



ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

**County Board Agenda Item
Meeting of July 10, 2010**

DATE: July 2, 2010

SUBJECT: Consideration of the East Falls Church Area Plan.

C.M. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. Adopt the attached resolution accepting the East Falls Church Area Plan, prepared by the East Falls Church Planning Task Force (see Resolution and Attachment 1);
- B. Adopt the County Board Policy Determinations, provides guidance for the completion of a final East Falls Church Area Plan document to be developed by staff for future County Board consideration (see Attachment 2);
- C. Direct the County Manager to submit two reports to the County Board, in two phases. The first report (Report 1 – Research and Analysis) should provide research and analysis related to the Plan’s recommendations. The second report (Report 2 – Proposed Area Plan) should recommend specific policies and implementation plans, as customarily associated with a sector plan, for the East Falls Church area for adoption by the County Board.

ISSUES: The East Falls Church Area Plan, which was prepared by the East Falls Church Planning Task Force, provides a general vision for the future development of key sites within East Falls Church. However, it does not fully contain guidance and information that would otherwise typically be found in County-adopted plans. Staff recommends acceptance of the Task Force’s Plan and adoption of County Board Policy Determinations, primarily based on the Task Force Plan. In addition, staff will continue to work on research and analysis related to the plan’s recommendations and a final East Falls Church Area Plan document that will be brought forward to the County Board at a later date for adoption.

SUMMARY: On June 9, 2010 the East Falls Church Planning Study Task Force (“the Task Force”), a citizen group appointed by the County Board, voted to recommend the East Falls

County Manager: MB/GA

County Attorney: SAM

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

51.

Church Area Plan document to the County Board for consideration. The Area Plan, which had been developed by the Task Force over a 3-year period, contains recommendations for the area that would contribute to a transit-oriented vision for East Falls Church, and the Plan addresses key planning issues such as height, density, land uses, urban design, affordable housing, transportation improvements, open space, and environmental sustainability. However, staff has reviewed the Task Force's Plan and determined that additional information, analysis and review is needed in order to compose a complete Plan for County Board consideration. This report provides policy determinations for adoption by the County Board that summarizes key policy guidance that would serve as the basis for the development of East Falls Church. The report also summarizes the major elements of the Task Force Plan and identifies action steps for moving forward in the planning process.

BACKGROUND: Over the past 25 years, a number of planning studies were conducted for the East Falls Church area. In 1986, the East Falls Church Land Use Study was presented and included policy guidelines and recommendations for the East Falls Church Metro Station Area. The stated planning goals for the area in this 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. These recommendations 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 WMATA, identified improvements that could enhance access to the station and 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 2004, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University ("Virginia Tech") Department of Urban Affairs and Planning prepared the East Falls Church Area Plan. 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 and 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.

In 2005, the Arlington-East Falls Church Civic Association had requested additional planning for the area with the understanding that changes at the Metrorail station and system could lead to additional development pressure for sites near the station. As a result, in June 2007, the Arlington County Board appointed a citizen Task Force and charged the group to generate a vision for transit-oriented development in the East Falls Church area. The 20-member Task Force, was comprised of residents from area civic associations, representatives of the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), Arlington County advisory boards and commissions, and several at-large members.

DISCUSSION:

Task Force Plan

The East Falls Church Area Plan, which has been prepared by the East Falls Church Planning Study Task Force, is the culmination of a three year planning process. The recommendations found in the Task Force Plan were developed as a result of discussions and review by the Task Force members on various information, data, and analyses generated by staff and consultants. The Task Force Plan recommends a transit-oriented vision for East Falls Church and addresses key planning issues such as height, density, land uses, urban design, affordable housing, transportation improvements, open space, and environmental sustainability. Some of the major initiatives recommended in the Task Force 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.

Staff worked closely with the Task Force as the plan 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”. 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 3). The Issues Matrix helps track the differences, where they existed, between staff and Task Force positions. Generally, the major differences included the level of development being proposed at the Park & Ride site, the potential impact of traffic, and the need to retain commuter parking at the Park & Ride site. Over time, as additional discussions among staff and the Task Force occurred, most of the major issues were resolved and reflected in the proposed Task Force 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 as Attachment 4. Most of the concerns were focused on

traffic impacts, the level of development, and commuter parking. Also, between April and June 2010, the Task Force's recommendations were presented to many of the County's advisory boards and commissions. A matrix of the comments received at those meetings is also attached to this report as Attachment 5. More recent advisory commission comments are also discussed at the end of 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 and Ride site, lack of an implementation strategy, 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 a revised draft Plan, dated June 2, 2010. Staff continued to work with the Task Force to refine the Plan, as there were minor editorial revisions to complete prior to County Board advertising.

At its June 15, 2010 carry-over meeting to consider the advertising of the Task Force Plan, the County Board requested that staff come back with responses to a number of questions and clarifications related to traffic impacts, community benefits, impacts on schools, affordable housing, urban design guidelines, and other planning items. Responses to those questions and clarifications will be provided as part of the First Report, as further described below. Since the time the County Board authorized advertising, staff has continued to make editorial changes to the Task Force Plan, which are reflected in the draft attached to this report.

Based on staff's analysis and input from various groups, staff has concluded that the East Falls Church Area Plan, which was developed by the East Falls Church Planning Task Force, does not fully contain critical guidance and information that would otherwise typically be found in County-adopted plans. Although staff generally agrees with the vision and most of the recommendations outlined in the Task Force Plan, the absence of this critical additional guidance and information makes it difficult for staff to recommend adoption of this document as County policy for the East Falls Church area. Such additional guidance and information includes an implementation component with recommended Comprehensive Plan changes, an infrastructure improvement strategy, further refinements on the vision and character of East Falls Church, and development of urban design guidelines specifically tailored for East Falls Church. Therefore, staff recommends that the County Board adopt Policy Determinations based on major recommendations from the Task Force Plan and accept the Task Force Plan.

The Task Force Plan has been available for review during the months of May and June and it was presented to various advisory boards and commissions within that timeframe. Some of the concerns that have been raised have been addressed in the final draft of that document. A major concern that was expressed by the Parks and Recreation Commission regarding a bike or shared-use facility that was proposed to be routed through Isaac Crossman Park was eliminated in the Task Force's final recommendations. The Historic Affairs and Landmarks Review Board (HALRB) reviewed the Plan at their June 16, 2010 meeting and recommended approval, having found the historic preservation guidance in the Plan was sufficient to protect resources such as the historic Eastman-Fenwick House and the and potentially historic abandoned railroad siding on the W&OD Trail adjacent to the Shreve Oil Company site (Site A).

The Transportation Commission voted to recommend approval of the Task Force Plan at their June 24, 2010 meeting, and additionally they voted to:

1. Support the Task Force's recommendation for no 100% replacement of the commuter parking spaces.
2. Recommend that the County immediately initiate infrastructure projects and planning studies related to transportation.
3. Request that a specific quantity of additional bicycle parking at the East Falls Church Metro be included in Recommendation #11.
4. Request that inside travel lanes shown in the street cross sections located in Appendix 4 of the Plan be reduced from 11 to 10 feet.

At the June 24, 2010 Housing Commission meeting, staff presented the key elements of the Task Force Plan and the specific recommendations related to the provision of affordable housing, within a range of housing opportunities, that could result from the implementation of the Plan. Commissioners expressed concern about the overall amount of affordable housing that could be generated within the East Falls Church area under the Plan and asked whether there were additional planning tools that could be used to increase the number of affordable units that could be developed. Staff related that, according to preliminary estimates developed at this time, a range of 43-66 affordable units (out of a total of 830-963 units that could be developed on all sites being considered) could potentially be developed. Staff explained that the limited number of units is reflective of the modest level of development being considered in the Plan.

Staff forwarded a draft report to the Planning Commission in advance of their June 28, 2010 Planning Commission meeting, and at the meeting, the recommendations of the report were discussed. Planning Commission members questioned whether the Vision Statement that was adopted by the Task Force, which was included in a Policy Framework, previously proposed by staff, is clear or specific enough to indicate the character of the place that is desired in East Falls Church. There were also questions regarding the level of affordable housing that could be created, as well as how much in community benefits could be derived from the proposed development. Planning Commissioners also requested that an implementation strategy, containing a detailed community benefits analysis of infrastructure costs, potential contributions from private developers, potential County expenditures, and timelines, should be added to the Plan. Staff was also asked if there were sufficient incentives for redevelopment, given the modest heights and densities being proposed.

The Planning Commission voted 9-0 to recommend that the County Board accept the Task Force Plan. The Planning Commission voted 8-0 to recommend that the County Board defer consideration of a previously proposed Policy Framework and that the County Board direct the County Manager to work with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission to revise and augment the Task Force Plan to:

- Add or delete recommendations that have been made by the Task Force;
- Provide discussion of potential General Land Use Plan and Zoning changes that may be needed to implement the Plan;

Consideration of the East Falls Church Area Plan

- Revise the Urban Design Guidelines to make them more place specific; and
- Provide an Implementation Plan that includes a detailed analysis of expected developer contributions for community benefits, estimated costs for infrastructure projects, and an overall financing plan for the infrastructure improvements.

In light of the feedback received at the Commission meetings, staff has revised the recommendations and is now recommending the adoption of County Policy Determinations that incorporates major policy-related components included in the Task Force Plan.

East Falls Church Area Policy Determinations

To assist with the planning effort moving forward, staff recommends that the County Board adopt East Falls Church Area Plan Policy Determinations (see Attachment 2). The East Falls Church Area Plan Policy Determinations incorporate key elements of the Task Force Plan, establishes a general vision with recommendations for future development in East Falls Church, and provides guidance for the completion of a final East Falls Church Area Plan document to be developed by staff for future County Board consideration. The Policy Determinations consists of a set of statements that outline the major recommendations and guidance for future private development and public infrastructure improvements in the area.

Report 1: Research and Analysis

Staff is also recommending that the County Board direct the County Manager to review the East Falls Church Area Plan presented by the Task Force, and other appropriate resources, and provide information and/or recommendations to the County Board by September regarding the following:

- 1) An economic analysis of the development potential of the Metro Station Park and Ride Lot and a systematic comparison on all relevant parcels of a) the heights, densities and uses permitted by the existing General Land Use Plan designations and existing zoning, b) the heights, densities and uses proposed in the Task Force Plan, and c) any additional heights, densities and uses that on the basis of economic potential could reasonably be proposed by the private sector.
- 2) An analysis of the level of community benefit resources that could be generated from each of these densities.
- 3) An inventory of existing affordable housing resources within one mile of the East Falls Church Metro station.
- 4) A list of feasible options for preservation and/or creation of affordable housing in the East Falls Church area.

- 5) The feasibility of attracting a grocery store to the area and the mechanisms by which this can be done.
- 6) An analysis of the application of policies and standards contained in the Master Transportation Plan to the East Falls Church area, comparing them both to the existing conditions and to the transportation proposals contained in the Plan.
- 7) Examine options for improved pedestrian crossing on Washington Blvd. near the Verizon parking lot.
- 8) Identify what can be done ahead of the plan's implementation to ease congestion.
- 9) Identification of any major policy questions that need to be resolved before proceeding to develop a detailed sector plan.
- 10) An appropriate timeline for developing the area plan, including a proposal for community participation in its development.
- 11) Analysis of the potential impact of the Tyson's-Dulles Metrorail extension on travel patterns and parking demand in the East Falls Church area.

Report 2: Proposed Area Plan

The second report should take the form of an area plan, including all relevant guidance ordinarily contained in a sector plan, such as any proposed changes to the General Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance, specific policy guidance for development, detailed design guidelines and illustrative plans, and an implementation plan that outlines steps to achieving the vision expressed in the plan, subject to the policy determinations of the County Board.

Community review process

1. The Manager's Research and Analysis report (Report 1) should be distributed to the public for review and comments before it is presented for action by the County Board.
2. The Manager's proposed area plan (Report 2) should fully incorporate the County Board's policy determinations and Report 1 findings. Staff will work with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission in the review of the final plan, to be submitted to the County Board within six months.
3. The public review process for Reports 1 and 2 may include, but need not be limited to: presentations of the draft report to civic associations and other interested organizations, general meetings open to the public, commission presentations, and work sessions with the County Board.

4. In presenting the area plan to the County Board prior to formal commission review, the Manager's report should thoroughly summarize community comments and questions received and provide the staff's response to them.

CONCLUSION: It is recommended that the County Board accept the East Falls Church Task Force Area Plan, adopt the East Falls Church Area Plan Policy Determinations, and direct the County Manager to complete the remaining sections of the final Area Plan document for County board consideration, as this approach will ensure that important policy guidance is enacted at this time, while continuing discussions and review of the Plan can be focused on providing information that will make the Plan more complete.

ATTACHMENT 1: East Falls Church Area Plan

ATTACHMENT 2: County Board Policy Determinations

ATTACHMENT 3: Task Force Issues Matrix

ATTACHMENT 4: Community Forums Comments

ATTACHMENT 5: Advisory Board and Commissions Comments

Resolution to Accept the East Falls Church Area Plan

Whereas, the County Board appointed the East Falls Church Planning Study Task Force (“the Task Force”) in 2007 to “generate a vision for transit-oriented development in the East Falls Church area”; and

Whereas, the Task Force worked closely with County staff over a three year period to develop a Task Force Plan that contains a Vision Statement and Land Use, Open Space, Sustainability, Affordable Housing, and Transportation recommendations; and

Whereas, on June 9, 2010, the Task Force voted 14-4 to forward their Plan to the County Board for consideration; and

Whereas, the Task Force Plan is generally in conformance with the goals and policies of Arlington County; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission also recommended acceptance of the East Falls Church Area Plan;

Now, therefore be it resolved that after careful staff review and community input regarding the recommendations of the East Falls Church Planning Study Task Force , the County Board hereby accepts the East Falls Church Area Plan, as updated through June 30, 2010 as a statement of the East Falls Church Planning Study Task Force and directs the County Manager to complete the remaining sections and other background information of a final East Falls Church Area Plan document to be developed by staff for future County Board consideration.

ATTACHMENT 2

County Board Policy Determinations

East Falls Church is a vital predominantly residential neighborhood with a Metro station located at its center. The East Falls Church area is not now like other Arlington Metro Station areas, nor does the County Board intend to replicate the densities and massing of other metro station areas. The presence of Interstate 66 and the Metro station, however, makes East Falls Church unlike any other low-density neighborhood in Arlington. Any proposed development should respect these distinctions while bringing to the area the kinds of shopping and recreational opportunities that exist close to many other Arlington neighborhoods. Heights and designs for new development should accommodate the preservation of single-family homes, while acknowledging that the proximity of the Metro Station and the desire for amenities and community benefits may result in sharper transitions than would be customary near single-family neighborhoods located farther from a major transit facility. Toward this end, any plan for East Falls Church should:

1. Preserve single-family homes (excluding only the two houses on the corner of Washington Boulevard at Sycamore St.).
2. Protect historic sites: Specifically, the Eastman-Fenwick House and the W&OD railway siding.
3. Include as a high priority a grocery store and other neighborhood-serving retail/office at mixed-use sites: restaurants, professional offices, farmer's market, etc.
4. Provide for new and enhanced public plazas and recreation spaces that could be used for gatherings and community events.
5. Generally limit building heights in the concept area to four to six stories where buildings meet the street.
6. On the Park & Ride site, restrict heights along the frontage to the same as those of the homes facing them across Washington Blvd. and Sycamore Street (generally, 4 stories and not more than 48 feet) tapering up from the neighborhood behind the buildings along the street frontage by one to two stories and then tapering up again by one to three stories along the center section of the I-66 frontage. Provide extensive design guidelines to allow for the creation of a neighborhood complementing development that is in keeping with the nature of the community throughout the area. Provide for access to the Metro station from within the site (i.e., via any plaza that may be included in the interior of the site).
7. Outline goals and strategies for preserving and creating affordable housing within one mile of the East Falls Church station area.

Transportation: The Metro Station, Interstate-66 and other major roadways dominate East Falls Church and currently interfere with the ability to walk, bike, drive, or use transit in the area. Significant improvements to the public's transportation experience and the impacts of automotive traffic in the East Falls Church area are needed. To achieve this, any plan for East Falls Church should:

1. Provide alternative financing mechanisms and plans for constructing a western entrance to the Metrorail station at the earliest possible date.
2. Reduce auto congestion in the area by reducing commuter parking at the Metro station.
3. Utilize the Residential Zoned Parking Program to control spillover parking.
4. Enhance the environment for pedestrians by improving the streetscape, especially across Lee Highway and along Washington Blvd. and by introducing measures consistent with the Master Transportation Plan to calm arterial traffic in the area, shorten crossing distances, and provide adequate pedestrian paths.
5. Create a more bike-friendly environment through establishing additional bike routes along arterial and neighborhood streets and providing for better bicycle parking and storage.
6. Design an improved path for crossing Lee Highway on the W&OD that is safer and easily accessible, to increase its use as a primary route by bicyclists and pedestrians.
7. Provide enhancements for bus service, and examine options for bus loading that ensure transferring is safe and convenient for riders.

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	<i>The Task Force could reach no consensus.</i> 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 compelling community benefits	This is consistent with staff's position.	None
2	Height / Tapers	<i>The Task Force could reach no consensus.</i> 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 compelling community benefits	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 75-150 publicly available parking spaces for visitors and retail customers with a pricing structure that favors short-term parkers.	Staff recommends 100-200 publicly available parking spaces for visitors and retail customers with a pricing structure that favors short-term parkers.	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 nd and 4 th 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 nd and 4 th 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 nd and 4 th 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	The Task Force supports Arlington County funding 1 of 3 options for a western entrance or pedestrian connection across I-66. Option 1: A walkway cantilevered off of the Washington Blvd flyer Option 2: A walkway/bridge over the eastbound lanes connecting to the western end of the station platform. Option 3: An angled connection from the W&OD (near Vanderpool St) to the center of the tracks/ROW, then to the station platform. Option 4: The original concept.	In conjunction with redevelopment of the Park & Ride lot, staff supports further analysis and refinement of these station entrance concepts (including cost estimates) leading to the selection of a preferred alternative. This work would be done cooperatively with WMATA and the community. A funding strategy would also be developed that will likely include a variety of public and private sources.	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 & 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 th 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"> • Six foot wide clear walking path • Five foot wide dedicated bike lanes • Installation of ADA compliant handicap ramps 	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 & 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	Amend the Master Transportation Plan to include the recommended transportation improvements in the East Falls Church area proposed in this plan. 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 – avoiding Isaac Crossman Park.	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 th 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
Items 30-35 below were adopted by the Task Force as items to be studied				

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>The Task Force formally adopted this recommendation</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
- 19th 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 & 19th 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 26th 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 19th 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 22nd 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 22nd) :

- 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 21st 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 listserve 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 21st 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 (35th St):

Question – Will this plan tear down any single family?

Bob Moore (6025 N 22nd 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 22nd 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 / 19th 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 listserve 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 1st 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 25th 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 21st 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 22nd):

- 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 22nd 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 27th 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 12th 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 22nd 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 14th 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 22nd 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 28th 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 14th 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 (22nd 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/25th 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 25th 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 25th St. There are still families living on Washington Boulevard between 25th 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.

John Shumate
1821 N. Tuckahoe St.
703-241-1217
jtmshumate@toast.net

COMMUNICATION

I chanced to see a reference to the Task Force Community Forum in the Falls Church News Press. I live 100 yards from the metro station. If I had not seen that newspaper, I would not have known there was such a forum. This is VERY poor communication.

The amount of discontent expressed by the attendees at the May 4th forum indicates that the task force has not been engaged adequately with the community and is out of touch with the people it purports to represent.

DENSITY

You are not listening to your citizens. See also "buffering," below.

PARKING

The task force and the county are in favor of eliminating commuter parking at the metro. Furthermore, the county will require LOWER than normal quantities of parking for the new development, based upon the fact that it is near a metro stop (standard county policy). If the occupants of the new development have more cars than the county hopes they will, parking for residents near the station could vanish to occupants of the project. Even if we abandon the intention of providing commuter parking, generous parking for the project is a must. In the event that excess parking spaces are created, they will easily be paid for by the fact that they can always be rented to commuters. An excess of spaces is not possible. A shortage is near-certain, at this point. Parking can be placed below grade for minimum impact.

BUFFERING

Setbacks, step-backs, streetscape, and landscape should be defined in detail and constitute integral requirements for every border of the site. Intelligent, sensitive buffering is the only way to make higher densities work compatibly with the existing low density residential neighborhood. Are the existing trees at the border of the site going to be retained and protected? Does the project height at the street meet

what is across the street? The task force does not see a need to bother with the details. The devil is in the details. Will you leave these details to the developer?

SUMMARY

The study is shallow and not representative of the community.

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

Comment	Task Force Response / Action	Staff Response
Parks & Recreation Commission (4/27/10)		
<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"> o Crossman Park is a natural area that could be adversely impacted by any disturbance. o Impacts on the stream and trees of concern. <p>Some Commission members were more open to this as an alternate route to the W&OD, since the W&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 <u>excludes Crossman Park (5/17)</u></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>
Parks & Recreation Commission (6/22/10)		
<i>The Parks & Recreation Commission generally supports the draft plan and will forward a letter to the County Board.</i>		
Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission (5/5/10)		
<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>Staff indicated that, since this approach is new, it is unclear what specific County Board action would be taken.</p>

4	(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&R site. The P&R site looks like an outlier with an artificial connection to the mixed use activity. Perhaps the open space should be at/near the Oil Company site and another use should be identified for the P&R site.	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.	Staff agrees with the Task Force approach.
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.
Joint Transportation Meeting [Transportation Commission, Bicycle Advisory Cmte., Pedestrian Advisory Cmte.] (5/12/10)			
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 Tuckahoe 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.
Historic Affairs and Landmarks Review Board (6/15/10)			
	THE HALRB voted to support the Plan and its provisions for sensitive development adjacent to the historic Eastman-Fenwick House and		

	<i>the potentially historic railroad siding located adjacent to the W&OD Trail on the Oil Company site (Site A).</i>		
<i>Transportation Commission (6/24/10)</i>			
	<i>The Transportation Commission voted to support the Task Force Plan with two additional recommendations:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Strongly supporting the Task Force recommendation against 100% replacement of the commuter parking spaces at the Park & Ride site, and</i> <i>2. Asking that the County take "immediate" action on the transportation-related recommendations to the extent that there is funding to do so.</i> 		<i>Staff has proposed, as part of follow-up actions to be taken by staff after the acceptance of the Task Force Plan and adoption of a Policy Framework for East Falls Church, that an Implementation Strategy be developed to address the public infrastructure and transportation-related recommendations in the Plan.</i>
<i>Housing Commission (5/13/10)</i>			
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.
<i>Housing Commission (6/24/10)</i>			
	<i>The Housing Commission expressed concerns about the lack of Housing Commission participation in the development of the Plan, the lack of flexibility for additional height or density, and expressed the need to find ways increase the number of affordable housing units that could be achieved with this Plan.</i>		<i>It may be possible, as staff works with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission, and other interested parties in the period after the July 10, 2010 County Board meeting, to revisit this issue with the Housing Commission.</i>
<i>Planning Commission (6/28/10)</i>			
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Recommended acceptance of the East Falls Church Area Plan;</u> 2. <u>Recommended deferral of adoption of the East Falls Church Area Plan Policy Framework;</u> 		Staff continues to recommend that the County Board adopt a Policy Framework that incorporates Vision Statement that was adopted by the Task Force and the major policy-related components of the Task Force Plan. By adopting the Policy Framework, it establishes the critical elements of the Task Force Plan and guides the

Items that are bold and italicized are updated since the June 15, 2010 recessed County Board meeting.

<p>3. <u>Recommended that the County Board direct the County Manager, working with the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission, to revise and augment the Task Force Plan and forward the completed Plan for consideration by January 2011, by:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Developing additions and/or deletions to the Task Force’s recommendations; b. Providing information regarding potential General Land Use Plan (GLUP) changes; c. Providing information regarding potential Zoning changes; d. Providing more place specific Urban Design Guidelines e. Providing an Implementation Plan – which would include a detailed Community Benefit Plan, with expected developer contributions, cost estimates for public infrastructure included in the Plan, and a financing strategy. 		<p>completion of the Plan. Staff will continue to work with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission to refine the other elements of the Plan that were identified by staff in this report and generally mirror the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission.</p>
---	--	--