

Site Plan Review Committee
Summary of Online Engagement Comments
Leckey Gardens – 2031 N. Woodrow Street

Project Contacts

SPRC Chairs

Eric Berkey
eberkey@commissions.arlingtonva.us
Paola Amodeo
pamodeo@commissions.arlingtonva.us

County Staff

CPHD Planner
Krissy Walentisch
kwalentisch@arlingtonva.us

DES Planner
Sergio Viricochea
sviricochea@arlingtonva.us

Applicant

True Ground Housing Partners
Jordi Fabian
jfabian@truegroundhousing.org

Represented by Venable LLP
Zachary Williams
zwilliams@venable.com

Site Plan Project Information

Project Name: [Leckey Gardens](#) (RPC# 07-010-001, -002)

Items Requested: GLUP Amendment, Rezoning, and New Site Plan

Engagement Session: October 23 – November 2, 2025

Review Focus Topics: Land Use & Density; Site Design; Building Height, Form, & Architecture; Transportation; and Open Space, Landscaping, & Sustainability



VIEW FROM N WOODSTOCK STREET

About this Document

This document contains comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee's (SPRC) Online Engagement opportunity for the Leckey Gardens project. A total of 83 participants provided comments during the Online Engagement Opportunity period between October 23 and November 2, 2025. The feedback results and summary to common topics can be found below. All comments beyond the review focus topics are categorized as "Other".

Feedback Results

- [Feedback form](#)
- [All Participants](#)
- [SPRC Members](#)
- [Other Board, Commission, or Committee Member](#)
- [Community Members](#)

Summary to 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 in order to provide an overview of the common themes and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual participant.

- **Land Use & Density**

Participants were supportive of a residential use in this location. The fact that the project is 100% affordable housing was also well received. A few participants commented that the building should contain ground-floor retail. The aspect of the project that received the overall most comments is the proposed building height and density. Although a significant number of participants noted that the proposed density was appropriate, the majority of commentors expressed strong opposition to the level of increased density at this location, as they believe it will overwhelm the community and will negatively impact neighborhood character and local infrastructure, such as streets, schools, and parks.

- **Site Design**

Comments regarding site design were mixed, with participants either supportive of the proposed design or in opposition of the proposal, citing that the proposed building footprint is too large. The location of the greenway on the southern portion of the site was supported by most, noting that it provided a transition to the single-family houses to the south.

- **Building Height, Form, & Architecture**

Similar to the opposition received regarding density, the proposed building height was strongly opposed by a majority of commentors, many of whom called for maximum building heights of 7 to 8 stories rather than the proposed 10 stories. With that said, many other commentors noted their support for the proposed building height. A few comments called for increased building height. In regard to building form, many found the proposal appropriate, with a couple comments calling for increased tapering and step-backs. No positive comments were received regarding the proposed architecture. Comments that were received noted that the facades are boring, do not fit with the human scale, and do not fit with the neighborhood context.

- **Transportation**

The largest transportation issue expressed by participants was concern for increased vehicular congestion surrounding the site and concern for pedestrian safety. There were also concerns that there is not enough bus service in this area to support increased density. The majority of participants noted that the proposed streetscapes are sufficient, although many other commentors indicated that they did not think they are sufficient, and that the building footprint is too large and the proposed landscaping is inadequate.

- **Parking & Loading**

While some believed the amount of parking is appropriate given the proposed use and nearby transit options, most participants feel it is insufficient and will negatively impact on-street parking availability in the area. Generally, participants were receptive to the fact that the applicant plans to relocate the

parking access to N. Woodrow Street from N. Woodstock Street and consolidate the parking garage entrances into one. A couple of comments called for the relocation of the loading access to N. Woodrow Street.

- **Open Space, Landscaping, & Sustainability**

The majority of participants noted that the proposed greenway, open space, and landscaping are appropriate. However, several others called for an increase either to the open space in general, or to the greenway. Several comments requested that green roofs and/or a green wall be added to the project. A couple of comments called for the provision of additional pollinator species on the proposed landscape plan. Additional comments called for increased biophilia within aspects of the project. A comment was also made noting the desire to see a higher LEED certification level achieved above that of the current proposal of LEED Silver.

- **Other**

A few comments were received voicing concern over the impact to the school systems the increased density would have on the County. Comments were also received inquiring about the tenant relocation plan for the current Leckey Gardens residents. Last, two comments were receiving citing concerns over construction and impacts to quality of life during redevelopment.