



## ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

**County Board Agenda Item  
Meeting of June 12, 2010**

**DATE:** June 10, 2010

**SUBJECT:** Request to Advertise public hearings of the Planning Commission and County Board to consider adoption of the East Falls Church Area Plan.

**C.M. RECOMMENDATION:**

Authorize the advertisement of public hearings by the Planning Commission on June 28, 2010, and the County Board on July 10, 2010, to consider adoption of the East Falls Church Area Plan.

**ISSUES:** This is a request to advertise public hearings for the adoption of the East Falls Church Area Plan, which was prepared by the East Falls Church Planning Task Force (the Task Force). The draft Plan is continuing to undergo staff and citizen review. Staff will work to address all comments that are received and provide alternative recommendations, if needed, for County Board consideration. However, there is agreement between staff and the Task Force on most of the recommendations in the Plan.

**SUMMARY:** In June 2007, the Arlington County Board appointed a citizen Task Force charged with a mission to “generate a vision for transit-oriented development in the East Falls Church area of Arlington County.” This vision takes the form of a concept plan with guidance that focuses on the East Falls Church Metro parking lot and other sites that are likely to redevelop. The East Falls Church Area Plan, which has been developed by the Task Force, addresses key planning issues including height and density, land uses, urban design, affordable housing, transportation improvements, open space and environmental sustainability. A major component of this Plan is a comprehensive transportation analysis for the East Falls Church area, including a portion of the City of Falls Church. Since the scope of the transportation analysis includes both jurisdictions, the Plan was developed in coordination with the City of Falls Church.

It is important to note that the Request to Advertise is the first step toward County Board consideration of the Plan and that authorizing the advertisement does not imply County Board support for the Plan.

County Manager: MB

County Attorney: RAM

Staff: Richard Tucker, DCPHD, Planning Division  
Richard Hartman, DES, Transportation Planning Bureau  
Bridget Obikoya, DES, Traffic Engineering and Operations Division

39.

**BACKGROUND:** The East Falls Church Area Plan, which is a document developed by the Task Force with assistance from staff, is the culmination of a nearly three year planning process initiated by a 20-member citizen task force comprised of residents from area civic associations, representatives of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), Arlington County advisory boards and commissions, and several at-large members. Since 2005, the Arlington-East Falls Church Civic Association (AEFCCA) has requested additional planning for the area, understanding that changes at the Metrorail station and system could lead to additional development pressure for sites near the station. Four members of the AEFCCA were appointed to the Task Force by the County Board.

Previous Plans: As reference, the Task Force reviewed several studies of the East Falls Church area that have been prepared over the years, including the East Falls Church Land Use Study (1986); which included policy guidelines and recommendations for the East Falls Church Metro Station Area. The stated planning goals for the area in the 1986 Study were “(1) the preservation of residential neighborhoods, (2) the enhancement of convenience service commercial uses, and (3) the coordination of new development near the County line with the style and scale of new development in the City of Falls Church”. At the same time, General Land Use Plan designations were changed to “Low” Office-Apartment-Hotel for sites along Lee Highway and Westmoreland Street. In 1987, an ad-hoc committee of residents from Arlington and the City of Falls Church developed recommendations for the area that included better coordination of efforts between the two jurisdictions and increased focus on preserving the Four Mile Run stream.

The 2002 East Falls Church Metro Access Study, which was conducted by the WMATA, identified improvements that could enhance access to the station and also evaluated several redevelopment scenarios for the Park & Ride lot. The redevelopment scenarios, which included mixed-use development on the site and increasing the number of commuter parking spaces from 422 surface spaces to up to 1,000 garage spaces, examined both the impact on revenue (to WMATA) and the impact on traffic of each scenario. No actions were taken by WMATA as a result of this study, and it was not forwarded to the County Board for formal review.

In June of 2004, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University’s (“Virginia Tech”) Department of Urban Affairs and Planning prepared the East Falls Church Metro Area Plan, the most detailed plan to date. As part of a studio project, students and faculty worked closely with the Arlington-East Falls Church Civic Association to draft this plan. A community charrette in which approximately 50 individuals participated was conducted which informed the plan’s recommendations on urban design, affordable housing and neighborhood-based retail development. In summary, the plan advocates for locally serving uses; compatible density; pedestrian orientation/human scale; central public spaces; gateway symbol/community identity; improved connection to surrounding residential areas; efficient use of land near transit hub; transit/bicycle/non-motorized trip increase; high occupancy vehicle trip increase; economic development and diverse economic opportunities; and affordable housing. This plan was not adopted by the County Board, but it did provide one potential vision for the area that led to additional discussion in the community.

**DISCUSSION:** The Plan establishes a vision for future development and provides specific guidance for development on the Metro Park & Ride lot and nine other sites likely to redevelop. The Plan also identifies several potential infrastructure improvement projects that will contribute to greater pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and safety, enhance the area’s “sense of place”, and mitigate some of the area’s greatest traffic problems. Some of the major initiatives recommended in the Plan are mixed-use development at key sites that includes neighborhood-oriented businesses; a significant public open space as part of the redevelopment of the Park & Ride site that would become a central gathering space; and a Western Entrance to the East Falls Church Metrorail station, which would provide better access to the station from planned development along Lee Highway in Arlington, and Washington Street in the City of Falls Church. The Plan also provides urban design guidelines that are intended to shape the character of private redevelopment and public spaces and ensure that East Falls Church is a pedestrian-friendly, inviting place to live, work, and visit.

Land Use Recommendations: In the Plan, the Task Force puts forth land use recommendations and urban design guidelines that will provide guidance for the height, density and character of new development on the various parcels considered in the study. Generally, the Task Force recommendations include mid-rise, mixed-use development at the Park & Ride lot and along Lee Highway adjacent to Interstate 66. Low-scale development is recommended for sites located closer to the surrounding single-family areas. The Plan also includes development incentives on key sites south of Interstate 66 and on the Park & Ride lot in order to encourage the inclusion of a grocery store and/or other important community benefits as part of an overall redevelopment proposal for these sites.

Transportation Analysis and Recommendations: The Task Force reviewed a transportation analysis of the area, which was provided to them by staff and consultants, that assessed current transportation conditions as well as existing transportation deficiencies. This analysis indicated that the moderate level of development contemplated in the Plan would not have a deleterious effect on future traffic patterns, given the high rate of transit use projected for the eventual users of the redeveloped sites. Based on the analysis, the Task Force developed recommendations to increase or enhance pedestrian and bicycle access through the area and to Metro, reduce single-occupancy vehicle access to the station, and address existing transportation deficiencies.

In addition, the Task Force is recommending the inclusion of bicycle lanes on all arterial streets within the study area, as well as requesting that additional study be devoted to improvements to the W&OD Trail and implementation of bicycle demonstration projects (i.e. bike boxes and bicycle boulevards) within the Study Area. Recommended pedestrian improvements include intersection redesign at key locations to reduce crossing distances, and comprehensive streetscape improvements within the Study Area in coordination with redevelopment. A major recommendation of the Task Force is the implementation of mitigation strategies for speeding traffic and traffic conflicts along Washington Boulevard westbound between Sycamore Street and the westbound Interstate 66 on-ramp. In this area, there is a high degree of speeding and merging conflicts in the off-peak hours, and the recommended improvements in this area are intended to moderate traffic speeds and reduce weaving conflicts.

Community Input and Staff Analysis: Staff has worked with the Task Force as the Plan has been developed. Since March of this year, the Task Force has been reviewing a “staff draft” of the East Falls Church Area Plan, with the goal of developing a “Task Force Draft” – which is the document attached to this report. The Task Force Issues Matrix, which was compiled during recent months as the Task Force reviewed the “staff draft” and developed their recommendations, is also attached (Attachment 1). The Issues Matrix tracks the differences, where they exist, between staff and Task Force positions. One major point of departure between staff and the Task Force was the level of development on the Park & Ride sites, and appurtenant to that, the treatment of commuter and visitor parking on the site. Staff has determined that, as the Task Force’s position on these issues has come into focus over time, their final recommendations on the development of the Park & Ride lot are consistent with staff’s position. Other, more technical issues remain outstanding, and although additional staff review is required, staff has determined that there are no significant issues pertaining to the recommendations in the Plan that would preclude the County Board from considering the advertisement of this Plan.

On April 29 and May 4, 2010, the Task Force held Community Forums to provide information to the general public on the Task Force’s preliminary recommendations and to receive input. Approximately 200 area residents, in total, attended these meetings. A summary of their comments is attached to this report for review (Attachment 2). Also in April and May, the Task Force’s preliminary recommendations were presented to many of the County’s advisory boards and commissions. A matrix of the comments received at these meetings (Attachment 3) is also attached to this report. Comments from these groups centered on the need to preserve or add open space, contextual development concerns between development along Lee Highway and at the Metro Park & Ride site, and the need for additional tools for the provision of affordable housing.

At their June 9, 2010 meeting, the Task Force voted 14-4 to adopt the revised draft Plan, dated June 2, 2010. Staff will continue to work with the Task Force to refine the Plan, as there may be minor editorial revisions to complete. Concurrently, as the Plan is made available for further public review, staff will continue to garner input from the County’s advisory boards and commissions, as well as the public, with the goal of providing the County Board with a summary of that input.

As staff evaluates the Task Force’s recommendations and receives input from advisory boards and commissions, staff may provide additional or alternate recommendations prior to the July 10, 2010 County Board hearing.

**CONCLUSION:** The East Falls Church Area Plan provides guidance that will assist in ensuring that future development in the East Falls Church Metrorail Station area is consistent with the vision for the area. Furthermore, it identifies infrastructure improvements that will provide better connectivity, promote pedestrian and bicycle safety, and will help mitigate some of the traffic issues that currently exist. Therefore, it is recommended that the County Board authorize the advertisement of public hearings on the draft East Falls Church Area Plan by the Planning Commission on June 28, 2010 and the County Board on July 10, 2010.

## East Falls Church Area Plan – Task Force Issue Matrix

Items highlighted below are areas where there was either no consensus among Task Force members, or a difference between the Task Force and Staff Positions. This table has been updated through the Task Force's latest discussions. Shading indicates items that either are or were points of disagreement between the Task Force and staff.

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
1	Density / Amount of Development	<b><i>The Task Force could reach no consensus.</i></b>  The Task Force agreed to a base level of development of 450,000 sq ft; and additional development may be earned, up to a maximum of 600,000 sq ft, in exchange for <b>compelling community benefits</b>	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
2	Height / Tapers	<b><i>The Task Force could reach no consensus.</i></b> The Task Force agreed to 4 stories along the Washington Blvd frontage, wrapping around onto Sycamore St and up to 6 stories on the interior of the site adjacent to I-66  Also, the Task Force agreed to up to 9 stories on the interior of the site for scenarios that are greater than 450,000 sq ft (but less than 600,000 sq ft) provided that there are <b>compelling community benefits</b>	Staff has developed scenarios with various heights and tapers.	None
3	Replacement Commuter Parking	The Task Force supports replacing none of the 422 commuter spaces; however the Task Force supports <b>75-150</b> publicly available parking spaces for visitors and retail customers with a pricing structure that favors short-term parkers	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
4	Public Plaza	The Task Force supports the creation of a public plaza, approx. 30,000 – 38,000 SF in size (comparable to Pentagon Row).	This is consistent with staff's position.	None.
5	Bus Operations	The Task Force supports the continuation and/or expansion of bus operation on the site	This is consistent with staff's position.	None.
6	Provisions for additional density/ height in exchange for additional community benefits on p.44	See #1 and #2 above	Staff agrees with the Task Force's approach.	None
7	Joint Development of P&R and K&R parcels	The Task Force supports a coordinated development of both parcels	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
8	Oil Company / Used Car Lot Sites	The Task Force supports 5 stories on the site, with additional height up to 8 stories in exchange for a grocery store and open space on Used Car Lot parcel adjacent to the WO&D Trail.	This is consistent with staff's position.	None

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
9	French Restaurant / Motel Sites	The Task Force supports 6 stories on the site, with a 10-foot step back between the 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> floors	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
10	BB&T Site	The Task Force supports a substantially residential 5-story building with 10-foot step backs between the 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> floors along Washington Blvd and Lee Hwy. Also, the building's height should be sensitive to the adjacent Eastman-Fenwick House (historic).	This is consistent with staff's position. <i>(Staff has developed language (on p. 56 of the draft Task Force Plan) that can address how development can be sensitive to the adjacent historic property.)</i>	None
11	Exxon Site	The Task Force supports a substantially residential 5-story building with 10-foot step backs between the 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> floors along Washington Blvd and Lee Hwy.	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
12	Suntrust Site	The Task Force supports a 3-4 story development that is 100% residential and does not preclude multi-family development; alternately, a mixed-use project including a grocery store would be considered.	This is generally consistent with staff's position, however staff has concerns about traffic, bulk and massing impacts of a residential mixed-use development that includes a grocery store operation.	The traffic impacts of a grocery store in this location may be an issue of concern.
13	Verizon Site	The Task Force supports 3-4 story townhouse, or low-rise multifamily or office development on this site.	This is consistent with staff's position with respect to height/character. A GLUP change and additional language in the Plan may be necessary to allow for office development.	Potential uses vary, but heights and intensity are consistent.
14	Parcels at Sycamore / Washington Blvd	The Task Force supports townhouse development on the site.	This is consistent with staff's position.	Potential uses vary, but heights and intensity are consistent.
15	Commercial Property at Fairfax / Little Falls Rd	The Task Force supports small scale residential or commercial development on this site.	Staff had recommended commercial only, but can revise the language.	Potential uses vary, but heights and intensity are consistent.
16	Western Entrance	<p>The Task Force supports Arlington County funding 1 of 3 options for a western entrance or pedestrian connection across I-66.</p> <p>Option 1: A walkway cantilevered off of the Washington Blvd flyer</p> <p>Option 2: A walkway/bridge over the eastbound lanes connecting to the western end of the station platform.</p> <p>Option 3: An angled connection from the W&amp;OD (near Vanderpool St) to the center of the tracks/ROW, then to the station platform</p> <p>Option 4: The original concept.</p>	In conjunction with redevelopment of the Park & Ride lot, staff supports further refinement of these station entrance concepts and the development of a funding strategy, which would include public and private sources, to pay for these infrastructure improvements.	The Task Force recommendation may involve more immediate cost implications for the County.

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
17	Western Entrance Review	As part of this effort the County should review the costs and benefits of alternative configurations for access to the West Entrance (including a longer, wider plaza, and better connections at both ends. The study area should extend from the west end of the current platform to the Lee Highway Bridge.	Staff agrees with the Task Force's approach.	None
18	Replacement Commuter Parking	See item #3 above. <i>The Task Force agreed to incorporate concerns / positions held by WMATA and VDOT, who are the property owners.</i>	See Item #3 above.	See Item #3 above
19	Sidewalks	Install Sidewalks sections to complete sidewalks at least one sides of each local street	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
	Arterial Crosswalks	Reconstruct intersections of Washington Boulevard & Sycamore St., Lee Highway & Sycamore Street, Lee Highway & Washington Boulevard, <i>and the Sycamore Street side of Sycamore Street &amp; 19th Street</i> to reduce crossing lengths, remove unnecessary turn lanes, install bulbouts, eliminate free right turns, and correct inadequate or missing handicap ramps.	This is consistent with staff's position; however the Task Force had concerns about nubs on 19 <sup>th</sup> Street. (This point was later clarified – the pedestrian nubs are shown on Sycamore Street only.)	None
20	Arterial Streetscapes	Provide streetscape improvements along the arterial streets, including minimum six foot clear sidewalks ( <i>or conform with County standards</i> ), landscaping, and on-street parking where appropriate to provide a safer and more comfortable walking environment.  <i>The Task Force was not sure that six feet clear on the sidewalk is enough width. The Task Force asked for clarity (better guidance) on this point – what are the County standards for a potentially high (foot) traffic area such as this?</i>	This is consistent with staff's position, assuming the Task Force is comfortable with the six feet clear sidewalk.	None.
22	Connecting Paths	Provide connecting paths <i>where practicable</i> as noted on Figure III. Where the paths traverse public lands, the trails can be built as county funds become available. Where paths are associated with expected development they should be a condition of site plan approval.	Staff indicated that some of the paths are within Resource Protection Areas (RPAs_ and may need additional review.  <i>Task Force members acknowledged RPA and private ownership issues and added "where practicable".</i>	None

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
23	Lee Highway Bridge	Initiate a study to examine the feasibility and design of a widened Lee Highway Bridge. Elements of the design could include upgrading the sidewalk along the bridge to include at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six foot wide clear walking path</li> <li>• Five foot wide dedicated bike lanes</li> <li>• Installation of ADA compliant handicap ramps</li> </ul>	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
24	Washington Blvd Mitigation	The Task Force supports the concept shown in the staff draft.	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
25	Bicycle Lanes	Provide bicycle lanes along both sides of Sycamore Street, Lee Highway, and Washington Boulevard throughout the study area.	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
26	Bicycle Routes	Designate on-street bicycle routes for the segments of Westmoreland Street, Winchester Street, Little Falls Road, 16th Street, 18th Street, 19th Street and 19th Road, as shown on the Bikeway Network Map.  <i>There was some concern about the number of routes indicated in the Staff Draft south of the Kiss &amp; Ride lot.</i>	This is consistent with staff's position.  <i>Staff will further refine the designation of marked and signed on-street bike routes through this area.</i>	None
27	Master Transportation Plan Amendments	<del>Amend the Master Transportation Plan to include the recommended transportation improvements in the East Falls Church area proposed in this plan.</del> Not included in this Plan.	Staff can address Master Transportation Plan amendments necessary to implement the Task Force Plan at some point in the future.	None
28	WO&D Connections / Four Mile Run Greenway	The Task Force Plan asks that Arlington County undertake a study to identify an off-street connection of the W&OD from west of Lee Highway to east of Sycamore Street – <b>avoiding Isaac Crossman Park.</b>	Staff agrees with the Task Force's approach.	
29	Traffic Calming	Improve pedestrian environment and reduce vehicular speeds on Washington Boulevard and Fairfax Drive by implementing the following improvements: 1. Add nubs to reduce pedestrian crossing distances. 2. Add landscaped trees along both sides of the roadways. 3. Install a new traffic signal for pedestrians on Washington Boulevard at Fairfax Drive/25th Street and on Fairfax Drive at Little Falls Road. 4. Enhance the landscaping on the south side of Washington Boulevard adjacent to Interstate 66 and on the north side of Fairfax Drive adjacent to I-66. Consider landscaped terraces that could serve as refuges, promenades, and off-road paths. 5. Narrow the travel lanes. 6. Shorten the left-turn lane onto 25 <sup>th</sup> St. N. 7. Incorporate dedicated bicycle lanes. 8. Widen and upgrade the sidewalk. 9. Add on-street parking along Washington Boulevard.	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
<b>Items 30-35 below were adopted by the Task Force as items to be studied</b>				

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
30	Cycle Tracks	The Task Force recommends that Arlington County undertake a carefully phased introduction and demonstration of "Cycle Tracks" in the Study area. Potential locations are indicted on the Map II. If proved successful, the cycle tracks could be deployed along other road segments in East Falls Church and across the county.	Staff agrees with this concept and can evaluate where appropriate locations are for implementation within the East Falls Church area.	None
31	Curbside Bus Loading Zones	The Task Force recommends that the County undertake a study of the feasibility of a decentralized roadside scheme for handling transferring travelers at the METRORAIL station. It should do so in cooperation with METROBUS, ART, George and other para-transit service providers.	Staff supports WMATA staff's goal of minimizing bus-to-rail transfer distances, which may not be met with extensive curbside loading zones that are not located within or contiguous to the Metro parcels. More detailed analysis would be needed to determine where curbside loading could be achieved.	The extent to which curbside loading can be accommodated will have to be determined in the context of review of a specific redevelopment proposal. Staff can work with the developer and the community to evaluate implementation opportunities.
32	Separate BRT Bus Stops (In-Line Stops)	The Task Force recommends that the County undertake a separate study to determine whether the Proposed I-66 BRT system can be operated from innovative "stops" using bus-only ramps or the shoulder within the I-66 right-of-way so as to avoid the delay of going "off-line"	Staff supports innovative solutions for future BRT implementation, but would suggest that the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT) and VDOT should coordinate this study.	There is a question regarding the responsibility for coordinating the study.
33	Bicycle Boulevards	The Task Force recommends that Arlington County undertake a carefully phased introduction and demonstration of bicycle boulevards in the Study area. If proved successful, the bicycle boulevards could be deployed along other road segments in East Falls Church and across the county.	Staff agrees with this concept and can evaluate where appropriate locations are for implementation within the East Falls Church area	None
34	Bicycle Boxes	The Task Force recommends that Arlington County undertake a carefully phased introduction and demonstration of bicycle boxes in the Study area. If proved successful, the bicycle boulevards could be deployed along other road segments in East Falls Church and across the county.	Staff agrees with this concept and can evaluate where appropriate locations are for implementation within the East Falls Church area	None
35	I-66 Ramps	In connection and coordination with the I-66 BRT station analysis, undertake a study or alternative new I-66 ramp facilities that would mitigate a substantial portion of thru-traffic including that induced by the widening of the only on ramp in the area.	N/A	N/A

Number	Issue	Task Force Position	Staff Position	Difference
36	Mid-Site Walkway from P&R Development to Metro Platform	<p>The Task Force took no formal action on this point, but there is general support.</p> <p><b>The Task Force formally adopted this recommendation</b></p>	Staff agrees with this concept.	None
37	Perspective Views of Massing Studies	The Task Force agreed that the massing studies should be replaced with pictures of buildings that better illustrate what is desired.	Staff has made these changes.	N/A

**East Falls Church Area Plan  
Community Forum # 1  
April 29, 2010**

Listed below is a brief sketch of verbal comments received at the April 29, 2010 Community Forum. At the end of the verbal comments, written comments that were received at the meeting have also been included.

**Barb Nash (2919 N. Edison St):**

- Lives 2 miles away & uses the K&R
- Suggests keeping the K&R
- Changes to K&R are not retiree friendly
- 19<sup>th</sup> Street residents want less traffic at K&R
- Keep EFC clean

**Warren Spaeth (1216 N Quantico St):**

- Madison Manor CA does not exist (not addressed in Plan)
- Concerned about parking spillover in the neighborhood
- How many potential residences will there be?
- Will there be school overcrowding as a result?
- Pedestrian improvements for Madison Manor needed
- There are bike and pedestrian safety issues at Sycamore & 19<sup>th</sup> St

**Chris Duckworth (1920 N. Powhatan St):**

- Recommendation to not replace parking – how do you encourage transit usage if there is no parking?
- Look at the possible demographics for impact on schools

**Hugh McGonigle (6748 26<sup>th</sup> St N):**

- This plan is short of pedestrian friendly
- Washington Blvd is a barrier
- Wider sidewalks would have a better impact than bike lanes

**Steve Hadley (6871 Washington Blvd):**

- Washington Blvd will get worse with I-66 westbound ramp widening

**Bernard Berne (4316 N. Carlin Springs Rd #2b):**

- Preserve railroad siding on Oil Company site and W&OD (see written comments below)

**Brad Rosenberg (6830 19<sup>th</sup> Rd N.):**

- Pluses and minuses to living in EFC – close to Metro, but can hear I-66
- Concerned about cut-through traffic
- Happy with draft plan
- Realizes that EFC has no “there” there
- Western Entrance creates a “sense of place” – don’t scale it back
- Favors more density, if it helps offsets cost of Western Entrance

- Echoes the idea of preserving the W&OD railroad siding

**Tom Holliday (6329 22<sup>nd</sup> St N):**

- Look at the traffic impacts from the expansion of the silver Line
- Pedestrian improvements needed on Sycamore St
- (We were) promised that I-66 would not be widened
- (We were) promised that P&R would not be developed

**Peter Mucchetti (6415 Washington Blvd):**

- Although the Plan is better / less dense than other areas, still has concerns
- Disagrees with six stories near single family on Sycamore St

**Allen Muchnick (1030 S. Barton St #274):**

- Advocates for W&OD bridge over Sycamore St
- Improvement to trail spur into Madison Manor is needed
- Up to \$15M is available, as per Rep. Wolf's Bill, for other improvements in the area

**Rick Stevens (1801 N. Underwood St):**

- Too many on-street bike routes in the neighborhood south of the K&R
- Disagrees with the study of route through Crossman Park
- Proposed trail through Banneker Park is on steep downhill & near tot lot - dangerous

**Jerry Auten (6049 N 22<sup>nd</sup>) :**

- Feels like Task Force is rushing to conclusion of the process
- Details that would provide protections are left out
- Already lots of congestion on Washington Blvd
- There are no provisions for truck loading and traffic cut-through
- Bus operations are proposed to be built over

**Scott Seaton (1911 N Van Buren St):**

- Thrilled to see plan
- Supports “Smart Growth”
- The questions is whether we are going to grow well, not whether we are going to grow
- Supports development on the K&R lot

**Ralph Oser (6234 21<sup>st</sup> St N):**

- What is the difference in the number of residential units between 6 and 8 stories?
- Could that better help to attract more retail?
- Neighborhood streets are raceways
- Parking and traffic are concerns
- How was this meeting advertised? Jay Wind has a listserv that would help get the word out
- A water feature at the P&R lot would help dampen the highway noise

**Donna Welsh (6701 Washington Blvd):**

- Four stories along Washington Blvd is good
- Supports a six story maximum on the site

**Unyong Waide (6019 N 21<sup>st</sup> St):**

- How will this development impact schools? Can schools absorb them?
- Plan lacks open space
- Is there a standard ratio of people to open space?

**Stephanie Lane (1012 N Quantico St):**

- Area needs improvement
- Elimination of parking at P&R is premature
- BJs traffic on Sycamore will affect area
- Buses to EFC Metro are not convenient; not well used

**Ann Rudd (35<sup>th</sup> St):**

Question – Will this plan tear down any single family?

**Bob Moore (6025 N 22<sup>nd</sup> Street):**

- Although some who moved here in the last 10 years did so expecting change, others who moved here in the 60s and 70s expected no change
- I-66 will be widened westbound to Sycamore St, so this will be the bottleneck
- Need more sensitivity to adjacent single family at P&R lot

- P&R Parking is a neighborhood asset – especially off peak

**Max Jensen (6001 Washington Blvd):**

- Doesn't understand traffic calming; traffic moves at snail's pace during rush hour
- P&R parking should be increased, not decreased
- P&R parking is an asset
- Need a feeder bus system – increased bus service. Current buses are underused; need to be more frequent

**Melissa Nuwaysir (6430 N 22<sup>nd</sup> St):**

- Likes the existing parks and trails in the area
- What is the impact of the Silver Line?
- What about the impact of cars from the P&R development?
- Schools are already overcrowded
- BJs traffic will impact this area

**Dennis Dineen (1422 N. McKinley Rd):**

- Exxon generates 1,700 trips (in &out) per day. The P&R generates 1,000 trips per day. If someone proposed these as new uses of these sites today, people would be up in arms
- Need to find other parking options

**Written Comments: (Submitted at the meeting)**

**Bernard Berne:** The plan must specify that the remnant of the W&OD railroad's elevated siding on the north side of the Petro Fuel Company site WILL BE PRESERVED. The siding is visible from the W&OD Trail. The siding contains the last ties and tracks of the W&OD Railroad that are still visible. All others are gone. Railroad tank cars used the siding to deliver fuel oil to the Robert

Shreve Fuel Company. The siding is probably the most significant historic resource (except for some houses) in the East falls Church neighborhood. Many railroad buffs and trail users are familiar with this unique resource. (at one time hopper cars delivered coal to a coal company using this or a similar siding.) In addition, the proposed 6-8 story building on the Oil Company site is much too close to the trail. No large building is this close to the trail anywhere in Northern Virginia. The open space between the trail and the building must be larger.

**Allen Muchnick:** (1)Improve pedestrian & bicycle access to EFC Metro & W&OD regional trail by directly connecting Custis Trail / W&OD OVER Sycamore St from Kiss & Ride Lot to Brandymore Castle Hill. This improvement, if planned, could be tied to any reconstruction of eastbound I-66. It would consist of an elevated pedestrian & bicycle overpass of Sycamore St directly adjacent to I-66 eastbound. (2) Also, the narrow spur trail currently from Sycamore St to Custis / W&OD to east @ Brandymore Castle Hill should be updated. (3) I-66 westbound federal earmarks (\$30M) exceeds cost to build "Spot #1" by about \$15M. (4)We SUPPORT a STUDY of a W&OD Trail alignment UNDER Lee Highway along Four Mile Run. The underpass of Lee Highway is most valuable, and the trail could be routed onto Westmoreland St / 19<sup>th</sup> Street on the east side of Lee Hwy to minimize negative impacts on Isaac Crossman Park.

**Ralph Oser:** We need to do a better job of getting future meetings publicized. Jay Wind has a listserv for the newsletter editors of the Community Associations.

**Unyong Waide:** we need more green open space for the density planned. Is there coordination with the school system to accommodate the influx of school children? Please select a LEED certified architect / builder; strict green building standards.

**Bill Braswell (1515 N Harrison Street):** The Task Force has spent lots of time and effort. These are very wise pictures and ideas in the presentation. Unfortunately, this effort did not consider financial realities, construction and development realities, and future land use planning concepts:

- (1) It is nice to envision open space, parks, bike paths and roads. It is quite another problem to do the hard work of determining whether sufficient people will use the facilities and most important – who will pay for the improvements.
- (2) More important the land use proposals do not provide sufficient density within the sites and the surrounding neighborhood to develop the land to an affordable density. The

plan envisions small businesses. The land can not be leased or purchased and developed with such low density to offer any chance of being affordable rents for small businesses. The surrounding density will not support such retail space.

- (3) Most important there is no analysis to show that WMATA will give up a revenue generating parking lot for a one time payment or land lease sufficient to match the parking revenue. A task force can come up with a plan. It is a far different issue for WMATA to give up a revenue source for less than the revenue source can now generate especially considering the current \$189M deficit.
- (4) This plan seems to capture and cater to special interests but does not take into account the needs of Arlington-wide, the community today and in the future, and the financial needs of WMATA.
- (5) All the comments were centered on “me” versus the needs of the larger community. This plan needs to consider the bigger picture of today and the future.
- (6) Nothing in the plan or in reality will change the fact that Lee, Washington & Sycamore are heavily used arterials and commuter roads for automobiles both local travel and commuters.
- (7) You can not treat this as a stand alone project. Lee Highway & Washington Blvd planning needs to be a(n) integral part.

**East Falls Church Area Plan  
Community Forum #2  
May 4, 2010**

Listed below is a brief sketch of verbal comments received at the May 4, 2010 Community Forum. At the end of the verbal comments, written comments that were received at the meeting have also been included. Also, a written comment was e-mailed to staff and has been included.

**Nick Lutsch (1240 N Quantico St):**

- Has a concern about storm water from new development getting into Four Mile Run
- County does not do a good job of preventing it
- Storm water overtaxes Four Mile Run
- I-66 storm water currently dumps into Four Mile Run

**Sarah Meservey (1008 N Larrimore St):**

- Plan lacks open space
- Too little existing open space
- Open space on P&R should be a park, not plaza
- Questions the impact of proposed bike route through Crossman Park on mature trees – consult the Urban Forester

**John Shumate (1821 N Tuckahoe St):**

- The zoning process is political
- Politicians influenced by revenue

- Task Force / community should focus on land use, density, etc. and pay attention to basic zoning details

**Mark Blacknell (715 N. Oakland St):**

- Lives in Ashton Heights and is a biker
- Expand bike parking at Metro
- Biking facilities (dry / secure) would increase bike usage

**Jakob Wolf-Barnett (5858 1<sup>st</sup> St N):**

- Business think biking is good
- Bike facilities at Metro are key
- More secured bike parking would help

**Tom Hazzard (1821 N. Roosevelt St):**

- Traffic is primary concern
- Traffic impact of new development?
- EFC is an intersection, not a destination, so traffic is different than other areas
- Neighborhood will be loaded up with commuter parking

**Bob Davidson (138 Gresham Place, Falls Church):**

- Resident of Gresham Place condos
- Concerned about proposed changes to Crossman Park, which is partially in Falls Church
- Falls Church developers have proposed bike path through it; Gresham Place residents have opposed it

**Ann McDermott (6869 Washington Blvd):**

- Lives on Washington Blvd at 25<sup>th</sup> St
- Increased density and narrower streets not good
- Suggests alternate location for westbound on-ramp to I-66 to ease traffic on her stretch of Washington Blvd

**Steven Fuchs (2240 N. Lexington St):**

- What will be the parking allotments for new developments?
- Lower parking requirements = parking in neighborhood
- Building heights could increase due to County Board negotiations
- Need higher parking ratios

**Mary Wuest (2112 N Nottingham St):**

- Concerned about loss of commuter parking
- Could there be a multi-level garage on the K&R lot

**Pam Jones (Washington Blvd):**

- Lives on Washington Blvd east of Sycamore (5-6 minute walk)
- Road infrastructure not considered in plan
- Falls Church (city) depends on Arlington, but not contributing
- Inadequate parking proposed
- This is a residential area; don't want to look like the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor
- Disapproves of plan 100%

**Craig Urbauer (120 Gresham Place, Falls Church):**

- Crossman Park – existing path is curvy and designed for pedestrians
- Introducing bikes would be a safety disaster and would drive off walkers

**Tonda Rush (6054 N 21<sup>st</sup> St):**

- Arlington County is hard on small businesses
- Need a parking structure in EFC
- Buses are often late and are not full
- Need lower density office development / condo opportunity

**Jesse Aronson (1105 N Quantico St):**

- Generally supports plan, but is concerned about lack of commuter parking
- Washington Blvd traffic is stop & go
- Proposed mitigation may make the problem worse

**Stewart Schwartz (4000 Albemarle St, NW, Suite 310, Washington DC 20016):**

- As the region continues to grow, a network of Transit Oriented Developments is needed
- People who live at Metro don't drive to Metro
- Changes in the regions demographics are in our favor
- Need to balance parking – don't want to "attract" cars

**Michele Moloner-Kitts (2015 N Quantico St):**

- Overall support for plan
- Parking should be retained on the Metro site
- Concern about Washington Blvd traffic
- Hard to cross Washington Blvd at Quantico St
- Have the possibility of 1-way streets been looked at for Washington Blvd and Lee Highway?

**Jerry Auten (6049 N 22<sup>nd</sup>):**

- 450,000 square feet of development would not provide any community benefits
- Community benefits should be required with that level of development
- 840-1,000 new housing units and approx. 1M square feet of development being proposed
- Need enough parking to support that
- Keep P&R especially now that the trees have matured

**Robert Swennes (6101 N 22<sup>nd</sup> Street):**

- Why was EFC development not higher in the 60's?
- Washington Blvd / Sycamore St intersection is congested. Is it legal to prohibit / ticket drivers who "block the box"
- There is no buffering between P&R development and single family homes across Sycamore St
- Need a step-back; no more than 4 stories along Sycamore St
- Need additional covered bike parking
- Must include ZipCar in new developments

**Tom Van Poole (6531 27<sup>th</sup> St N):**

- VDOT staff member and neighbor
- Development is out of scale with surrounding neighborhood
- Existing businesses will be pushed out
- Can currently walk to goods & services (store / bank/ veterinarian)
- Redevelopment could lead to needing to drive for same services, plus gasoline
- Residents from areas of nearby Fairfax County need this P&R – it is their closest option
- Talk of eliminating parking should not occur

**Pat Tilden (6241 N 12<sup>th</sup> St):**

- Commuter parking will end up in the neighborhood
- Bike trails should be developed
- Why are we doing so much?
- The area is not prepared
- BJs will impact Sycamore St traffic

**Nina Bonnelycke (6016 N 22<sup>nd</sup> St):**

- Disappointed and angry
- Density is not desirable
- Likes Westover Shopping Center
- Pedestrian and bike improvements proposed here are a distraction
- Why is density a precursor? Why does the County need it?

**Colleen Fredricks (1103 N Rockingham St)**

- Traffic on Sycamore St is a concern
- BJs will make it worse
- What will be the impact on schools?
- Glad that the K&R will stay

**Kay-Margaret Cronk (5882 N 14<sup>th</sup> St):**

- Needs to pick up her kids after work; loss of P&R would force her to drive to work
- Lives too far from station to walk / pick up kids

**Dennis Dineen (1424 n. McKinley Rd):**

- Supports the plan
- Everyone is self-centered
- Can't stop progress; only control it
- Need to have a plan like this or developers will build as they choose
- Must think long term
- Lived here since 1952 – traffic has always been bad. Never was better.
- Arlington's changes have been good

**Gail Bell (2427 N Sycamore St):**

- Has lived on Sycamore St since 1977
- Was told the area would remain residential
- Developer at Palmer property wanted more density – citing “changes in the area”

- Neighborhood association has fought against the County and developers to preserve parks in the area
- Does not see the benefit of more density

**Hugh Caudle (6008 22<sup>nd</sup> St N):**

- Uses Exxon, BB&T and Suntrust all the time
- Hopes that facilities such as these continue to exist and will be included in the plan

**Brian Tanenbaum (1104 Rochester St):**

- Potential overflow parking is an issue
- Has there been an independent parking study?
- High rise development causes overflow parking problem

**Michael Colby (6555 Washington Blvd):**

- There is a lack of guest parking at Fenwick Court and Promenade
- Residents use parking lots on commercial properties after hours

**Leilani Henderson (6232 N 28<sup>th</sup> St):**

- Can't visualize anything over 4 stories being built
- Weekend parking at P&R lot needed
- This is a residential area; Clarendon development not compatible

**Karl VanNewbirk (1116 N Rochester St):**

- The westbound I-66 on-ramp needs to be relocated and/or re-engineered
- Washington Blvd near I-66 on-ramp is not conducive for nubs
- There is a high demand for parking near his house

**Eric Ackerman (3677 N Harrison St):**

- It is obvious that this plan is not in our interest
- He is starting a sign-up sheet / e-mail roster for opponents

**Michelle Barrans (5869 N 14<sup>th</sup> St):**

- Need parking; parking will be exacerbated by new development
- Schools will be impacted

**Written Comments: (submitted at meeting)**

**Einar Olsen (2023 N Lexington St):**

- Concerned that more residences will result in more crowding at Tuckahoe Elementary School.
- Minimize stormwater impacts to Four Mile Run
- Please ensure that pedestrians and cyclists have easy access to the rail station
- If all the parking is being removed from the Metrorail station, how will people access the station? Will new bus routes be put in place?

**Rebecca Easby (5508 N24th St):** As many pointed out, this plan is naïve with regards to parking and traffic. The increased density will make these problems worse. The people who move into the new condo will have cars and will not necessarily use the metro. The proposed traffic calming will increase congestion in and around the neighborhood. Although some new

development around the metro is inevitable, it must supply adequate parking and concern for dealing with the added congestion.

**Marna Costanzo (22<sup>nd</sup> Rd):**

- Please do the cost and income analysis for development and make that available.
- Please consider placing the most strenuous and hard-to-change restrictions on development because the developer is buying almost exclusive access to Metro and developers have a history of going back on promises because community benefits are “too expensive”.

**Tom VanPoole:**

- The proposed 4-8 story development is totally out of scale with the existing and historic neighborhood. It will also, even if ground floor retail is included, put out of business every vestige of the neighborhood-oriented businesses that remain. It will increase and lengthen automobile trips as residents must travel longer distances, by auto, to accomplish business that is now within walking distance or a short drive.
- Elimination of Metro parking will discourage transit use by residents of the Annandale / Lake Barcroft / Sleepy hollow wedge for whom this is the nearest station.
- This draft needs a lot of work to be acceptable.

**Written Comments Submitted via E-mail**

**Steve Hadley (6871 Washington Boulevard):**

Thank you so much for addressing the hazards on Washington Boulevard. Several steps would further strengthen what appears to be a good plan:

- 1) Mitigation measures for Washington Boulevard need to be pushed forward in their own right. The dangers on Washington Boulevard are serious and here today. They need action regardless of what may happen with VDOT’s Spot Improvement 2 or the more ambitious components of the broader Plan.
- 2) Useful mitigation measures mentioned in Chapter V of the Plan don’t seem to be included in the detailed recommendations for Washington Boulevard in the Appendices (Chapter VII). Specifically:
  - a. “Install a new traffic signal for pedestrians on Washington Boulevard at Fairfax Drive/25<sup>th</sup> Street” from page 88 of Chapter V needs to be included in Chapter VII.

- b. “Install a midblock crosswalk on Washington Boulevard near the Park and Ride facility” and “Install a full traffic signal on Washington Boulevard at the Park and Ride facility” (p. 89) also need to be reflected in Chapter VII.
  
- 3) Signage is not covered in the Plan which generally adopts a lane-narrowing approach to reducing traffic speeds. Lane narrowing may work. But improved signs on Washington Boulevard are still important. As low cost measures, many or all could even be implemented now. Most of the suggestions below are borrowed from VDOT practice on Route 7 between Lee Hiway and Seven Corners – one of the few stretches of fairly open VDOT road in the area on which traffic actually travels at moderate speed:
  - a. Install a prominent “No Right Turn on Red (when pedestrians present)” sign at the corner of Lee Hiway and Washington Boulevard for westbound vehicles on Lee Hiway that turn right at Washington Boulevard to access I-66. Many vehicles that turn right on red at that spot do not slow down for pedestrians at all, much less stop.
  - b. Install clear speed limit signs along Washington Boulevard and “Residential Area – fines increased \$200 ....” yellow signs just below them. VDOT did this on Route 7 and it seems to help.
  - c. Somewhere on Washington Boulevard between Lee Hiway and the I-66 onramp, add a flashing yellow light to the speed limit sign and paint rumble strips on the road surface. VDOT has done both on Route 7 and it seems to slow traffic down.
  - d. Fix the angle of the arrow on the onramp sign for I-66. Despite promises to correct this, it is still wrong and still misleads drivers. Many vehicles a day continue to turn left on the 25<sup>th</sup> St/Fairfax Drive bridge then back out because they intended to get onto I-66.
  
- 4) Make sure that speed reducing measures on Washington Boulevard don’t stop at 25<sup>th</sup> St. There are still families living on Washington Boulevard between 25<sup>th</sup> St. and the I-66 onramp. Something is needed – signs that say “Residential area \$200 additional fine...” or painted rumble strips or whatever - to discourage speeding until vehicles are entirely off of Washington Boulevard and on the onramp.

The Plan appears to accept the likelihood that VDOT’s proposed Spot Improvement 2 will go ahead at some point. Plan drawings show two lanes on the onramp to I-66. But the pedestrian- and neighborhood-friendly principles of the Plan suggest that it should at least propose that the current onramp be expanded away from residences rather than toward them and that landscaping and screening between the onramp and houses in the neighborhood be maintained or improved rather than eliminated.

East Falls Church Area Plan - Summary of Comments from Advisory Boards, Commissions and Committees

Comment	Task Force Response / Action	Staff Response
<p><b>Parks &amp; Recreation Commission (4/27/10)</b></p> <p>1</p> <p>Crossman Park - Concerns were raised by some Commission members regarding the proposed study of a new bike trail adjacent to Four Mile Run [that would be aligned behind the fire station and the West Lee, and run through Isaac Crossman Park].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Crossman Park is a natural area that could be adversely impacted by any disturbance.</li> <li>o Impacts on the stream and trees of concern.</li> </ul> <p>Some Commission members were more open to this as an alternate route to the W&amp;OD, since the W&amp;OD is boxed in between the highway and private back yards. They said they might prefer to bike through a park.</p>	<p>Bike trail recommendation has been revised to examine options for off-street bike connectivity from west of Lee Hwy to east of Sycamore St and excludes <u>Crossman Park</u> (5/17)</p>	<p>Staff agrees w/ Task Force action</p>
<p>2</p> <p>Open Space needs – The Chairman requested that the Task Force advocate for more open space; especially given the new potential households that are proposed.</p>	<p>The Task Force has taken no action on this point.</p>	<p>Staff will revisit this issue with the Commission and Parks staff.</p>
<p><b>Long Range Planning Committee (5/5/10)</b></p>		
<p>3</p> <p>(Savelle – to staff) What action will the County Board be taking? Typically, the CB accepts a task Force or community plan (i.e. NC Plans).</p>	<p style="background-color: #cccccc;"></p>	<p>Staff indicated that, since this approach is new, it is unclear what specific County Board action would be taken.</p>
<p>4</p> <p>(Harner) No contextual relationship between nodes. There doesn't seem to be proper linkage between the Lee Hwy corridor [where development is and should be focused] and the P&amp;R site. The P&amp;R site looks like an outlier with an artificial connection to the mixed use activity. Perhaps the open space should be</p>	<p>The Task Force Plan establishes and reinforces linkages between the nodes by making recommendations that lead to better connections across I-66, development that are of a similar and compatible scale, and similar materials.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with the Task Force approach.</p>

Attachment 3

	at/near the Oil Company site and another use should be identified for the P&R site.		
5	Does plaza at P&R create sense of place? (Monfort) If the traditional bulls-eye approach were applied, the Metro and P&R site could be at the center of the study area. The study is constrained by the surrounding single family development and it is difficult to develop a good plan.	The Task Force Plan, as reiterated at this meeting, incorporates concepts to improve connections across I-66 and bring the station closer to Lee Hwy with the Western Entrance.	The scope of the planning study is limited to considering redevelopment the targeted sites – and includes a comprehensive transportation analysis. This scope helps to integrate new development into the existing neighborhood fabric.
6	(Savela – to staff) Would like to see economic & traffic analysis, demographics, etc.		Staff indicated that this information would be available.
<b>Joint Transportation Meeting [Transportation Commission, Bicycle Advisory Cmte., Pedestrian Advisory Cmte. &amp; Transit Advisory Cmte.] (5/12/10)</b>			
7	Add Bike Station / dry, secure bike facilities at EFC Metro	Task Force voted to add this language to the Plan	Staff agrees with the Task Force approach.
8	Requested study of extending W&OD over Sycamore St via bridge cantilevered off of I-66 eastbound (instead of dumping onto Tuekahoe at substation)	This option is covered as part of the revised recommendation from #1 above.	Staff agrees with the Task Force approach.
9	Offered technical correction of bike lanes as they approach intersections		(This is a technical issue that can be addressed in revised graphics – staff agrees with suggested change)
10	Requested detailed cross sections at intersections	The Task Force has taken no action on this point.	This is a detail that may not be available as part of the Plan. The Plan's recommendations are general and do not include specific design for each intersection.
<b>Housing Commission (5/13/10)</b>			
11	Would like to see more affordable housing in EFC – bonus density?	Task Force Plan has set limits on height/density.	This issue may need further review by staff.
12	Commissioners thought Plan came to them late / no time to develop innovative approaches to get more affordable housing – may seek input from Commissioners offline and forward to staff		Staff will have to evaluate any suggestions that are generated by the Housing Commission.