

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
<b>Concept Options 1 and 2 (General)</b>				
1 LRPC	PC	<p><b>Roadway Alignment</b> Should the Plan emphasize alignment/connectivity versus ability of roadways to service the development within the blocks?</p>	<p>The Master Transportation Plan amendments were approved by the County Board in February 2006 which established the policy to create new streets in Clarendon and gain additional connectivity.</p> <p>While service is the primary purpose of the roads, connectivity and alignment is preferred whenever possible.</p>	No change.
2 LRPC	PC	<p><b>New Intersections near Existing Intersections</b> Would a new intersection close to Wilson/Washington/ Clarendon Blvd and 10<sup>th</sup>/Wilson intersections result in greater degradation of service?</p>	Staff does not anticipate that either option would more than the other effectively minimize negative impacts on the projected level of service of the Washington/Wilson Blvds intersection.	No change.
3 LRPC PC	PC	<p><b>More Open Space</b> Open space should be extended along Fairfax Drive by removing as much parking as possible, and creating a pedestrian zone from the building face to building face, with limited vehicular access for service.</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend converting Fairfax Drive completely to a pedestrian-only environment. This condition would likely result in a less-safe, or perceived less-safe space, during evenings primarily due to the adjacent uses which would not guarantee “eyes on the street” during some hours of the day. Also, closing the segment to vehicles would create a mega-block condition which is counter to many of the recommendations of the sector plan. Staff would encourage retention of vehicle access in Fairfax Drive which could provide service access points to adjacent developments, balanced with improved pedestrian walkways, landscape plantings, and opportunities for space that could be used for public market activities.</p> <p>Staff’s recommended option would be to design the space as a flexible, convertible space that would balance: 1) pedestrian space; 2) vehicle circulation and parking; 3) trees/landscaping; and 4) flexibility to modify the space at certain times of the week/year for public gathering activities. The space could accommodate vehicles and parking areas during the week, and more pedestrian traffic activities during the weekends and special events. (See photo handout).</p>	No change.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
4 PC	PC PRC/UF	<p><b>More Open Space (General)</b> More open space is needed in Clarendon that can be more easily and readily attained in a shorter time frame than waiting for County facilities and the Verizon property to be relocated or redeveloped.</p>	<p>The sector plan is establishing a long-term vision for open space, recognizing that it typically takes a long time to realize new open spaces. Other sites with private ownership would also present challenges to create a large, contiguous open space and would likely require the County to help facilitate and/or fund the acquisition of the property. Also, there are limited sites in Clarendon with sufficient development capacity to receive density from other parts of Clarendon in order to create open space. As part of the process to develop a Land Acquisition policy per the Public Space Master Plan, staff could examine opportunities for additional open space locations through the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor.</p>	No change.
5 LRPC	TC	<p><b>Form of Access into West End Block/Fairfax Drive</b> Is the Plan's intent to limit potential options for future access from Wilson Blvd to Fairfax Dr, or keep the pallet open?</p>	<p>Staff continues to recommend that use of the space from Wilson to Fairfax for through-traffic be determined at a time in the future when a proposal for revitalization/rehabilitation of the historic structures occurs.</p>	No change.
6 LRPC	HALRB/ PC	<p><b>Road Between Historic Buildings</b> What is the value of any one-lane new road into the West End block?</p>	<p>The roadway would provide emergency access between Clarendon Circle and Fairfax Drive in Virginia Square as bypass of 10<sup>th</sup> Street/ Wilson Blvd intersection. Additionally, the segment would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create an additional route to provide relief/diversion from the major intersection at Washington and Wilson Blvds.;</li> <li>• Provide access to service buildings and through block passage to Washington Boulevard from Wilson Boulevard; and</li> <li>• Replace existing one-lane connection from Wilson Blvd. to Fairfax Dr.</li> </ul> <p>Creating smaller blocks and more service roads limits demands on major critical intersections by providing more opportunities to bypass such intersections.</p>	No change.
<b>Concept Option I</b>				

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
<p>7 LRPC HALRB</p>	PC	<p><b>Road Between Historic Buildings</b> 1. Would the space between the 2 buildings be green in the interim?</p>	1. Not likely, but this would depend on the ultimate future use. Some street trees could be accommodated. Staff recommend that the space between the buildings be designed similar to a plaza to accommodate pedestrian and bike circulation; however, the surface should also support service to the buildings, as well as accommodate vehicles if space is needed in emergency situations to divert vehicles from Wilson Blvd.	
	PC	2. How and when would the interim pedestrian use be obtained?		
	PC	3. Is a two-lane segment possible? Can the historic buildings be moved to achieve this?		
	HALRB	4. A road between Kirby Garage and Murky Coffee would not be a positive modification to the buildings.	2. Staff anticipates that the a site plan project would be the most likely way to achieve a County ROW, or public access easement, between Kirby Garage and Murky Coffee.	1. The sector plan would be modified to clarify how the space would be used, by whom and when.
	HALRB	5. Pedestrian access between the historic buildings and vehicular access west of Kirby Garage is preferred.	3. There is only enough width (appx. 34') to achieve one travel lane with desired sidewalks. HALRB representation opined that moving either structure is probably infeasible (cost).	2. No change.
	HALRB (11.29.06)	6. HALRB would support deferring the use of the space between the historic buildings for vehicle through traffic until a future time per staff's recommendation; however, any space allocated for vehicles, even in emergency conditions, should be limited to 12'; additional space should be used to improve the space adjacent to Murky Coffee building.	4. HALRB would need to evaluate any proposed change for buildings that are part of local historic district in the context of a "CoA" review. 5. N/A 6. Staff intends to work with HALRB in the future in order to determine an appropriate design for the space between the two buildings while maintaining an appropriate contextual condition for the preserved structures.	3. No change. 4. No change. 5. No change. 6. No change.
8 PC	PC	The building spanning over N. Ivy Street south of Washington Boulevard should be removed (also from other drawings).	In order to provide locations for density and provide for a more viable small building at the point, staff have proposed to permit a building spanning over the N. Ivy St. segment.	No change.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
9 LRPC PC	PC	<b>Preference for Option 1</b>		
	PC	1. Except, exclude/remove road between the two historic buildings; dedicate for pedestrian/ bicyclist/ service alley.		
	PC	2. Proposed open spaces are good spaces that can be achieved in our lifetime. Plan accomplishes objective of connectivity at same time.		
	PC	3. Push to extend open space as far down Fairfax Dr as possible; Option 2 is a non-starter.		
	PC	4. Supports better development site west of Dominion substation.		
	PC	5. Need more green open space and need to address/recognize need for space for public market.		
	PC	6. Designate Fairfax Drive as pedestrian plaza (see #3 above).		
PC	7. The building spanning over N. Ivy Street south of Washington Boulevard should be removed (see #8 above).			
<b>Concept Option 2</b>				
10 LRPC	PC	<b>Impacts on Church Property</b> Is the Option 2 approach on church property feasible and would it ever be achieved?	Informal feedback from the Church indicates that scheme bisects their property in a more disruptive manner, and expressed preference for approach in Option 1.	No change.
11 LRPC	TC	<b>Revised Alignment for new 10<sup>th</sup> Road at Wilson Blvd</b> 10 <sup>th</sup> Road could meet Wilson Boulevard with oblique angle to attain alignment and better development site south of 10 <sup>th</sup> Road/ east of Wilson Blvd.	Oblique angle intersections would challenge vehicles with large turning radii and would create larger-than-necessary curb-to-curb distances for pedestrians to cross along the eastern edge of Wilson Blvd.	No change.
12 LRPC WG	PC	<b>Road Between Kirby Garage and Sub Station</b>	1. No, Dominion Power indicates they are only able to allocate appx. 20' total; this would allow for only one travel lane and one narrow sidewalk 2. Staff concurs. The amount of open space as shown in Option 2 would likely be reduced by maintaining some vehicular access to the existing down-ramp into Kirby Garage.	No change.
	WG	1. Can 2-lane road between Dominion Sub Station and Kirby Garage be attained? 2. Vehicular access to existing down-ramp at Kirby Garage should be maintained which could reduce the amount of achievable open space.		

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
13 LRPC	PC  PC PC  PC  PC	<b>Preference for Option 2</b> 1. Supports street on Dominion land with pedestrian way between the 2 historic buildings; should eliminate most/all surface parking on Fairfax Drive, to achieve more open space. 2. Achieves more open space. 3. Respects integrity of the historic buildings. 4. Except, remove any roadway to provide access into West End block from Wilson Blvd. 5. Intersection between new Ivy St and Washington Blvd is further from Wilson/Washington Blvd intersection. 6. Would also recommend that more time/effort is spent on the design/re-design of intersection between Wilson and Washington Blvds.		
14 WG	WG	<b>Preference for Option 2</b> Achieves more concentrated open space in west end along Fairfax complemented by new or preserved structures.		
<b>Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)</b>				
15 LRPC	PC	Emphasize <b>accessibility</b> to housing units, particularly in 9 <sup>th</sup> Road and Urban Residential Frontage Types; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines for raised first floor elevations limit opportunities for universal access;</li> <li>Given proximity to Metro, units within Clarendon should call for at least 1 zero-threshold entrance per unit.</li> </ul>	Staff concurs.	Staff will revise the 9 <sup>th</sup> Road and Urban Residential guidelines with reference to accessibility/visitability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concept of having at least 1 zero-threshold entrance per housing unit will be included.</li> <li>Plan will include examples of units that are designed with visitability in mind.</li> </ul>
16 WG	WG	Will density and height limits control how much can be built in the areas where English-basement type units can be built?	Yes, the maximum height along 13 <sup>th</sup> Street is set at 55'; any additional density and any additional floors above 3 floors could be approved by the County Board in consideration of community benefits. This unit type wouldn't necessarily increase density; however, if additional floors were added bonus density would be used.	No change.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
17 WG	LPCA	<b>Balance accessibility needs with the goal of achieving multiple, separate entries</b> along the street/sidewalk to Urban Residential and 9 <sup>th</sup> Road housing units.	Staff concurs.	See #12 above. The plan will be revised to clarify that entries into individual units from the streetscape area will still be desired while balancing accessibility.
18 PC	LPCA	Consider a separate set of urban design guidelines for English-basement type units, separate from the Frontage Type descriptions. Separate entries to these types of units should be available from the adjacent	Staff concludes that separating this information from the specific Urban Residential and 9 <sup>th</sup> Road Residential frontage types is not necessary. Maintaining the English-basement unit description with these specific frontage types is preferred as these are the only frontage types where these units are recommended. Staff concurs that separate individual entries should be available from the adjacent streetscape area.	The plan will be revised to indicate that entrances to this building type from the streetscape area is desired in the Urban Residential and 9 <sup>th</sup> Road Residential frontage types.
19 WG	LVCA	<b>Reconcile streetscape dimensions</b> and cross sections for 13 <sup>th</sup> Street to indicate same widths for clear zones, tree zones, and stoop zones.	The intention was to create a 12' walkway inclusive of a 6' tree/furniture zone and a 6' wide clear zone, plus an additional 6' stoop/landscape zone. This would total 18' from the curb to the building wall.	The street cross section will be revised to indicate 18' rather than 19'.
20 LRPC	PC	Do <b>frontage type</b> categories relate to size of buildings? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Live/Work – Work/Live frontage guidelines appear to talk more about building use; how does this provide design guidance to developers?</li> </ul>	Frontage type categories are based on levels of pedestrian volumes projected for individual streetscapes and the type of street in order to create the appropriate amount of entries, transparency, and threshold level into the structure.	The plan will be clarified as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the use Mix Map – re-label “Optional Retail Frontages” as “Retail and/or Personal/Business Services”</li> <li>In the Use Mix discussion – define “retail” and “person/business services” in the Use Mix discussion to clarify intent of retail orientation vs. other commercial uses</li> <li>In the Use Mix discussion – clarify that Live/Work – Work/Live type units are desired and could be used along 10<sup>th</sup> Street corridor.</li> <li>In the Live/Work – Work/Live Frontage Type discussion – rename this frontage type to “10<sup>th</sup> Street Frontage Type”; clarify that live/work-work/live units <u>could</u> occur along 10<sup>th</sup> Street, but would not be required. A proposal, at a minimum, should include Personal/Business uses on the first floor.</li> </ol>
21 WG	WG	<b>Frontage Type map</b> is difficult to read/interpret; suggest using another method to convey information such as different color lines.	Staff concurs.	The map will be revised to introduce colors to differentiate frontage types. (See attached revised Frontage Type map).

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
22 LRPC	PC	Include a <b>preamble</b> that describes the performance intent of the guidelines, and emphasizes what the County is really looking to achieve through the UDGs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction should note that UDGs are meant to serve as good guidance while being reasonably flexible</li> </ul>	Staff concurs.	A preamble to the Urban Design Guidelines, incorporating the noted points will be included in the sector plan.
23 LRPC PC	PC	Incorporate <b>sustainability</b> guidelines.  Incorporate specific reference in the sector plan that buildings should be constructed to LEED Certified, or higher LEED, levels.	The Draft Plan addresses sustainability by integrating discussion of sustainable principles within various sections of the UDG discussion. For example, see last bullet included in Introduction, 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet under Design Composition, 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet under Materials, and 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet under Fenestration.  Staff concurs. A specific guideline referencing LEED Certified buildings can be included in the plan.	The UDGs will be revised to include a guideline recommending that future buildings be constructed to LEED Certified, or higher, levels.
24 LRPC	TC	Why are <b>curb cuts</b> not indicated on 11 <sup>th</sup> Street between Highland/Garfield?	Based on discussions with community members, concerns were raised that 11 <sup>th</sup> Street is a primary east-west secondary street for pedestrian circulation. Therefore, a sentiment was raised that the street should not be overloaded with service/parking access points, or at least along one edge.	No change.
25 LRPC	PC	How will <b>Build-To Lines</b> be determined? What is the reference point?	Build-to lines would be located and registered when either public street improvements or private redevelopment projects are proposed within Clarendon. At such time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff would review preliminary project plans for consistency with cross-sections recommended in the Sector Plan.</li> <li>Based on the Sector Plan and existing conditions, projects would be directed to provide a build-to line that achieves the desired cross-section and coordinates with the existing conditions.</li> <li>For most locations, a centerline would be used as a reference point. In other locations, such as along 13<sup>th</sup> Street or Wilson between 10<sup>th</sup> St and Washington Blvd, the centerline is expected to shift. Therefore, the build-to line may be referenced from other existing elements such as adjacent building walls such as the build-to lines of Murky Coffee and Kirby Garage.</li> </ul>	A description of this typical process will be included in the Building Placement section of the Sector Plan.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
26 WG	LPCA PC	<b>Build-to lines</b> should indicate the preferred building lines, even if it conflicts with recently approved or constructed building lines.	Staff concurs and will reexamine the Build-To Line map to indicate preferred locations for building lines and a note that clarifies that some lines may not reflect the physical conditions.	The Build-To Line map will be revised to indicate preferred building lines for areas where an existing or approved condition occurs that is inconsistent with other sector plan guidelines. (See attached revised Build-To Map).
27 LRPC	PC	What elements of the UDGs will be <b>codified</b> ?	The sector plan is a guide. Staff anticipates that a number of items in the plan would be codified including density limits and maximum building heights. Other items such as the urban design guidelines are a set of best practices that the County would prefer most, if not all, development projects to follow. However, as every site and development project will be different, staff does not recommend codifying the UDGs so that the creative solutions can be proposed and the County Board has some flexibility to adjust some guidelines.	No change.
28 WG	WG	<b>Build-To Lines</b> are a very important element of the sector plan and should be included in future Zoning Ordinance amendments for “C-3”, “C-2” or other districts used in Clarendon.	Build-To Lines could be an element in the proposed zoning ordinance amendments for Clarendon and staff would analyze how best to include this element in the ordinance language. However, staff would expect that this would be an item that the County Board could modify for certain site constraints, priorities for plazas/open spaces, and alternative locations for service/parking access areas.	No change.
29 WG	WG	<b>Clear Zone widths</b> in the Streetscape guidelines should be codified in zoning.	Clear zones could be codified and staff would analyze how best to incorporate into the ordinance. However, staff would recommend that the County Board be able to modify these items on a case-by-case basis to account for preserved structures or other specific site constraints where achieving the described clear width may not be feasible.	No change.
30 TC	LPCA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>At least 6’ minimum clear width</b> should be achieved adjacent to historic structures.</li> <li>2) Also, the streetscape exemptions described in the sector plan should only apply to that frontage directly adjacent to the preserved structure; all other streetscape areas should be consistent with the streetscape guidelines.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Staff concurs and adjustments to the specified dimensions for the Tree/Furniture and/or Shy Zone may be necessary in order to maintain clear widths in these locations. In order to maintain continuity of tree plantings, narrower tree pits, tree grates, or variation in the tree spacing may be necessary.</li> <li>2) Staff concurs.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) This will be clarified in the streetscape guideline section of the sector plan.</li> <li>2) This will be clarified in the streetscape guideline section of the sector plan.</li> </ol>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
31 TC	LPCA	The <b>Service/Alley frontage type</b> should be separated into two separate categories and each should clearly indicate the unique designation.	Staff concurs.	The category will be split and a different line type/designation will be used for alleys. Alleys will not be required to accommodate pedestrian circulation and therefore, accommodate the streetscape elements that are described for service streets.
32 TC	LPCA	<b>Service/Parking access areas</b> should at a minimum maintain the designated clear width for sufficient pedestrian travel. Within Service Frontages, there will be “service/parking access areas” and “non service/parking access areas”. The non-service areas should be consistent with other urban design guidelines such as fenestration, materials, and signage.	Staff concurs.	The plan will be clarified to indicate that, at a minimum, the clear widths should be accommodated even across “service/parking access areas”.  For areas outside of “service/parking access areas,” consistency with the fenestration, materials, and signage guidelines described in section C.4 Building Design would be expected.
<b>Transportation &amp; Parking</b>				
33 LRPC	PC	Include a goal/standard to <b>reduce streetscape clutter</b> near handicap access parking spaces?	Staff concurs.	The plan will be revised to include a guideline that will address adequate clearance along streetscapes, and reduction of clutter, in vicinity of designated handicap/wheelchair parking spaces.
34 LRPC	PC	Include more detail on the <b>Washington Blvd and 10<sup>th</sup> Street</b> intersection.	Staff concurs.	A graphic will be included in the plan that illustrates the proposed improvements for this and other key intersections. (See attached graphic of proposed intersection improvements).
35 LRPC	TC	The Plan should indicate that developers should contribute to <b>new traffic signals</b> .	Staff concurs.	A recommendation will be included that the County should evaluate the provision of new traffic signals when warranted as part of future site plan projects.
36 LRPC	PC	Discuss <b>streetscape furniture</b> in context of all streetscape categories, not just on Tertiary Streets as currently drafted (pages 2.58-2.59)	Staff concurs.	The plan will be revised to delete the mention of streetscape furniture in this section to reduce confusion and inconsistency. This topic is covered in the UDGs discussion of Streetscapes, beginning on pg. 3.22.
37 LRPC	PC	Include discussion on <b>car sharing</b> (Flex, car pools, etc.)	A discussion on these items is covered by the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) section on p.2.82.	No change.
38 LRPC	PC	Include/maintain <b>left turn lanes</b> on Kirkwood Rd at Washington Blvd. and Fairfax Dr.	Two approach lanes should be provided at each traffic signal.	The plan will indicate that turn lanes would be provided.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
39 LRPC	PC	Clarify <b>intent of Parking Policies</b> #45 (Locate and design any needed parking...), #48 (Consider the high land values.....), and #49 (Price public parking.....)	Staff prepared revised policies to clarify the intent and reduce duplication. These revised policies were discussed with and supported by the Transportation Commission on 11/21/06 (see next column).  Intent of parking policy related to “pricing” is essentially to not provide free parking if people driving (rather than taking transit) is to be discouraged.	The plan will be revised to include the following revised parking polices: 43. Provide sufficient parking to meet realistic needs generated by the envisioned land use mix proposed in the plan. 44. Locate and design parking facilities, including access points, in such a manner as to reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians along streetscapes and through the design readily enable pedestrians to reach parking areas. 45. Emphasize strategic locations of pooled parking resources enabling visitors to Clarendon to park once and walk to multiple destinations. 46. Include knock-out panels in underground parking garages in order to facilitate connections to adjacent parking facilities particularly where adjacent parcels are irregularly shaped or sized which could limit the viability of underground parking. 47. Price on- and off-street public parking to encourage efficient use, reflect the public cost of providing parking, and to minimize incentives to drive personal vehicles.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
40 LRPC PC	PC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider identifying critical locations for <b>shared parking</b> resources.</li> <li>2. A <b>specific shared parking formula</b> should not be included in the sector plan, only a strong recommendation that would encourage shared parking through future site plan projects.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff concurs. Also, after further staff discussion, staff has revised the Shared Parking formula/criteria to obtain shared parking quantities (see next column for revised text).</li> <li>2. Staff continues to recommend that obtaining a portion of the required parking for visitors to Clarendon is an important objective of the sector plan and that by including a specific target for each use in the sector plan establishes a criteria in which the County can negotiate for shared parking through future site plan projects.</li> </ol>	<p>1. The plan will be revised to clarify that the recommended Prime Office sites are important sites where shared parking for visitors to Clarendon will be sought.</p> <p>The plan will be changed to indicate this revised information on Shared Parking (<u>new text</u>):            “New projects should design their garages to <u>maximize the use of their parking spaces over a twenty-four hour period. The parking spaces would be “shared” so that visitors of the proposed building(s) and the general public would have access to short-term, unreserved, high-turnover parking spaces during the hours not in use by the primary building occupants.</u> The shared parking spaces should not be considered extra or additional parking spaces; rather, these spaces would be allocated from the total amount of required spaces for the total project based on the proposed uses. The parking spaces that are designated as shared parking would be calculated by applying the following formulas to the specific project and should be located on the first level of the garage closest to the street level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 1 space for every 10 residential units, <u>when there is at least 100 units, made available during the day from 9AM-5PM;</u></li> <li>– <u>During the day and evening hours,</u> the following uses shall provide shared parking as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o All parking for retail and restaurant uses</li> <li>o Any parking proposed for commercial office uses that exceeds the minimum requirement; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Ten percent (10%) of the required commercial office use parking <u>made available during the day from 9AM-5PM.</u></li> <li>– <u>70%</u> of the required commercial office use parking should be made available for use by the public during evenings and weekends when the office spaces are not typically occupied.”</li> </ul> <p>2. No change.</p>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
41 LRPC	PC	Include a recycling plan that identifies design and locations for <b>recycling</b> bins/containers on within streetscape.	A program for street side recycling has not been developed yet in Arlington County.	No change.
42 LRPC	PC	Are the 6-foot parking lanes correct as shown in figures 2.21 and 2.22?	The 6-foot notations are typos.	These figures will be revised to indicate 8-foot wide parking lanes.
43 LRPC	PC	Clarify the term shy lane (Figures on pages 2.72 and 2.73)?	“Shy lanes” should read as “Shy Lines” in these figures.	The cross sections will be revised to correct these typos.
44 LRPC	PC	Do any of the street cross sections address the intersection of Highland Street and Washington Blvd?	Figure 2.27 (Cross-section #8, on p2.72) should be titled “Washington Boulevard West of North Highland Street”.	The cross section will be renamed. (See attached graphic of proposed street improvements along Highland Street).
45 WG	LPCA	The proposed <b>lane widths for Highland Street</b> should remain at 9’ – 10’ to accommodate 5’-wide bike lanes.	Staff concurs. 9’-10’ lane widths with bike lanes can be used on Highland in order to create 5’ bike lanes. Where parking is not provided, and the bicycle lane is adjacent to the curb it can be marked at 4’ wide.	The plan will be revised to indicate these dimensions. (See attached graphic mentioned above).
46 WG	LVCA	Should <b>bike lanes on Highland Street be considered an interim use</b> which could later be converted to additional on-street parking areas in the future if tenancy changes at 3100 Clarendon Blvd?	Bike lane markings could be removed in the future if the community favors additional parking.	No change.
47 WG	LVCA	Can oversize vehicles (i.e., delivery trucks) maneuver around <b>nubs</b> proposed at some intersections such as Highland/Clarendon?	One goal of the sector plan is to reduce crosswalk distances. Nubs indicated on illustrative plans are illustrative. However, detailed engineering plans will have to be prepared at which time staff will determine where and how nubs can be used.	No change.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
<p>48 TC PC</p>	<p>1) TC 2) PC</p>	<p>1. The <b><u>parking relief for preservation or smaller sites under 20,000 square feet</u></b> with allowances for off-site parking or in-lieu fee contributions could yield no or too few parking spaces at the project site which could result in spillover parking in adjacent neighborhoods, too heavy parking demands on other nearby parking locations, or could conflict with accessible parking needs. A lower site size threshold should be considered for off-site parking locations. The Transportation Commission recommended a distance of ¼-mile radius from a project site to the off-site parking location.</p> <p>2. Additional accessible parking spaces should be provided in Clarendon, in on- and off-street locations.</p>	<p>1. As part of the planning process, it was determined that small, infill projects were desired which could provide diverse architecture and could provide opportunities for smaller and/or diverse office tenants. Smaller sites could occur throughout Clarendon, however, these small sites may be more frequent along the edges of the Clarendon station area such as along 10<sup>th</sup> Street or Wilson Boulevard. In order for many of these sites to develop in a form consistent with the sector plan with multiple uses, multiple stories, improved sidewalks, and screened or underground parking, some on-site parking relief may be necessary.</p> <p>Staff continue to recommend that a site size of 20,000 square feet be used for this parking relief option as this is a small site size and would likely have size constraints for parking; anything smaller in size may not likely be a viable development site if all required parking were to remain on site. In order to address concerns that any off-site parking should be in closer proximity to the project site, staff would recommend revising the targeted distance from ¼-mile to 1,000 linear feet radius from the project site. This distance is consistent with an existing distance used in the Metro corridors for parking relief for restaurants or commercial uses with 5,000 square feet or less gross floor area. This would establish a walking distance of approximately three (3) blocks between the off-site parking location and the project site.</p> <p>2. Staff will continue to obtain accessible parking spaces in private garages and ensure that facilities are properly constructed to accommodate accessible vehicles. Also, the County policy is to work with the community to provide accessible parking spaces on the street based on demand.</p>	<p>1. The plan would be revised to permit up to 100% of the required parking could be located within a 1,000 feet of the project site.</p> <p>2. No change.</p>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
49 TC	TC	<p>What is the most appropriate parking relief for projects with preserved structures? TC members support Option 4 as described.</p>	<p>Staff prepared 3 options to determine how much parking would be required or relieved for projects that include structures recommended for preservation. Option 1 include the existing relief offered in the “C-3” and “C-R” districts; however, the regulation language is complex and the relief could relieve more parking than necessary and result with too few required parking spaces. Option 2 would allow for full relief from required parking if there is no existing parking and would allow the lesser of either the required parking for the proposed use in the associated preserved structure or the amount of existing parking. Option 3 would reduce the parking requirement by an amount of parking that would have been otherwise required for the amount of building square footage preserved.</p> <p>A fourth option, similar to Option 2, was suggested at a Clarendon working group and Transportation Commission meetings as a way of pro-rating parking based on the amount of partial preservation proposed and introduces an option to maintain the amount of existing parking as of the sector plan adoption. The proposal is as follows:  <u>The parking requirement for the floor area of full preservation required by the plan will be the lesser of: (1) the ordinary requirement under the ordinance, or (2) the amount specified in Table X as existing on January 1, 2007 [or alternative date chosen by the County Board].</u></p> <p><u>The parking requirement for the floor area of partial building preservation required by the plan will be the amount of parking specified in the table above, pro-rated by the ratio between the floor area specified {the bonus density provision that specifies the amount that is used to calculate the bonus} and the floor area of the original building.</u></p> <p><u>The County Board may choose to reduce the parking requirement for preservation of floor area within the identified buildings beyond the partial preservation required in the plan. In such case, the reduction may be equal to the lesser of: (1) the current ordinance requirement or, (2) the pro-rated amount based on the ratio of the floor area preserved and the floor area of the original building.</u></p>	<p>Staff supports the approach outlined in Option 4. The sector plan would be revised to incorporate this concept and remove other options. However, further refinement of the approach and verification of the existing parking amounts would be necessary during the development and review of proposed zoning ordinance amendments.</p> <p>A recent survey of parking associated with the structures recommended for preservation indicates the following amount of parking spaces for each structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Block 1: Meat market building (27); Bike/garden shop building (5)</li> <li>• Block 2: NTB (35)</li> <li>• Block 3: all buildings (40)</li> <li>• Block 8: all buildings (30)</li> <li>• Block 10: all buildings (12)</li> <li>• Block 12: all buildings (0)</li> <li>• Block 18: Murky Coffee (5)</li> <li>• Block 19: Kirby Garage (8)</li> <li>• Block 24: USPS (0)</li> <li>• Block 27: all buildings (0)</li> <li>• Block 30: Leadership Bldg (0)</li> </ul>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
50 TC	LPCA	<p>The 10<sup>th</sup> Street cross section, east of Washington Blvd. needs further discussion with the community to improve pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>Improved pedestrian facilities such as reflective cross walks should be installed in the near term to improve safe pedestrian crossings.</p>	<p>As part of NC Plan implementation, traffic calming, or other pedestrian safety initiatives, staff will continue to work with the community on the most appropriate cross section for this segment of 10<sup>th</sup> Street and any other improvements to the pedestrian network.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Other</b>				
51 WG	WG	<p>Lower building forms should be created if redevelopment occurs on “C-3” properties where it abuts “R” zoning areas in order to provide an <b><u>appropriate transition between low-density residential and commercial areas.</u></b></p> <p>Concerns were raised about precedents in other parts of the County, such as Cherrydale, if the maximum building envelope is permitted.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the achievable floorplate sizes on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor if larger setbacks and stepbacks are imposed.</p> <p>Support was expressed for dual proposal which developers can choose either option: 1) establish setbacks (25’) and stepbacks (25’ height step up to 35’, then 45’ (LVCA proposal) or 2) establish a maximum number of floors (3) with maximum height of 40’. In either scenario, any remaining density that is earned for community benefits that can not fit on site, could be transferred to another receiving site in Clarendon.</p>	<p>Staff supports the dual approach as described.</p> <p>This approach would provide a transition between adjacent low-density areas and commercial areas, allow for any unused density to be transferred elsewhere in Clarendon, and would allow for viable floor plates and floor-to-floor ceiling heights which could support multiple uses.</p>	<p>The plan (text and/or maps) would be updated to reflect maximum building heights &amp; tapers in these areas.</p> <p>When Zoning Ordinance amendments for “C-2” are prepared, these options would be included.</p>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
52 WG	WG	<p>1) Are absolute height limits included in the adopted policies?</p> <p>2) Are absolute density limits included in the adopted policies?</p> <p>3) Are there limitations on the objects for which bonus density may be earned?</p> <p>The County Board has adopted 4 priorities for community benefits in Clarendon including: affordable housing, historic preservation, LEED, and public open space. If other community benefits are proposed, the County Board should announce in advance of its review of a site plan project, its intent to consider other community benefits.</p>	<p>1. Yes, there a maximum building heights (in feet) for all blocks in Clarendon. There are 3 specific areas that can exceed the maximum height designated as “Additional Height above Maximum Building Height and Additional Density above GLUP”, which allows heights up to 128’. The adopted policies also establish a maximum number of floors that are connected to the maximum density limits; however, the County Board can modify the maximum number of floors for all sites designated as “Receiving Sites” in exchange for community benefits.</p> <p>2. No, the adopted policies established a maximum density limit for all areas of Clarendon; however, additional density could be approved by the County Board in exchange for community benefits such as historic preservation. There is no absolute density limit on how much bonus density could be approved. Although, the maximum building height would establish that threshold.</p> <p>3. The adopted policies regarding bonus density for community benefits specifically list affordable housing, historic preservation, LEED, and public open space as possible purposes for bonus density. Section 36 allows bonus density for public facilities; however, this was not specifically cited in the sector plan.</p> <p>If other community benefits are to be considered for any site plan project, the County Board may consider in the context of a proposal that it would be considering an alternative community benefit and whether an announcement in advance of any public hearing was necessary.</p>	<p>1. No change</p> <p>2. No change</p> <p>3. No change.</p>

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

No./ Mtg.	Advisory Group	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Sector Plan
53 WG	WG	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the County Board approve bonus density for more preservation than what is recommended in the sector plan?</li> <li>2. Can the County Board approve parking relief for more preservation than what is recommended in the sector plan?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The intent of the adopted policy was, at a minimum, to obtain preservation of the buildings or partial buildings specified in the plan. If additional preservation is proposed beyond what the plan recommends, any bonus density for the additional preservation area would have to be evaluated and would be subject to the bonus density provisions outlined in Section 36 of the ZO to determine the impacts of the additional bonus density.</li> <li>2. Similar to the bonus density, the parking relief for preserved structures would be available for the amount of preservation recommended in the plan. If however, additional preservation is proposed, any additional parking relief would have to be evaluated to determine if the additional parking relief causes a negative impact on the available parking resources in Clarendon.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No change.</li> <li>2. No change.</li> </ol>
54 PC	PC PRC/UF	The County should strive to achieve at least a 15% tree coverage in Clarendon through the installation of street trees.	Staff concurs.	The plan will be revised to include a goal of achieving 15% tree coverage in Clarendon.
55 PC	PC	The County Board should direct staff to review the final document with the Long-Range Planning Committee, which incorporates all changes described at the time of County Board adoption, to ensure that all items are properly included.	Staff could bring the final plan to LRPC for review to ensure that all described changes are properly incorporated into the document before the final printing.	No change.

Legend: LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; PC – Planning Commission; TC – Transportation Commission; PRC – Park & Recreation Commission; UF – Urban Forestry; WG – Working Group Meeting; LVCA – Lyon Village Citizens Association representative; HALRB – Historic Affairs and Landmark Review Board representative; LPCA – Lyon Park Citizens Association representative; etc.

