

Angela Brackett

FA

From: Christer.Ahl <christer.ahl@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2011 7:17 PM
To: Christopher Zimmerman; Mary Hynes; Walter Tejada; Barbara Favola; Jay Fisette
Subject: Tuesday Board Meeting: Items 55 A-B Monument View and 56 Street Renaming

Importance: High

Dear friends on the County Board:

Being aware that, further to the PC recommendation for a deferral on Item 55 A-B, the applicant has now also requested a deferral, I assume that this matter will not be the subject of a substantive discussion on Tuesday. Accordingly, I will refrain from being present for the purpose of an oral intervention.

However, considering the possibility that the matter might be the subject of informal discussions, between now and the October Board meeting, I would at least want to be sure that you are aware of my strongly held views on the application as it now stands. As I noted in the PC meeting, and as is recorded in the 'PC Letter', there are major problems with the application, largely along the lines of the specific concerns raised by the PC.

First, however, I should note that it became all too apparent during the SPRC process how dangerous it can be when County representatives outdo each other in stating how wonderful it would be to be able to welcome a particular applicant. Depending on the attitude of the applicant and developer, it appears that this can encourage an attitude of arrogance, entitlement and unwillingness to cooperate. This applicant dismissed all the serious objections and tried to sway us with a series of purely cosmetic adjustments.

The reality is that what is proposed would be an absolute misfit on the site. It would sabotage the County's efforts to create a genuinely attractive park, because of the architecture, the 'bunker-like' features, the orientation of the building and its entrances/exits, the unwillingness to achieve a suitable interface on 6th St., and the unwillingness to incur the expense/inconvenience involved in allowing shared parking. Moreover, I find it totally unacceptable that this project dismisses any notion of transit-orientation, instead flaunting the excess of parking for its internal use, in a location close to the entrances/exits used by adjacent neighborhoods for the major arteries in and out of the area. It is also insulting to note the dismissal of county-wide efforts to achieve green buildings, simply by reference to 'nationwide standards'. From the perspective of the Crystal City Plan, such precedents could be very damaging. Simply put, this proposal must not be approved in its present form.

Finally, on item 56, the matter of the street renaming, I trust that other LBPDAC representatives will help clarify why a change to Long Bridge Park Drive is the only sensible alternative! You have previously agreed that the geographic and historic connection to Long Bridge was the appropriate one for the naming of the Park itself. This argument now remains, together with the importance of using the park's name in the street name (and street signs on arteries) to facilitate way-finding. As a representative of the CC community, I dismiss any arguments in favor of 'extending' Clark St., as an incorrect and misplaced attempt to extend Crystal City or to incorporate the park as if it were a mere neighborhood park. Clark St. (and Crystal Dr.) appropriately come to an end as part of the CC grid where they meet 12th St. From there on, a different name is needed. From a way-finding standpoint, it would also be unfortunate to try use Clark St. and Crystal City as the coordinates for finding the park (on the map or in the streets).

Thank you for your attention!

Sincerely,

Christer Ahl
Crystal City and LBPDAC

377929

1

#55

Angela Brackett

From: Christopher Zimmerman
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 8:50 AM
To: Christer.Ahl
Cc: Mary Hynes; Walter Tejada; Barbara Favola; Jay Fiset; Samantha Sissman
Subject: Re: Tuesday Board Meeting: Items 55 A-B Monument View and 56 Street Renaming

Christer --

Thank you for thoughtful letter. As always, Board Members appreciate your carefully considered views, and you have given us much to think about. (As you note, the item is now the subject of deferral, so we will not be acting this month.)

I hope all is well with you.

-- CZ

On Sep 17, 2011, at 7:22 PM, "Christer.Ahl" <christer.ahl@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear friends on the County Board:

Being aware that, further to the PC recommendation for a deferral on Item 55 A-B, the applicant has now also requested a deferral, I assume that this matter will not be the subject of a substantive discussion on Tuesday. Accordingly, I will refrain from being present for the purpose of an oral intervention.

However, considering the possibility that the matter might be the subject of informal discussions, between now and the October Board meeting, I would at least want to be sure that you are aware of my strongly held views on the application as it now stands. As I noted in the PC meeting, and as is recorded in the 'PC Letter', there are major problems with the application, largely along the lines of the specific concerns raised by the PC.

First, however, I should note that it became all too apparent during the SPRC process how dangerous it can be when County representatives outdo each other in stating how wonderful it would be to be able to welcome a particular applicant. Depending on the attitude of the applicant and developer, it appears that this can encourage an attitude of arrogance, entitlement and unwillingness to cooperate. This applicant dismissed all the serious objections and tried to sway us with a series of purely cosmetic adjustments.

The reality is that what is proposed would be an absolute misfit on the site. It would sabotage the County's efforts to create a genuinely attractive park, because of the architecture, the

'bunker-like' features, the orientation of the building and its entrances/exits, the unwillingness to achieve a suitable interface on 6th St., and the unwillingness to incur the expense/inconvenience involved in allowing shared parking. Moreover, I find it totally unacceptable that this project dismisses any notion of transit-orientation, instead flaunting the excess of parking for its internal use, in a location close to the entrances/exits used by adjacent neighborhoods for the major arteries in and out of the area. It is also insulting to note the dismissal of county-wide efforts to achieve green buildings, simply by reference to 'nationwide standards'. From the perspective of the Crystal City Plan, such precedents could be very damaging. Simply put, this proposal must not be approved in its present form.

Finally, on item 56, the matter of the street renaming, I trust that other LBPDAC representatives will help clarify why a change to Long Bridge Park Drive is the only sensible alternative! You have previously agreed that the geographic and historic connection to Long Bridge was the appropriate one for the naming of the Park itself. This argument now remains, together with the importance of using the park's name in the street name (and street signs on arteries) to facilitate way-finding. As a representative of the CC community, I dismiss any arguments in favor or 'extending' Clark St., as an incorrect and misplaced attempt to extend Crystal City or to incorporate the park as if it were a mere neighborhood park. Clark St. (and Crystal Dr.) appropriately come to an end as part of the CC grid where they meet 12th St. From there on, a different name is needed. From a way-finding standpoint, it would also be unfortunate to try use Clark St. and Crystal City as the coordinates for finding the park (on the map or in the streets).

Thank you for your attention!

Sincerely,

Christer Ahl

Crystal City and LBPDAC