

Site Plan Review Committee

Summary of Online Engagement Comments

Kensington Elder Care—4500 Langston Blvd (SPLN25-00005)

Project Contact:

SPRC Chairs:

Paola Amodeo
pamodeo@commissions.arlingtonva.us

Tenley Peterson
tpeterson@commissions.arlingtonva.us

County Staff Contact:

CPHD Planner
Peter Schulz
pschulz@arlingtonva.us

DES Planner
Bryce Johnson
bjohnson1@arlingtonva.us

Applicant Contact:

Tad Lunger
Arlington Land Use Group
tadlunger@arlingtonlandusegroup.com

Site Plan Project Information

Project Name: Kensington Elder Care—4500 Langston Blvd

Items Requested: General Land Use Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Major Site Plan Amendment

Online Engagement Opportunity: May 18-June 1, 2026

Review Focus Topics: Land Use & Density, Site Design & Layout, Building Height, Form & Architecture, Parking & Loading, Transportation, Open Space & Landscaping, Green Building & Sustainability



About this Document

This document contains comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee's (SPRC) Online Engagement Opportunity for the [Kensington Elder Care site plan at 4500 Langston Boulevard](#). A total of 75 different respondents provided over 348 comments during the Online Engagement Opportunity period between May 18-June 1, 2026. The feedback results and summary of common topics can be found below.

Feedback Results

- Feedback Form
- All Participants
- SPRC Members
- Other Board, Commission, or Committee Members
- Community Members

Summary of Common Topics

Below are common topics or themes received through the online engagement session that were identified by County staff. Please note that the topics have been summarized to provide an overview of the common themes or remarks and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual respondent.

1. Land Use & Density

Many respondents expressed concerns that the proposed density is too high for the site and represents overdevelopment that is inconsistent with neighborhood character. A substantial portion of commenters questioned the tradeoffs being made (e.g., additional density for LEED certification), while others supported the elder care use and noted the need for increased housing for an aging population. Overall sentiment leaned negative, with a smaller but notable group expressing support for additional density if thoughtfully planned.

2. Site Design and Layout

Many respondents feel the site design does not adequately integrate with the surrounding street network and places too much emphasis on certain frontages while limiting accessibility alongside others. A significant number of commenters raised concerns about traffic flow, loss of green space, and the configuration of streets and public areas, while some supported narrower streets and traffic calming measures. Overall sentiment was mixed but trended negative, with more concerns about functionality and connectivity than support.

3. Building Height, Form and Architecture

Many respondents believe the building is too tall and out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood, citing concerns about shadows, neighborhood character, and overall massing. A smaller group supported the proposed height or even encouraged greater height to increase housing supply, while others focused on improving architectural quality and pedestrian experience. Overall sentiment was predominantly unfavorable, with consistent concerns about height, bulk, and compatibility.

4. Parking, Loading & Transportation

Many respondents expressed concern about both too much and too little parking, reflecting differing priorities between reducing car dependence and maintaining accessibility for residents, visitors, and retail. A large number highlighted potential spillover parking, impacts to nearby businesses, and challenges for employees and emergency vehicles, while some advocated for reducing parking in favor of transit and active transportation. Overall sentiment was mixed but leaned negative, with widespread concern about how parking is balanced and managed.

Many respondents raised concerns about increased traffic congestion, unsafe pedestrian conditions, and insufficient off street pick up and drop off and emergency vehicle access. A number of commenters emphasized the importance of improving pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure, while others doubted the adequacy of existing transit options for this use. Overall sentiment was largely unfavorable, with recurring concerns about safety, circulation, and traffic impacts. The loss of parking on North Upton Street was a concern of several commenters.

5. Landscaping

Many respondents feel the plan does not provide sufficient open space, tree cover, or meaningful landscaping to offset the level of development. Several commenters emphasized the loss of greenery and the need to address heat island effects, while a smaller group appreciated the inclusion of street trees. Overall sentiment was mostly negative, with strong calls for more robust and visible open space elements.

6. Green Building and Sustainability

Many respondents appreciated their commitment to LEED Gold and sustainable design, but questioned whether these measures justify the increased density or adequately address broader environmental impacts. Several commenters raised concerns about emissions related to car dependence and the lack of emphasis on stormwater management and holistic sustainability. Overall sentiment was mixed but somewhat skeptical, with cautious support paired with calls for stronger environmental performance.

7. Other Comments

Additional comments recommended committed affordable units or some sort of program for the applicant to also cater to the less-affluent.