment to retail and a desire on the part of the builder to avoid putting a service provider into that space. In this modern world of COVID, with relatively well-to-do residents, there will not be that many households without cars. That .58 isn't feasible. It squanders a good opportunity. We as a county are debating the missing middle proposal. In it you ask me to contemplate allowing builders more freedom under a mistaken belief that with this freedom they will build more family housing. Yet, here on this choice block, when in a position to ask for something, you are making concessions to a builder who plans 50% one-bedrooms. Here is an opportunity to use some leverage to create "middle" housing and the county is not. Much less disruptive than wholesale zoning elimination.</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
CM-23	Nikia Bergan	Community member or neighbor			X		X		I don't think preserving the Joyce Motors sign is worth any other concessions on the facade. Would prefer to ensure that sidewalks are widened to accommodate increased foot traffic. That corner is already tricky for pedestrians.
CM-24	Seth Caplan	Community member or neighbor				X	X		Would like to see sidewalk space added not removed. Not enough parking for retail or residents. More parking needs to be added.
CM-25	Brenda Dean	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X		X	Please explain where these residents will park. Arlington (Clarendon - Ballston) is now being over developed and will soon resemble cavernous, characterless places like Rosslyn, Chevy Chase, Bethesda, Crystal City, etc. The County Board and developers keep pushing limits on density and height. This short-sighted greed is killing the community for those who moved to Arlington because it did not resemble those other places. This building design in another cash "box" and pocket liner for investors and those swayed to approve it. This is the most laughable attempt at historic preservation. Say farewell to Arlington. We simply do not need any more taller buildings in the area. This design is cold and characterless and does not invite human interaction with the site or any natural elements. It appears as though they are trying to build a big box store in the heart of Clarendon. The sad thing is that some version of this cookie cutter development/building will get built and developers will continue to profit off razing what made this area appealing to begin with. The number of parking spots for retail and benefit to the rest of the community is insufficient. When will enough be enough? Taking away the sight lines, sky, green space, historic buildings and character of Arlington has ruined it for generations to come. Where are the benefits for residents? Certainly not lower taxes or more pleasant living. Who really benefits?
CM-26	George Brazier	Community member or neighbor		X		X			I agree with the proposal. I favor additional density. Sounds good. I agree with reduced parking.
CM-27	Elizabeth Collaton	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	I object to the proposed building. First of all, it is ugly as sin. A giant concrete block next to our beautiful neighborhood. No balconies. No green space. No regard for knitting this building into our neighborhood. It is a monstrosity of concrete and lack of imagination. Further, what about parking? Are we on Irving Street to absorb the overflow? What is 'retail equivalent'? Oh, let me guess. Another tanning salon? You people are pathetic at your jobs. Looks like Tyson's Corner. It looks like a prison. What about the county's concern for so-called missing middle housing is satisfied by this building? You would never approve something like this further north in Arlington. Your entire approach is mass all of these undesirable land uses in our neighborhoods, allowing those in North Arlington to be completely



Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>unaffected. Okay, this is a joke. Does the developer get some kind of break by incorporating design from a auto repair shop? Seriously? In 25 years when everyone is driving electric cars, this will seem a quaint if not stupid concession to the developers. Nice work. Please explain what justifies reducing sidewalk width? This is a very walkable neighborhood. People with strollers, people in wheelchairs, people on scooters -- you're just stupid to make the sidewalks narrower. Who does that serve? Seriously? Four parking spaces for retail? How is this justified? And, yes, by all means, let's push to the future any discussion or study of the need for bicycle facilities and green space. Yes, please restrict the loading to the alleyway. Those of us in Lyon Park and Ashton Heights continue to absorb a disproportionate share of the COSTS associated with densifying Arlington -- a goal we all agree on as long as the costs are shared by ALL ARLINGTONIANS. But, you continue to push all of these developments into our neighborhood. It is unfair. We don't agree with your approach. Furthermore, we all believe you are completely out of step with the need to develop in an eco-conscious manner. You seem to want to take us back to the 1950s.</p>
CM-28	Paul Randolph	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>The plan may be consistent with sector plan but does not include enough commercial space on the ground floor. It only has commercial space on the 10th street side and none on Irving. The residential space on Irving appears to be only studio apartments which would be unattractive and not utilized well. It would be advised to add additional commercial space on Irving. The step back on 10th street does not meet the 10 ft setback on the corner with preserved Joyce motor building. A larger area of frontage is needed on 10th with a more gradual step back. The precedent of this building will impact the two other developments on this block. Where are the details of for "affordable house" to be included into the building design? Has the plan set aside two &amp; three bedroom units for families who need affordable housing? Where are the details? The proposed deviation from the site plan is unacceptable. Why establish a plan for to immediately ask for a deviation? 10th street should become a more frequently used pedestrian area and to include a reduction in the width of the sidewalk would be a negative for creating an improved pedestrian experience. The historic preservation should start at the build to line, not exceed it. Allowing for only 144 spaces for a 241 unit building that also has commercial space is unacceptable and will lead to more congestion on the surrounding neighborhood streets. The design needs to be changed to include a minimum of one space for each residential unit and more than four spaces for commercial space. In addition, the availability of electric car charging stations in the parking area should be mandatory, along with secure bike storage. The architectural design of the building is uninspired. It is a white plain building with limited external design traits that would be memorable. The design plan for this project proposes</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									several changes to the sector plan? E.g. reduce sidewalk space, reduce setback over historic preservation, increase height step back, limited off street parking and lack of details on affordable housing. These are a critical omission and needs to be included in the next version of this plan.
CM-29	John McEvilly	Community member or neighbor	X		X	X			This is a great residential location. The retail may be a little tough here since it is not a highly traveled pedestrian location. Looks very nice and efficient. Nicely done by the architecture team. Easy access to Metro will compliment the low parking ratio. This is a tremendous upgrade to the current use of this site, which presently has a messy industrial look.
CM-30	Cathy Miller	Community member or neighbor	X		X	X	X	X	I believe that the open/green space/park that was identified in the Clarendon GLUP on this or an adjacent parcel must be built. Adding 241 dwelling units without a speck of public green space is not a reasonable way to develop this property. The request to reduce sidewalk widths should not be granted. This is a heavily traveled corridor. The bike lanes should be added at this time. Moving that part of the plan to some future date is unacceptable. The proposed "community benefits" to justify a near doubling of FAR are mighty thin. While the project will be significantly more profitable the benefits to the neighborhood are not clear. The public art component is not shown, the sidewalks are not as requested, the affordable housing component is not enumerated, while the building may meet sustainable guidelines it is not an attractive addition to the area. The benefits do not begin to justify the bonus density. The Joyce Motors facade is of limited historic value. It is, however, the only part of this building that has any personality at all. The rest of the structure is just a boxy block. The setback and taper of the building is minimal, for the most part the structure goes straight up to a height well above the Sector Plan specification. The request to reduce sidewalk widths should not be granted. This is a heavily traveled corridor and should meet the County's recommendation. If these most heavily traveled routes immediately adjacent to Metro do not meet the recommended width where will the County enforce the recommendations? The bike lanes should be added at this time. Moving that part of the plan to some future date is unacceptable. The new alley will be a much needed route to move traffic into this parking garage without backing up 10th Street. The proposed parking spaces in this plan are UNACCEPTABLE. At present, 92% of Arlington households own at least one vehicle. This building will not begin to have the number of spaces needed for its residents. The excess vehicles will be parked in the already crowded neighboring streets. Look at car ownership data on adjacent residential parcels, it is much higher than .58/unit. Overall, this project gives up too much density for too little payback! If the developer is not prepared to put in sidewalks of recommended width, parking to accommodate the residents - including loading and delivery spaces - and the very small retail footprint [so small as to barely call this mixed use] then it should revert to its by right size of 100 fewer

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									residential units. The County simply must do a better job negotiating on behalf of the citizens.
CM-31	Kyle Bogaert	Community member or neighbor		X			X		Additional residential density is neither welcome nor unwelcome in the neighborhood. Continued building up of the neighborhood will likely exacerbate an already difficult intersection and drain on community resources. The density and height seem in line with the neighborhood and I would NOT favor expanding it. 10th Street is already difficult and unappealing as a pedestrian (and the intersection with Wilson Blvd. can be scary to cross). Losing additional sidewalk along portions here would be a major detriment for walkability on an already tough street.
CM-32	Helana Neumann	Community member or neighbor				X			I have a strong objection to the limited parking available for the residential and retail units planned. It's not enough. Parking is hard enough in the Clarendon/Courthouse area. Please don't make it worse with this plan. Require more parking spaces for both the residential and retail units.
CM-33	David Bernstein	Community member or neighbor			X				Trying to preserve an old gas station is among the dumbest sorts of historic preservation. Tear it down if needed and otherwise forget it.
CM-34	Anonymous	Community member or neighbor	X						Put a park!
CM-35	William Murray	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	Fine with residential. Eliminate the ground floor retail. A dog-eared land use model in the corridor. And absent any info on its integration into the TCS Realty project, haphazard and sloppy public planning. Too dense. (Developer is all take and no give to get more density, as well.) Given serious issues with parking on offer, something has to give and it has to be by the developer. More residential parking. Step back gimmicky. Big block on the block design. This is silly. Get rid of it and don't facilitate the developer's bid for a density offset. Feeble historic preservation. Nothing historic about this existing property other than the sector plan designation. Trees on 10 Street a critical need. The build-to line deviation is just one more "take and no give" example. Need more "give" on this project. For e.g., the width of sidewalk and its impact on bike lanes not addressed by either the county or the developer. Poor planning. Too many deviations. The is one of the weakest parts of the development plan. More parking clearly needed. Poor planning to commit to this plan, as well, without integrating it into the TCS Realty project. Maybe not a train wreck but downside risks for sure given this planning flaw. The county should also be a bit more creative. What about electric charging stations for cars? What about positioning this site for the future? Think of 2049 rather than 1949.
CM-36	P. Olson	Community member or		X		X		X	Replaces small building with high building using too much of the lot. Too dense, too high, increases traffic in area. Too many Ubers lyfts and deliveries in an area that already has too much traffic.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		neighbor							Laughable- Sticking the facade of a historical landmark on the front of the hugh building is not historical preservation. Too much building, no green space, no open space. What about making a park? Increases traffic even with reduced parking. Makes those who want to park fight for a spot or look for street parking. Also increased Ubers, lyfts and deliveries (more double parked trucks vans and cars.). Too high, too dense, increases traffic too much.
CM-37	Laura Phillips	Community member or neighbor						X	This email arrived Friday, JUNE 24TH, after 3:45 pm!! Deadline is June 27th!! This happens regularly. Arlington Staff are NOT GIVING THE PUBLIC enough notice and time to comment on proposals. I am formally requesting more time. This has happened so much that I am contacting Cty Board Members. How did staff have the nerve to send out the email less than 3 days before the deadline to comment??? This is a frequent occurence.
CM-38	Phoebe Ramsey	Community member or neighbor	X					X	It seems there is no actual appetite for addressing Missing Middle as so few of the proposed residential units are 2 or 3 bedrooms. Additionally, affordable housing units should be required for this building (and not simply a cash contribution to other affordable housing projects).
CM-39	John Mueller	Community member or neighbor	X	X			X	X	The commercial areas of Arlington need more open space/green space and development of this site does not foster a healthier arlington. I oppose additional density at that location. A wide streetscape is a major factor in creating livable space. No loss of sidewalk width should be allowed. Rather than commercial use, if building is to be done on that site, it should be for moderate income families (3-4 bedroom units) at a pricepoint that can be met by a household income of 120-150,000\$/year.
CM-40	Jon Obenberger	Community member or neighbor	X	X		X	X		Land use is fine. The added density is not acceptable as proposed. Parking should be 1 parking space for every bonus unit developed above 3.0. We are fine is the builder doesnt want to build the extra parking and chooses not to build the project. There isnt enough set back along Wilson Blvd. The added density is not acceptable as proposed. Parking should be 1 parking space for every bonus unit developed in the added density above 3.0. The parking impacts on the adjoining neighborhoods will be severe. We are fine is the builder doesnt want to build the extra parking and chooses not to build the project. There isnt enough set back along Wilson Blvd. a 70' and 90' step back also needs to be provided on Wilson Blvd if added density is to be considered - it will be a canyon on Wilson Blvd. Reject developer's proposal. The developer should be made to provide the step back requirement on Wilson Blvd. as is being required on 10th Street. Sidewalk needs to remain 8' on N Irving and 12' on 10st N. This incroachment narrows the corridor and adds to the Canyon effect. We do not want the parking problems this development will place on neighborhood so the developer can only profit w/o developer building more parking. Reject developers proposal for reduced parking space. They should be required to build 1 parking space for every bonus unit approved in prjoect. Developer can easily

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									built more of underground parking. Neighborhood will live with parking problems for decades and developer will have taken profits are ran. Reject developers request. Build space on 10th for bike lanes. Reject request for reduced loading. Do not allow new 10th Road to connect to Wilson Blvd, this will be a high accident location.
CM-41	Gregory Wood	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	First, please note that I have reviewed all the materials on the project website. I have no comment on land use. The current proposal does not justify the requested additional density (nearly 2x specified by the sector plan) nor the variation from the setback requirement. The obligation is on the developer to meet the setback requirements along with other requirements such as historic preservation. These requirements should not be waived. Especially given the proposed overall height, the setbacks are critical to maintaining the human scale and pedestrian friendliness that is part of Clarendon's defining characteristic. No rational is provided about why the facades must protrude over the build-to line. Especially given the expected additional pedestrian traffic this, and other anticipated developments will generate--particularly implied by the request to reduce parking requirements--it seems unfathomable to reduce walkway width when we already can see in other parts of Clarendon with less density that similar widths are inadequate. Walkways should be included in this section consideration. Walking is a significant transportation mode-proximity to the metro is highlighted by the applicant as a key factor in several areas of the proposal. Reducing pedestrian walkways by 25% on a side seems like it would have a significant impact on transportation. Please provide more information about what "enhanced bicycle facilities" means, when they will be studied, and how they will be incorporated into this development. Why only 10 days for this public feedback period? This excludes anyone who might have taken a reasonable summertime vacation (2-week). Are there general guidelines about this kind of feedback period? Also, *all* submitted feedback should be posted so that all submitters can be assured their feedback was, in fact received. Finally, this format for feedback (e.g. structured by staff slides, 500 character max), is too restrictive. Providing feedback should not be like tweeting.
CM-42	Bernard Berne	Community member or neighbor			X		X	X	The relocated Joyce Motors facade will preserve its streamline moderne architecture. However, the remainder of the proposed structure will have no such architecture, creating discordancy. All parts of the structure need to contain streamline moderne elements, including prominent straight lines and, most importantly, curved corners. This would be consistent with the architecture of recent Clarendon buildings constructed on and near N. Highland Street between Wilson Blvd. and Washington Blvd. To support the County Board's 2017 Monarch Pledge, tree trenches must contain native plants that support pollinators. They should not contain wind-pollinated plants that do not support pollinators. Low fences or barriers should surround trenches to protect plants. Trenches should preferably

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									contain plantings of Common Milkweed ( <i>Asclepias syriaca</i> ). This is the only plant that grows well and survives in Arlington's natural areas and that reproducing Monarch butterflies prefer when laying eggs. The 4.1 submission contains a Conceptual Landscape Plan for the streetscape and four other areas within the project's site. To permit adequate public review, the Conceptual Landscape Plan should contain a plant list and illustrations that specify the locations, species, numbers, sizes and spacing of all plants, including ground covers and perennials. The plant list should only contain plants native to the U.S., much Common Milkweed and few or no grasses, sedges and other wind-pollinated plants. There is too little sustainability and biophilia to support LEED Gold. The roof and all ledges should have planters with native flowering vines that support pollinators. These will hang down or climb up the bare faces of the building (including the bare face near the southeast corner, above the Joyce Motors facade), the building's corners and between windows of residential floors. The Level 2 bioretention area should contain plantings for pollinators (no wind pollinated grasses and sedges).
CM-43	Deborah Hartman	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	Mention of contamination on site. What standards will be used to ensure this is decontaminated and who will ensure site is cleaned to those standards? What contaminants are present and how will cleanup be done? Proposal never defines GFA, FAR, HRI, SPRC. Easier for public review when key terms are defined. Says this will provide multifamily units. But only 20 percent are 2 bedrooms, and 5 percent three bedrooms. Seems geared to small units instead. Doesn't look like it fits with rest of neighborhood. What are mechanical pent house screening walls? Seems like a massive building. Maybe Clarendon will resemble NYC before long. Underground parking - is it free? 4 retail spaces doesn't seem enough. any zone 6 parking? Strongly suggest more green spaces, and not putting off "landscaped median" to the future, include it now. "community service contribution and affordable housing contribution" very vague... are these contributions instead of providing affordable housing in this building? what kind of community service and what value/dollar-wise. 75 percent are studios or one bedroom. geared to single professionals, not multi-family. we need a park and more affordable units. No one but the uber-wealthy will be able to live in this County.
CM-44	Charles Hernandez	Community member or neighbor				X	X		RIP to green space. Do not reduce pedestrian walkways! We already have so many people using scooters and other modes of transportation. Why? The developers are hardly providing anything unique for the community. What risk are they incurring on this project? Do not reduce parking. Zone 6 residents will be impacted by this decision.
CM-45	Dima Hakura	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X		I recommend that the County Board NOT approve additional density. The density for this site has already been increased and there is no benefit for the county or the community to increase density further. I recommend that the county board hold the development to one step-back of 10 feet. If

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									they wish to have a two step-back then the first step-back should be 10 feet and the second step-back should be in addition to that. For example a 10ft. step-back followed by an additional 5 ft., totally 15 ft. I have no problem with the two-tiers on the condition that the top part remain glass as depicted in the plans. Also, it is critical that the sidewalk width be maintained at 12 ft. all along and not be allowed to deviate under. As we have seen during Pandemic, sidewalks are essential and make a difference in outdoor seating and the economic vitality of the area. They also need to maintain ADA accessibility. Therefore, the County Board should NOT approve having the historic facade protrude over the build-to line! Parking and loading requirements should also NOT be reduced. This is where the community and the County Board gets into trouble in future years. Parking and load dock requirements need to be enforced. The sidewalk needs to be functional in allowing retail to possibly place tables or seating outside and allow for ADA accessibility as well as the green medians.
CM-46	Julie Mangis	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	Agree that the proposed land use is in keeping with Zoning and Sector Plan. Proposed FAR is nearly double the baseline. For this amount of additional density, the applicant needs to provide many more community benefits. I would like to see a significant number of affordable housing units in this building. I applaud staff for negotiating LEED bonus in keeping with new policy requirements. While stepbacks may meet the requirement, they are not sufficient to alleviate the massiveness of the proposed building. There is much work to do in SPRC. I am not in favor of the deviation. Applicant needs to modify the plan for incorporating the facade so that site meets the 10 foot stepback requirement and does not lose 2 feet of sidewalk on N. Irving Street and N. 10th Street. A loss of some GFA is not a tragedy for this applicant. As mentioned above, the loss of 2 feet of sidewalk on two sides is unacceptable. 10th Street is a very busy street and pedestrians need the safety and security of a broad sidewalk. Additionally, I foresee those garage doors in the Joyce Motors facade potentially serving to open the sidewalk for streetside dining. Move the facade back to accommodate pedestrians as well as a sidewalk cafe. Proposed parking/loading reductions are unacceptable. The impact will be felt in surrounding neighborhoods. Proposed number of retail parking spaces is inadequate to accommodate the workers coming to work in the retail, much less any customers. Where will commercial vehicles doing building maintenance park? At a very minimum, the ACZO requirements should be met. The developers is proposing 254 units in this building, 58% i-bedroom and 17% studios. That's 75% of the building devoted to mostly single individuals. Arlington County would benefit from more family housing. I would encourage the SPRC and staff to negotiate for more 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units. They are much needed.
CM-47	David Cheek	Community	X	X		X	X	X	On behalf of the Civic Association, issues are increased FAR, narrowed sidewalks, the reduction in

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
		member or neighbor							parking and the loading dock. Are the community benefits a fair exchange of value for bonus density? Why not use a proffer fee based on a mathematical formula for extra sq ft? There are concerns the County Board is ignoring the Civic Association in favor of developers unlike in the past when Market Common was built.
CM-50	Cynthia Connolly	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X			Hotel and mixed use. Need more hotels in this area. Smaller commercial spaces for more diversity of shop owners and offerings. [building massing] That seems fine, but if we keep on doing this we create huge dark canyons with buildings. Is this good? Like the step back. Adds character.. not some boring flat building. I like the Signage. Please consult a typographer who is aware of the history of fonts to use the RIGHT font, not Helvetica (not in existence in the 40's) or the Microsoft version Arial. (Please do NOT use a Microsoft font for the sign) Would be great if the sign was back lit neon. Or exposed neon. NOT LED back lit. LED lights have a different color spectrum and are not as soothing and accurate to the time period. Please use enameled steel facade. Like enhanced bicycle-- we REALLY NEED THIS. Like the parking and loading from alley. Not sure how many units there are, but seems like not enough parking. Retail parking always is an issue. reduced loading space means that loading will start at the crack of dawn and be noisy.. is that good? Sounds like What I remember of being in NYC and why I never wanted to live in a city.
CM-51	Robert Wood	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X	X	I oppose the size of this building. The 70' stepback is so narrow as to be completely meaningless. Additionally, the Sector Plan calls for lower heights near Clarendon metro (as opposed to Courthouse or Va. Sq.). I know that the county staff recently rammed through changes to the successful sector plan, but it's still a bad idea. Lower step backs would be preferable, to better interface with the lower-rise buildings on 10th, and the residential neighborhood behind. The loss of sidewalk is unacceptable. We need to balance developers' desires with the needs of people who actually live in the neighborhood. Clarendon is an extremely pedestrian-heavy neighborhood, and there are already lots of choke points where outdoor seating from restaurants encroach on mobility. We don't need to add to the problem. The parking reduction is unfortunate for such a large building. Regardless of proximity to metro, many people in our neighborhood have cars, even people in apartment buildings. They also have guest parking needs. Our street parking is already in short supply. What community benefit is the developer offering for their increased density and reduced parking? A median? To be landscaped sometime in the future? That's a terrible deal, and our neighborhood deserves better.
CM-52	Jeanne Williams	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X		The building is too high and too dense with no visual interest. There are no balconies to break up the building. It is right on the street and creates a canyon look for 10th St and N. Irving St. This is not at all the urban village look that neighbors supported during the clarendon sector plan. The loss of sidewalk



Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									is not at all consistent with the walkable, urban village we support in arlington. This is a very busy area with many pedestrians. The sidewalks should be wider and the building should not be right on the street. I support the new alley. It is laughable that the builder will only proved 4 parking spaces for retail. There is no way that is enough. This project is a huge disappointment. It's an ugly massive grey block encroaching on the street and providing little green space or positive street aesthetic. It is too high and does not incorporate the visual setbacks supported by neighbors. This is not the type of project we want in the urban village of clarendon.
CM-53	Oleg Bulshteyn	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X		The building height is fine, however, consider adding balconies to some of the larger apartments. I personally will not be interested in renting an apartment in this building without a balcony. Finally, the proper apartment sound insulation will have to be provided to reduce both the outdoor (due to traffic, aircraft, etc.) and indoor (due to walking/running upstairs, etc.) noise. Adequate greenery will have to be planted around the building perimeter as well as some seating. please make sure the parking spaces are wide and comfortable for the residents to park in. Also, several visitor parking spots will need to be provided.
CM-54	Melissa Riggio	Other Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member (PRC)		X		X	X		I strongly approve of additional density for this project. I am not a fan of the loss of sidewalk space. Is there a way to mitigate this or build a sidewalk addition that does not result in loss of pedestrian space? I support the enhanced bicycle facilities idea, as we are working towards a more bike-friendly Arlington and need to consider that in any transportation plans.
CM-55	Monique	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X				I would like to see this land used as green space. NO further development AT ALL. I would like ABSOLUTELY NO increased height or density to any structure placed on this site. I find these suggestions unacceptable as this is not historic preservation at all. For historic preservation please preserve the original building and use the interior as a museum on historic Arlington. In other words, keep the original building. All unacceptable. I have watched with horror and dread as the Clarendon area has been built up and built up and built up endlessly over the past twenty years. For me and many others, the busyness of life and the confusing and seemingly endless bureaucratic processes associated with this were barriers to becoming more informed or more involved. So I've watched with a sense of powerlessness as the community has been devoured by the County's "development". It has gone much too far. Leave this alone please.
CM-56	Alexander Rhodes	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X		Maximize height and density to the greatest extent possible. Those living in Clarendon did it for the walkability/urban density that an underground metro station can offer will still living in VA. If you're seeking drab suburban sprawl with a strip mall within a 10 minute drive then live in Woodbridge.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									Understood that there's little flexibility when dealing w/ properties already listed on the HRI. That being said, there are very few bldgs in Arlington from the post-WW2 construction boom that have any historic significance. Joyce Motors is the perfect example of "just because it's old doesn't mean it's historic". Like much of Arlington's post-WW2 boom residential units, they were lazily built on the cheap. Which I don't blame anyone for at the time but they're certainly not prized to maintain. Support the decreased sidewalk distance. Support the alley construction.
CM-57	Alistair Watson	Community member or neighbor						X	I support.
CM-58	Paula Bryan	Community member or neighbor			X	X	X		What kinds of businesses could possibly be established in this building with only 4 commercial parking spaces? What facilities are in the commercial spaces to attract particular types of tenants. Clarendon already has a lot of ground level commercial space that has been vacant for years. The apartment building proposed to replace Joyce Motors is, in my view, an unattractive generic white monolith, designed to get as much money out of its cubic footage as possible. I see nothing in the design that connects it to the wider neighborhood or community or architectural styles; it could just as easily be placed next to the Dulles Toll Road. Nothing in the building design redeems the fact that it is a white blockish monolith. If the design was meant to echo the the tile facade of Joyce motors, then it was done with limited imagination. The limited setbacks block light & make the transition to a neighborhood with single family homes very abrupt. I do not think the county should approve the building design. Really? design elements & landscaping? There is nothing thoughtful, warm or engaging about this building exterior. The facade is cold looking, and the limited space for vegetation or even walking or seating makes this building quite uninviting. The nearby ARC building at 3409 Wilson Blvd had insufficient parking because the "commercial" spaces were always occupied by maintenance vans & owners' multiple cars. This will not be any different in this building: Arlington county's "car-free" vision is aspirational, not actual. There is no parking for visitors or maintenance vehicles. N Irving will find excess vehicles competing for on-street parking: already, in the 500 block of N. Irving, metro riders parking on a regular basis.
CM-59	John Spilsbury	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	I support the retail requirements, but believe that offering additional public parking would be an important public benefit as part of the bonus density contributions. First, the developer's proposals calling for significant height and density increases (above 3.0 FAR) require providing commensurate community benefits. It's vital that the SPRC carefully review options for these public benefits and

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>what the developers will have to do to achieve them. This is a missed opportunity to create a more inviting streetscape by preserving the Joyce Facade in its current location. Preserving the facade in place would also provide much needed open space -- thus helping to offset the impact of increased density and heights. Retaining the existing setback would make 10th Street more inviting by preserving light and openness and offer environmental benefits through increased Tree Canopy and permeable surfaces. The loss of sidewalk width should be closely evaluated for its impact on pedestrians. It also needs to be reviewed in view of plans for creating a protected bike path along 10th Street. Four dedicated parking spaces are inadequate to service the retail elements of the proposal. The County should share its projections of anticipated demand for parking and consider options – including requesting the developer to provide additional publicly accessible parking as a public benefit. This takes on added urgency in light of the proposed elimination of parking capacity envisioned nearby on Fairfax Drive. The priority for public benefits should be contributions to quality, open space. My two requests for the SPRC are: 1. to explore installing a small pocket park along the Irving Street frontage as a substitute for the prior step-back requirements. Mostly, this could be a seating/area in a protected spot (so, indented into the building). 2) Tree canopy in this part of Clarendon is inadequate. Please focus on improving nearby tree canopy coverage such as on the closed-off section of Irving.</p>
CM-60	M. Bucell	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	<p>Land use seems valid, but I'd mention that to go along with the historic preservation, it feels like the retail here would be best served as a space for smaller businesses owned and operated by those in our community. It's unclear that what is being offered to gain the extra FAR is worth the strain on the neighborhood. Most of the housing proposed appears to be expensive, single-person housing; our crisis and need is to support families and low- middle-income individuals, which the excess number of studios / 1 bedrooms in the building does not address. Given the reasons stated, relocating the facade is not ideal but acceptable. However, the two setbacks do seem to hide and take away from the focus on the historical facade in the renderings, and would prefer a single setback to better highlight the facade. I worry about losing 2 feet of sidewalk here. This is already a common pedestrian route, and those 2 feet can mean the difference between two people being able to walk on the same sidewalk in opposing directions or one being pushed into the street. Additionally, with the lack of parking, the sidewalk also needs to accommodate grocery carts for residents and retail-patrons, people using mobility devices, strollers, etc, and that 2ft is needed to safely and sustainably support that traffic. I worry the reduced loading space will lead to overflow in the already narrowed sidewalks. Additionally, the lack of non-resident parking is worrisome in that Arlington's North/South public transport is weak</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									and residents who rely on buses instead of metro will be unable to access the retail or visit residents if they drive and can't park.
CM-61	Douglas Williams	Community member or neighbor	X	X	X	X	X	X	The only issue here [land use] is that having 4 parking spots for retails is hardly in the spirit of having a robust mixed use project. The lack of retail parking makes me think the developer is not serious about the retail space being utilized. More parking spots should be dedicated for retail parking. The building is a massive, uninteresting gray block, particularly on 10th and Irving with no step backs, no balconies, nothing visually interesting. It does not have an urban village feel, more like a city canyon straight up. There are no architectural features that enhance the streetscape or is welcoming to pedestrians. We can do much better than this for something that will likely stand of 50+ years. The use of the Joyce motors facade is nice, but the step backs above the facades should be large to be the building a feel of less mass. The walkway width should be maintained, there is no good reason to reduce the walkways be 2 feet. 4 retail spaces is insufficient, more retail parking needs to be allocated. The alley is a good addition, but it must be maintained - is the county going to take responsibility for maintaining the alley. Cash contributions for affordable housing instead of affordable units in the building is disappointing. If we are serious about affordable housing, it should be integrated with at market housing instead of set off to itself. Additionally, this build has a large percentage of 1Br units and studios. These are not desirable for families. Overall this is a severely insufficient design presented. If this is approved, the county should be ashamed of itself. This building can be done much better.
CM-62	Brooke Alexander	Community member or neighbor	X		X	X	X	X	Main pedestrian path from Ashton Heights is along Irving Street. Hope there would be more retail along Irving street. Also sitting area more successful if along Irving. see comments below. The community benefits should include contribution to the park that hopefully will be built across the street on 10th Street. What are the facilities that will be on the roof (concern: noise into neighborhood)? I like the protrusion of the historic facade from the main face of the building, which gives it extra emphasis. And the combination of the two setbacks which total 10 ft is acceptable to me in order to accommodate the developers requirement of interior clear height. However, this protruded portion of the building results in a narrowed sidewalk, as well as the whole front of the building being 2 feet closer to the street. This protrusion into the public space should not be allowed. Move it back. Would like more detail on the landscaping particulars although it is not required at this point in the process. With limited landscaping I believe that all the plants should be those that will support out ecosystem. Thus would hope that all landscaping will be native plant material, and the pure species (not cultivars). Two trees on 10th st and 5 on Irving are insufficient. Need more. Irving is major pedestrian route for Ashton Heighters, and shade trees very helpful for pedestrian comfort.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									unclear what the enhanced bicycle facilities are (bicycle lane?/bicycle parking?)t I believe that anything affecting the public right of way should be discussed together, so that trade offs can be made up front rather than backed into. I do not support reduced parking. And I believe more space is needed for retail. Discussion of reduced loading space needed. Also, since Joyce and Bingham are cojoined in some manner, would like to discuss possibility of shared underground parking for the block. Pictured is outdoor eating along 10th St. 10th is not a pleasant street to sit along. Although there is outdoor seating on the south side of Irving that is used, it is in the shade since it is on the north side of the building. Sitting along 10th Street on the south side of Joyce will be unpleasant in this climate. More successful to put the seating along the east side of the building, and even better to make it protected by some indentation into the building.Synergistic with the 10th st park.
CM-63	B. K.	Other: Arlington County resident		X		X	X		I strongly support the increase in residential density at this site. Please do not reduce the sidewalk width. I strongly support the proposed parking reduction and loading space reduction. The intersection at 10th and Irving needs better traffic controls than the present flashing crosswalk. Preferably an all-way stop, or maybe a traffic light. It does not feel safe to cross 10th Street at this intersection, either on foot or bike, even with the lights flashing at the crosswalk. Too many drivers either ignore it or bully individuals trying to cross.
CM-64	Toby McIntosh	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	I live in Lyon Park with a direct view of Joyce Motors just a block away. As a resident for 40 years I have never had any illusions that the area would not be developed. And in general I support high density building near the metro corridor. That said, I think this proposed building is bulky and fails to conform to the "urban village" goals of the Clarendon Sector Plan. The proposed wall on 10th in particular is the first step in creating an tunnel along a much-used pedestrian way. Sadly, the building seems to lack any architectural creativity. The preservation of the Joyce façade is laudable, but considering the minimal effort needed to move the ceramic panels I wonder if the bonus density is not overly generous. I agree that the use of the façade should not justify taking up more sidewalk space. Also, I wonder if the Joyce Motor façade signage will be interrupted/superseded by any other signage on that corner. (But Joyce Motors would be a good name for a restaurant. :-). Also, on the bonus for affordable housing. Perhaps I am missing it, the documents I see don't clarify what the applicant is doing to meet this requirement. The lack of sufficient multi-bedroom units is a telling deficiency. And as an aside, I think the county's summary document, while succinct, is unclear for those who are not conversant with the relevant acronyms. I think a transparency review of how such materials are done is warranted. Near as I can tell, there is almost no parking for retail. Surely a weakness that will put pressure on the adjoining neighborhoods, already heavily impacted by development. I hope that the

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Land Use	Building Massing/Height	Architecture/HP	Transportation	Streetscapes & Landscaping	Other	Community Comments
									<p>prohibition on apartment residents obtaining neighborhood parking permits will be applied. Good luck to the County in getting a higher LED standard. The developer should be aiming higher. The alleyway is a necessity. Finally, please review the application with regard to architectural lighting. This element is usually in the fine print, and is a surprise to neighbors (as it was for 10th St.Flats.) Also, question the very large "Sign" shown in the illustration on the 10th street side, surely not a necessity for an apartment building.</p>