

Report of the
Glencarlyn/Forest Glen Task Force
Urgent Care Center Property
July 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines the results of a survey conducted in April and May 2016 by a joint task force of the Glencarlyn Citizens Association and the Forest Glen Civic Association. The survey (see Appendix A) was developed to solicit views of the neighborhoods' residents on possible uses of the Urgent Care Center property on S. Carlin Springs Road (the "Property") should Arlington County elect to acquire it from the Virginia Hospital Center. Forty-two percent of the households responded. The survey was conducted in advance of the County identifying any plans for the Property. The survey looked at both public and private uses of the Property, including use of at least part of the Property for parks and recreation purposes.

The survey provided a clear and overwhelming consensus on some citizen concerns about possible use of the Property:

- Use of the Property should not increase traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road, particularly during peak school hours. South Carlin Springs Road between Route 50 and Columbia Pike is often gridlocked during the hours students arrive and depart because of traffic from two elementary schools and one middle school within a half-mile stretch of S. Carlin Springs Road.
- No use of the Property should result in construction of new or modification of existing roads in or through Glencarlyn Park ("the Park") or either the Glencarlyn or Forest Glen neighborhoods. Citizens of both neighborhoods strongly opposed any such action intended to make the Property, which is accessible by vehicle only from S. Carlin Springs Road, more accessible to vehicles (e.g., a pathway through Glencarlyn to Route 50, or to Columbia Pike via the Park and S. Greenbrier Street in Forest Glen).
- The County should preserve the scenic easement, maintaining the current greenspace between any structure on the Property and the Park. Preservation of the character of those tracts could be accomplished by adding the easement tracts to the Park.
- Other issues about use of the Property that resulted in 90 percent of the respondents indicating they were either somewhat or very concerned were loss of green space/open space, negative effect on natural resources and high intensity use (possibly related to traffic).
- Issues that resulted in concerned responses in the 80 percent range included possible high-rise development, incompatibility with single-family residential neighborhoods, overflow parking on neighborhood streets, noise, and reduction in property values from industrial use.

The survey provided less consensus on specific possible uses of the property.

- Parks and recreation uses receiving the most positive response were providing better protection for Moses Ball Spring, an environmental center/outdoor lab, an arboretum or a community garden.
- No public uses of the property were favored distinctly, although a farmers' market, County offices for staff use only, a County Emergency Operations Center or a County overflow conference center showed the highest levels of acceptance or support.
- There was consensus with respect to some public uses. Public uses that were opposed by the highest margins were schools at any level. The greatest degree of opposition was to a high school (72.3 percent very opposed, 10.6 percent somewhat opposed), trailed closely by a middle school (70.9 percent and 11.2 percent), another elementary school (63 percent and 15.2 percent), or school "swing" sites¹ (42.4 percent and 20.4 percent, or 48.2 percent and 17.3 percent if trailers were added to the existing facility). Also opposed by a high margin were a school bus parking and maintenance garage, a community service center with homeless shelter and a recycling center (including organic waste recycling).
- The survey also suggested some private uses of the property, none of which received overwhelming support. The highest level of support was for an urgent care center and a day care center, the existing uses. The greatest opposition was to affordable housing for families, with a lower rate of opposition to affordable housing for the elderly. More than 50 percent of respondents were somewhat or very opposed to small retail use of the property.

I. Background to the Survey

In March 2016, the Glencarlyn Citizens Association ("Glencarlyn") and the Forest Glen Civic Association ("Forest Glen") formed a joint task force to evaluate their members' views on the possible uses of the Urgent Care Center property (the "Property") on South Carlin Springs Road if Arlington County elects to acquire it from Virginia Hospital Center. The Property is adjacent to Glencarlyn boundaries and Glencarlyn Park. Although not directly adjacent to Forest Glen boundaries, the Property is nearby to and visible from Forest Glen and directly adjacent to Glencarlyn Park, into which Forest Glen streets dead-end.

Before forming the task force, the two associations held an initial informational meeting on the potential acquisition of the Property (December 2015) and a subsequent workshop (January 2016) to present information on the Property, zoning and related land use and natural resource plans. The workshop included a "brainstorming" session in which the participants identified concerns about the change in use as well as possible uses of the Property (with

¹ A "swing" site is a temporary site for a school used during construction of a school at a different location.

associated pros and cons). The results of that brainstorming session were the basis for the survey the task force conducted in April and May 2016. See the survey form in Appendix A.

Printed copies of the surveys were distributed in the neighborhoods and also were made available through list-serve and e-mail distribution. The task force also offered the option of completing the survey online through Survey Monkey. Printed and completed surveys were collected online, at the Glencarlyn Library and a home in each neighborhood and during the Glencarlyn Days pancake breakfast. Residents were asked to complete only one survey per household. A total of 263 surveys were returned from the 619 households in the two neighborhoods, a response rate of 42 percent.

The discussion below includes reference to some individual write-in comments from respondents. All write-in comments are compiled for reference in Appendix B.

II. Question 1: Concerns about Changing the Use of the Property

Question 1 asked respondents to indicate their level of concern about multiple issues associated with changing the use of the property from an urgent care center, day care and administrative office. The issues identified were ones discussed in the neighborhoods' brainstorming session. The discussion of the issues that follows has grouped them into categories, although they were not so categorized in the survey itself. See [Table 1](#) for a compilation of the responses.

A. Traffic Concerns

The survey identified three issues specifically related to traffic from a change in use: increased traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road, increased traffic during peak school hours and possible road access through the Park or neighborhoods to increase vehicle access to the Property.

The greatest level of concern was the possibility of road access through the Park or the neighborhoods to increase vehicle access to the Property, followed closely by increased traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road and increased traffic during peak school hours. On the issue of new roads, 85.7 percent responded that they were very concerned (with 9.7 per percent saying they were somewhat concerned). Only 2.3 percent said they were neutral, with 1.6 percent saying they did not think this was a big problem.²

Traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road also rated high as a concern. Survey responses on the question of increased traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road were 77.2 percent very concerned and 16.6 percent somewhat concerned. On the question of increased traffic during peak school hours the responses were 73.8 percent very concerned and 17.2 percent somewhat concerned.

Write-in comments from several respondents noted the safety issues from adding roads through the Park or either neighborhood. One respondent noted that traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road already causes some cut-through traffic in Glencarlyn, as drivers try to avoid gridlocked traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road by taking parallel roads in Glencarlyn. The challenge to

² See the discussion in Section III for additional color on this issue.

residents' safety is significant. A number of write-in comments also addressed residents' frustrations from gridlocked traffic on S. Carlin Springs Road, particularly during school hours.

B. Environmental Effects

The survey responses also indicated a high level of concern about environmental effects from development of the Property. On the issue of potential loss of green space and open space, 77 percent of respondents indicated they were very concerned and 13.4 percent indicated they were somewhat concerned. Only 4.2 percent expressed neutrality and 3.5 percent responded that they did not think this was a problem.³ On the potential negative effect on natural resources (such as pollution of Long Branch), 71 percent of respondents expressed a high level of concern, 21.3 percent said they were somewhat concerned and 9 percent said they were neutral or not concerned. On the question of noise, 51.6 percent said they were highly concerned, 31.2 percent were somewhat concerned, and 16.8 percent were neutral or not concerned.

Some survey respondents added write-in comments on the importance of preserving existing green space and open space in a County that is rapidly urbanizing, and the importance of Long Branch Nature Center, the surrounding parklands and the tree canopy.

C. Land Use/Compatibility

Several survey questions asked about the level of concern associated with the nature of use of the land, e.g., high-intensity use, high-rise development and incompatibility with single-family residential neighborhoods. A related question asked about possible overflow parking onto neighborhood streets. On the question of high-rise development, 70.9 percent said they were very concerned, and 14.2 percent were somewhat concerned. A total of 10.7 percent of respondents were neutral on the issue and 3.8 percent said they did not think it was a concern. On the question of incompatibility with single-family residential neighborhoods, 69.8 percent were very concerned, 16.7 percent were somewhat concerned, 6.6 percent were neutral and 5.8 percent responded that they did not believe it was a concern. Responses were somewhat similar on "high-intensity" use, with 66.4 percent very concerned, 24.2 percent somewhat concerned, 7 percent neutral and 2 percent not concerned.

We note that we did not break out the responses on the question of overflow parking between Glencarlyn (which could be affected) and Forest Glen (which likely would not be affected), so the level of concern expressed in the compiled responses may actually be lower than it would be if Glencarlyn only were surveyed on this question. Even with that disclaimer, we note that 61.6 percent expressed a high level of concern on this issue, with 19.1 percent somewhat concerned, 11.3 percent neutral and 4.7 percent not concerned.

Write-in comments on land use questions expressed concern about density and environmental effects of high density development. A write-in comment notes that we do not want to become a "mini-Manhattan." The comments also frequently note concern about development that would bring commuters and parkers onto neighborhood streets, which are very narrow in Glencarlyn.

³ See the discussion in Sections IV and V for additional color on this issue.

D. Property Values

On the question of concern about property values, respondents were more concerned about reduction in values from industrial use than from addition of affordable housing in the area, although the level of concern was high on both questions (65 percent very concerned about industrial use and 19.1 percent somewhat concerned; 52.4 percent very concerned about affordable housing use and 19.3 percent somewhat concerned).

One write-in comment specifically opposing any industrial use recommended conversion of the entire Property to parkland, a comment echoed in several other responses. Another respondent said that additional affordable housing in South Arlington and loss of green space were the greatest concerns.

E. Other Issues

As noted in the introduction, the suggested issues in the survey were generated at a workshop and brainstorming session with representatives from the Glencarlyn and Forest Glen neighborhoods. As such, the survey did not list all possible concerns, but invited write-ins. Write-in comments raised concerns about air pollution, property taxes, crime and increased population. Several comments expressed concern about loss of the nearby urgent care center, which decreases the need for emergency room visits. Other comments expressed general frustration with County decision-making, which those respondents believe burdens and disfavors South Arlington over North Arlington (and developers). Several commenters expressed concern that the decision-making process on property acquisition will not take citizen concerns into account.

III. Question 2: Roads through the Neighborhoods or the Park

As [Figure 1](#) shows, an overwhelming majority of respondents (88 percent) were very opposed to any attempt to mitigate traffic effects from development of the Property by building new or modifying existing roads through the Park or either neighborhood. Only five of the 259 respondents who answered this question were in favor of new roads (see write-in comments in [Appendix B](#)); however, the predominant response indicated that no proposed use of the Property should result in additional traffic through the neighborhoods or the Park.

Write-in comments expressed a high level of concern about preservation of the neighborhoods' peace and quiet that derives from dead-ending into the Park. A few comments also noted that road-building through the Park could be problematic for the County's compliance with municipal separate storm sewer system and Chesapeake Bay Watershed Act requirements.

IV. Question 3: Preservation of Scenic Easement

Survey respondents favored preservation of the scenic easement as green space by a wide margin. See [Figure 2](#), which illustrates that 78.7 percent of responses thought preservation of the easement was very important, 14.8 percent thought it was somewhat important, 5.7 percent were neutral, and less than one percent were in favor of its being developed. We note also that some respondents wrote in their votes in favor of preserving the "sledding hill" behind the hospital, which involves the easement.

V. Question 4: Parks and Recreation Uses

The survey solicited response to co-location of parks and recreation uses with other possible uses of the property. See the compilation of responses in [Table 2](#). Suggestions that received a relatively high level of support include better protection of Moses Ball Spring, which is located on the Property (48.2 percent highly supportive and 26.7 percent somewhat supportive), an arboretum (41.8 percent highly supportive and 19.3 percent somewhat supportive), a community garden (34.8 percent highly supportive and 24.1 percent somewhat supportive), and an environmental center/outdoor lab (30.6 percent highly supportive and 23.4 percent somewhat supportive). Another possible use that was generally supported, but at a lower rate, was a picnic area (27 percent and 25.8 percent).

A possible use with a largely split response was relocation of the Glencarlyn Dog Park from its current streamside location to the Property. Proponents of this suggestion during the brainstorming session suggested it as a measure to protect Long Branch by diminishing erosion and allowing revegetation for water quality protection and improvement.

Suggested uses that received more negative votes than positive ones were development of a community center and the relocation of Long Branch Nature Center to allow for better parking and disabled access.

Write-in comments also suggested a pool, sportsplex, baseball diamonds and a “green” elementary school addition to Campbell; however, a greater proportion of the write-in comments opposed any construction and loss of green space.

The Task Force decided not to include as a survey option conversion of the entire tract to parkland, given the strong expression of multiple County needs identified in the Community Facilities Study Report. Nevertheless, a number of write-in comments supporting natural resource protection in response to both Question 1 and Question 4 suggest that some residents from both neighborhoods would support a move to add the entire Property to the Park.

VI. Question 5: Public Uses

The survey results on the question of acceptable public uses of the Property provided stronger signs of what uses would be opposed than what uses would be supported. See the compilation of responses in [Table 3](#). The only suggested public use that received strong support was a farmers’ market (41.5 percent highly supportive, 21.9 percent somewhat supportive, with low rates of opposition).

It was clear that the neighborhoods do not want the Property to be the location of another school. The greatest opposition was to a high school (72.3 percent very opposed, 10.6 percent somewhat opposed), followed by a middle school (70.9 percent very opposed, 11.2 percent somewhat opposed) and then an elementary school (63 percent very opposed, 15.2 percent somewhat opposed). The rate of opposition was lower (but still significant) to use of the Property as a school “swing” site, a temporary site for a school during construction at a different location. Responses to that option were 48.2 percent very opposed and 17.3 percent somewhat opposed if trailers were involved (42.4 percent very opposed and 20.4 percent somewhat opposed if only the existing building were involved). Most of the write-in comments on the

question of schools noted that there are already two elementary schools and a middle school in close proximity, all of them channeling traffic onto S. Carlin Springs Road.

Respondents also strongly opposed using the site for any industrial-type use, e.g., a school bus parking and maintenance garage (64.2 percent very opposed, 18.3 percent somewhat opposed) or a recycling center (52.6 percent very opposed, 19.8 percent somewhat opposed; for organic waste recycling, 42.9 percent very opposed and 15.6 percent somewhat opposed).

More than half of the respondents also opposed a community services center (57 percent strongly opposed to a center that includes a homeless shelter, 14.3 percent somewhat opposed; 39 percent strongly opposed to a center without a shelter, 19.7 percent somewhat opposed). Opposition was less strong for a fire station (30.6 percent very opposed, 17.3 percent somewhat opposed), but the number of supporters was low, with 25.5 percent willing to accept a fire station, 18 percent somewhat supportive and only 8.6 percent highly supportive.

Support and opposition were more balanced on the question of County offices, a County Emergency Operations Center, or an overflow conference center or meeting space. Although none of the options received a resounding vote of support, a fair percentage responded that they “could accept” those uses of the property. We note, however, that there was a higher level of opposition to County administrative offices that would involve customer visits instead of just staff use.


At least one write-in comment urged location of Parks and Recreation offices at the site because of proximity to Glencarlyn Park. Other comments generally echoed the concern that use of the Property not worsen the already difficult traffic problems on S. Carlin Springs Road.

VII. Question 6: Private Uses

The only private use identified in the survey that received relatively strong support from the neighborhoods was continued location of an urgent care center at the Property. Responses were mixed, although generally more favorable to than opposed to a day care center. See the compilation of responses in [Table 4](#). Opposition was generally high to affordable housing (51.4 percent very opposed, 13.6 percent somewhat opposed, to family housing; 32.8 percent very opposed and 14.7 percent somewhat opposed to elder housing). Small retail operations also got a relatively high negative response (33.7 percent very opposed, 19.4 percent somewhat opposed).


FIGURES

Figure 1
Question 2: The property may be more useful to the County if it can route traffic through Glencarlyn, Glencarlyn Park, Forest Glen and/or the scenic easement to Route 50, Columbia Pike and/or 7th Road South (behind Campbell School).



[Go to discussion of question 2](#)

Figure 2
**Question 3: How important is it to you that the
“scenic easement” remains green space only?**



[Go to discussion of question 3](#)

TABLES

Table 1

Question 1: Assuming Arlington County obtains the Urgent Care Center Property in a land swap with the Virginia Hospital Center, what are your concerns about changing the use of the property?					
	I don't think this is a big problem.	I'm neutral on this.	I'm somewhat concerned.	I'm very concerned.	N/A
Possible road access through the park or neighborhoods	1.55% 4	2.33% 6	9.69% 25	85.66% 221	0.78% 2
Increased traffic on Carlin Springs Road	1.93% 5	4.25% 11	16.60% 43	77.22% 200	0.00% 0
Loss of green space and open space	3.45% 9	4.21% 11	13.41% 35	77.01% 201	1.92% 5
Increased traffic during peak school hours	1.56% 4	6.64% 17	17.19% 44	73.83% 189	0.78% 2
Negative effect on natural resources (such as pollution of Long Branch)	2.33% 6	3.88% 10	21.32% 55	70.93% 183	1.55% 4
High-intensity use	1.95% 5	7.03% 18	24.22% 62	66.41% 170	0.39% 1
High-rise development	3.83% 10	10.73% 28	14.18% 37	70.88% 185	0.38% 1
Use that is incompatible with single-family residential neighborhoods	5.81% 15	6.59% 17	16.67% 43	69.77% 180	1.16% 3
Overflow parking onto neighborhood streets	4.65% 12	8.53% 22	25.19% 65	61.63% 159	0.00% 0
Reduction in property values from industrial use	4.67% 12	11.28% 29	19.07% 49	64.98% 167	0.00% 0
Noise	6.80% 17	10.00% 25	31.20% 78	51.60% 129	0.40% 1
Reduction in property values from affordable housing development	13.39% 34	14.17% 36	19.29% 49	52.36% 133	0.79% 2

[Go to discussion of question 1](#)

Table 2

Question 4: The County could set aside part of the Urgent Care Property for parks and recreation, even if it makes other use of the property, such as building administrative offices. The County calls that “co-locating” multiple uses at a site. Please indicate your view on the following possible parks and recreation uses.

	Highly supportive	Somewhat supportive	Could accept	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
Re-locate Long Branch Nature Center (better parking and access)	15.56% 40	14.79% 38	25.68% 66	15.56% 40	29.96% 77
Environmental Center/Outdoor Lab for students (non-peak traffic)	30.56% 77	23.41% 59	30.95% 78	7.54% 19	7.94% 20
Re-locate the Glencarlyn Dog Park (natural resource protection, decreased traffic through Glencarlyn, and decreased parking in Forest Glen)	16.73% 42	19.12% 48	33.07% 83	12.75% 32	18.73% 47
Better protection of Moses Ball Spring (See aerial photograph at the beginning of the survey—Moses Ball Spring is one of the original natural springs in the area.)	48.21% 121	26.69% 67	16.33% 41	5.18% 13	4.78% 12
Picnic area	26.98% 68	25.79% 65	28.57% 72	7.94% 20	10.71% 27
Community garden	34.78% 88	24.11% 61	22.92% 58	8.30% 21	10.28% 26
Arboretum	41.77% 104	19.28% 48	25.70% 64	6.02% 15	7.23% 18
A community center (including recreation facilities, meeting rooms, classrooms)	16.67% 42	15.87% 40	27.38% 69	15.87% 40	24.21% 61

[Go to discussion of question 4](#)

Table 3

Question 5: What are your views on the following County or School Board uses of the property? Listed below are PUBLIC uses— use of the property for County or School facilities.					
	Highly supportive	Somewhat supportive	Could Accept	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
County offices for staff use only (limited public traffic but some rushhour traffic)	11.37% 29	19.22% 49	34.90% 89	12.94% 33	21.57% 55
County offices with customer visits (assume additional vehicle traffic throughout the day)	6.75% 17	12.30% 31	23.41% 59	23.41% 59	34.13% 86
County Emergency Operations Center (non-routine use)	13.55% 34	22.31% 56	31.87% 80	12.75% 32	19.52% 49
County overflow conference center or meeting space (non-routine use)	9.56% 24	18.73% 47	35.46% 89	14.34% 36	21.91% 55
Community services center (such as employment assistance, homeless assistance)	6.95% 18	10.81% 28	23.55% 61	19.69% 51	39.00% 101
Community services center, including homeless shelter	2.71% 7	9.30% 24	16.67% 43	14.34% 37	56.98% 147
Community performance center (arts, entertainment)	18.97% 48	24.90% 63	25.69% 65	12.65% 32	17.79% 45
Farmers' market	41.47% 107	20.93% 54	22.09% 57	5.43% 14	10.08% 26
Fire station	8.63% 22	18.04% 46	25.49% 65	17.25% 44	30.59% 78
Elementary school	4.28% 11	8.17% 21	9.34% 24	15.18% 39	63.04% 162
Middle school	3.10% 8	5.81% 15	8.91% 23	11.24% 29	70.93% 183
High school	3.52% 9	4.30% 11	9.38% 24	10.55% 27	72.27% 185
“Swing site” for schools using only existing building (temporary school site when other school is under construction)	3.53% 9	11.76% 30	21.96% 56	20.39% 52	42.35% 108

**Question 5: What are your views on the following County or School Board uses of the property?
Listed below are PUBLIC uses— use of the property for County or School facilities.**

	Highly supportive	Somewhat supportive	Could Accept	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
“Swing site” for schools using existing building and/or trailers (temporary school site when other school is under construction)	3.14% 8	10.98% 28	20.39% 52	17.25% 44	48.24% 123
School bus parking and maintenance garage	1.95% 5	2.72% 7	12.84% 33	18.29% 47	64.20% 165
Recycling center	2.77% 7	8.70% 22	16.21% 41	19.76% 50	52.57% 133
Organic waste recycling center (mulch production from clippings, leaves—similar to former site at 26th St. N and Old Dominion)	7.03% 18	10.94% 28	21.48% 55	15.63% 40	44.92% 115

[Go to discussion of question 5](#)

Table 4

Question 6: What are your views on the following possible PRIVATE uses of the property, where the County could make the property available for others' use?					
	Highly supportive	Somewhat supportive	Could accept	Somewhat opposed	Very opposed
Affordable housing (families)	8.56% 22	7.78% 20	18.68% 48	13.62% 35	51.36% 132
Affordable housing (elderly)	13.90% 36	15.06% 39	23.55% 61	14.67% 38	32.82% 85
Day care center	17.44% 45	20.54% 53	31.01% 80	9.69% 25	21.32% 55
Urgent care center	33.59% 87	20.08% 52	30.12% 78	4.25% 11	11.97% 31
Small retail	13.18% 34	15.50% 40	18.22% 47	19.38% 50	33.72% 87

[Go to discussion of question 6](#)

APPENDIX A

Survey Form

Glencarlyn/Forest Glen Neighborhood Survey
Virginia Hospital Center's Urgent Care Center Property
April 2016

**PLEASE TAKE 15 MINUTES TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY—
IT'S IMPORTANT—DEADLINE MAY 30**

Arlington County and the Virginia Hospital Center are discussing a land swap that could result in Arlington County owning the Urgent Care Center Property on Carlin Springs Road.

This survey is from the Glencarlyn/Forest Glen Task Force that was formed by the two civic associations to identify and communicate to the County our neighborhoods' concerns and preferences on the use of the Urgent Care Center Property, if the County acquires it. The survey covers possible use of the Urgent Care Center property by Arlington County or the Arlington County Schools.

Please provide your address below so we will know which residences have responded. We want to be able to tell the County that we have responses from a significant number of residents in the affected area, and we need to be able to verify only one response per household.

Please also provide the optional information, if at all possible. We will not use your name in our report and will contact you only if we have follow-up questions (can't read the response, etc.). The other information, such as years you have lived in the neighborhood, may help us in writing our report on the survey.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

REQUIRED INFORMATION:

My street address is:

OPTIONAL INFORMATION:

Name:

Phone number:

E-mail address:

I live in Glencarlyn.

I live in Forest Glen.

I own my residence.

I rent my residence.


I have lived here for ____ years.

A PICTURE OF THE PROPERTY

The Urgent Care Center property that Arlington County may acquire from Virginia Hospital Center does not include the medical offices to the south that are between the Urgent Care Center and Campbell Elementary School. They are not owned by Virginia Hospital Center.

The aerial photograph below shows the Urgent Care Center property and the “scenic easement” that is on part of the property, which Virginia Hospital Center cannot build on. Because the easement is for the benefit of the County, we are not certain it will remain in effect if the County (or the School Board) acquires the property. The picture also shows the location of Moses Ball Spring. The easement and Moses Ball Spring are mentioned in Questions 2, 3 and 4.

Virginia Hospital Center Urgent Care at S. Carlin Springs Rd.
Existing Conditions and Scenic Easements



QUESTION 1: Assuming Arlington County obtains the Urgent Care Center Property in a land swap with the Virginia Hospital Center, what are your concerns about changing the use of the property? Please indicate your views using the following codes:

- 1. **I don't think this is a big problem.**
- 2. **I'm neutral on this.**
- 3. **I'm somewhat concerned.**
- 4. **I'm very concerned.**

- _____ A. Increased traffic on Carlin Springs Road
- _____ B. Increased traffic during peak school hours
- _____ C. Possible road access through the park or neighborhoods
- _____ D. Overflow parking onto neighborhood streets
- _____ E. High-intensity use
- _____ F. High-rise development
- _____ G. Reduction in property values from industrial use
- _____ H. Reduction in property values from affordable housing development
- _____ I. Use that is incompatible with single-family residential neighborhoods
- _____ J. Loss of green space and open space
- _____ K. Negative effect on natural resources (such as pollution of Long Branch)
- _____ L. Noise
- _____ M. Other:

Additional comments or concerns: _____

QUESTION 2: Because the only access to the Urgent Care Center Property is from Carlin Springs Road, we have heard that the County or Arlington County Schools may consider making the property more useful to them by routing traffic **through** Glencarlyn, Glencarlyn Park, Forest Glen and/or the scenic easement **to** Route 50, Columbia Pike and/or 7th Road South (behind Campbell School). Indicate your views on this issue by marking one response with an X.

- _____ 1. I would like to see some additional roads built.
- _____ 2. I'm neutral on this question.
- _____ 3. I am somewhat concerned about additional roads.
- _____ 4. I am opposed to any additional traffic routed through the Park or our neighborhoods.
- _____ 5. I am VERY opposed to any additional traffic routed through the Park or our neighborhoods.

Additional comments or concerns: _____

QUESTION 3: How important is it to you that the “scenic easement” (shown on the aerial photograph at the beginning of this survey) remains green space only? Mark one response below with an X.

- _____ 1. Very important
- _____ 2. Somewhat important
- _____ 3. I’m neutral.
- _____ 4. I would like to see it developed.

QUESTION 4: The County could set aside part of the Urgent Care Property for parks and recreation, even if it makes other use of the property, such as building administrative offices. The County calls that “co-locating” multiple uses at a site. Please indicate your view on the following possible parks and recreation uses by the following numbered codes:

- 1. **Highly supportive** of this use of the property
 - 2. **Somewhat supportive** of this use of the property
 - 3. **Could accept** this use of the property
 - 4. **Somewhat opposed** to this use of the property
 - 5. **Very opposed** to this use of the property
-
- _____ A. Re-locate Long Branch Nature Center (better parking and access)
 - _____ B. Environmental Center/Outdoor Lab for students (non-peak traffic)
 - _____ C. Re-locate the Glencarlyn Dog Park (natural resource protection, decreased traffic through Glencarlyn, and decreased parking in Forest Glen)
 - _____ D. Better protection of Moses Ball Spring (See aerial photograph at the beginning of the survey—Moses Ball Spring is one of the original natural springs in the area.)
 - _____ E. Picnic area
 - _____ F. Community garden
 - _____ G. Arboretum
 - _____ H. A community center (including recreation facilities, meeting rooms, classrooms)
 - _____ I. Other:

 - _____ J. Other:

Please provide any comments you may have about your responses: _____

QUESTION 5: What are your views on the following County or School Board uses of the property? Listed below are PUBLIC uses—use of the property for County or School facilities. Possible PRIVATE uses (the County making the property available for others’ use) are in Question 6. Please indicate your view on the following PUBLIC uses by the following numbered codes:

- 1. **Highly supportive** of this use of the property
 - 2. **Somewhat supportive** of this use of the property
 - 3. **Could accept** this use of the property
 - 4. **Somewhat opposed** to this use of the property
 - 5. **Very opposed** to this use of the property
-
- _____ A. County offices for staff use only (limited public traffic but some rush-hour traffic)
 - _____ B. County offices with customer visits (assume additional vehicle traffic throughout the day)
 - _____ C. County Emergency Operations Center (non-routine use)
 - _____ D. County overflow conference center or meeting space (non-routine use)
 - _____ E. Community services center (such as employment assistance, homeless assistance)
 - _____ F. Community services center, including homeless shelter
 - _____ G. Community performance center (arts, entertainment)
 - _____ H. Farmers’ market
 - _____ I. Fire station
 - _____ J. Elementary school
 - _____ K. Middle school
 - _____ L. High school
 - _____ M. “Swing site” for schools⁴ using only existing building
 - _____ N. “Swing site” for schools using existing building and/or trailers
 - _____ O. School bus parking and maintenance garage
 - _____ P. Recycling center
 - _____ Q. Organic waste recycling center (mulch production from clippings, leaves—similar to former site at 26th St. N and Old Dominion)
 - _____ R. Other (describe):

 - _____ S. Other (describe):

Any additional comments on public uses (for example, types of service center operations you support or oppose): _____

⁴ A swing site is used for students displaced by construction at another location.

QUESTION 6: What are your views on the following possible PRIVATE uses of the property, where the County could make the property available for others' use? Please indicate your view on the possible PRIVATE uses by the following numbered codes:

- 1. **Highly supportive** of this use of the property
- 2. **Somewhat supportive** of this use of the property
- 3. **Could accept** this use of the property
- 4. **Somewhat opposed** to this use of the property
- 5. **Very opposed** to this use of the property

- _____ A. Affordable housing (families)
- _____ B. Affordable housing (elderly)
- _____ C. Day care center
- _____ D. Urgent care center
- _____ E. Small retail
- _____ F. Other (describe):

- _____ G. Other (describe):

Additional comments on private uses (for example, your reasons for your preferences): _____

APPENDIX B

Compilation of Write-in Comments

**Comments in Response to Question 1:
Assuming Arlington County obtains the Urgent Care Center Property
in a land swap with the Virginia Hospital Center, what are your
concerns about changing the use of the property?**

Any additional loss of or impact to the very limited natural space remaining in Arlington (around only 4%) is a disservice to both current and future residents. . . . Scientific studies have shown the essential value toward well-being from time spent in natural settings for children and adults and these opportunities are even more limited for families that live in the already highly concentrated affordable housing near this remaining parkland in Arlington - far more than any other part of the county.

I do not want to see any type of industrial use--we have enough business-type use in this area, and enough housing - I think perhaps a county park type area

Save Hospital Hill for sledding

South Arlington is already overcrowded. It's time to look at North Arlington for some of the proposed changes (i.e. more APAH units.)

Additional affordable housing in South Arlington and loss of green space are the biggest concerns for me.

Reduction of scenic use/parkland and preservation of natural and cultural resources (e.g., the natural vernal pool that salamanders use for their once-a-year mating ritual, the historic spring, etc.). We do not want Arlington to become a "mini-Manhattan" as Jay Fisette said in one of Glencarlyn's community meetings in 2015.

Very concerned about loss, reduction, relocation of Long Branch Nature Center, and especially the surrounding park lands. Loss of tree canopy and watershed management are key environmental issues.

South Arlington seems to get the brunt of traffic changes, new schools, while our neighbors in North Arlington remain relatively unaffected. There are three schools in easy walking distance: we don't need a fourth school in this area, nor do we need any "improvement" that results in more traffic.

Environmental concerns due to density of construction is a big concern. Any use of this green area should be well planned and include maximum green spaces that gives Arlington its urban credibility.

Low income housing would destroy the character of Glencarlyn.

The very notion of adding to the existing burden in the area by making this property county property is utterly insensitive to current tax paying residents. It is absurd.

Very concerned that the decision-making process will be controlled by a small group of county personnel and not adequately take into account the concerns of the residents in the immediately surrounding neighborhoods.

Traffic on Carlin Springs Road is already much too heavy! The idea of placing anything on this site that would increase the number of cars on a daily basis is irresponsible. Cars are already cutting through the neighborhood in order to avoid the lights on Carlin Springs Road. I see this everyday. As these drivers routinely travel at unsafe speeds, increasing the numbers of these cars increases the danger to those of us who walk, run, bike or play in the neighborhood. If any of the county board members lived in our neighborhood they would never consider moving forward with this.

Overall more congestion that we do NOT have the capacity to absorb.

Any change in the use of this property that brings added traffic on Carlin Springs Road is going to be a significant quality of life issue for my family and neighbors. Traffic congestion on Carlin Springs Road is already a major problem, especially during rush hour and during peak school hours. Whatever the land is used for needs to be accompanied by a comprehensive traffic mitigation plan for Carlin Springs Road from Columbia Pike to Route 50.

Very concerned about crime, population increase. Change in the demographic of the neighborhood as a result is the main concern. This is why I bought into this neighborhood--because of the enclosure and buffer from the general population. Hence the definition of a neighborhood.

In 1976 Carlin Springs Road increased to 4 lanes. the County took 25 feet away from my front yard. Now the noise level went up 6 DB and goes 24/7

I would be very concerned if access to site thru Kensington St was ever granted. Concerned that possible access thru Kensington St would effectively chop the neighborhood in half. Kids walking to library would have to pay greater attention when crossing Kensington St to get to Library or Carlin Hall.

Since I moved to this area I have had to write letters: when the library hours were cut, when there was talk of 1) Campbell School having to move, 2) using the park for affordable housing, and 3) limiting the hours of Long Branch Nature Center. I paid a lot for my house, but it has lost value because, I believe, of the decline in the schools (associated with the rise in the schools in North Arlington that have fewer than 1 percent kids from Affordable Housing). The wholesale disregard for the concerns of S. Arlington homeowners correlates to the paramount concern for developers and North Arlington homeowners.

As a parent of a Campbell student and a teacher in Arlington Public Schools, I already have a fiendishly difficult time dropping my child off at school and getting to my own work site on time due to the traffic already on Carlin Springs Road, and discussion of a fourth school within this less than 1 mile stretch seems completely tone deaf to the community.

Tell the County Officials to take up knitting-leave our community alone

It may be convenient for the County to meet its goals of maintaining sufficient affordable housing in the county by adding more to this area of South Arlington. However, this area already has lots of affordable housing and maintains robust economic diversity. This site should NOT be used for more affordable housing. If more affordable housing is needed in the county, it should be built in North Arlington where socio-economic diversity is not yet as robust as this neighborhood.

We are VERY concerned about the possibility of new roads cutting through Glencarlyn Park

I am concerned with use which would be incompatible with the QUIET, LOW TRAFFIC, SINGLE FAMILY neighborhood. The neighborhood area adjacent to the Urgent Care Property -- at 5th Rd S and Kensington -- is a quiet area with no direct access to Carlin Springs Rd because 5th Rd stops and starts again, so it is a dead-end stretch on both ends. Please do not do anything that is incompatible with this single family, quiet, low traffic neighborhood. Also, if something new is built on the property, please do not have any entrances/exits 5th Rd S or Kensington St S. Finally, I am very concerned about anything that might bring commuters or parkers onto our neighborhood streets.

The adverse effect on traffic & diminished property values cannot be overstated. The quality of life in this neighborhood is predicated on the peace & privacy we now enjoy.

My daughter crosses at 3rd and Carlin to get to Kenmore. There is a light and a crossing guard but I still feel its unsafe during times when she is walking when guard not on duty

Have Arlington County executives seen the rush hour back-ups on Carlin Springs Rd? They are impressive, but not in a good way....

Traffic is unbearable now

Biggest concern is traffic. But we are open to affordable housing

Air pollution

I am very concerned that the new use would diminish the quality of life of the current residents of the neighborhood. I am very concerned that road access through the park or neighborhood would cause safety issues to the residents or property. I am very concerned that the new use would not reflect the neighborhood tax-payers' will, which might lead to political upheaval.

I love having a local urgent care center in such a convenient local area that services our area. It keeps emergency room visits lower at Virginia Hospital center. Why mess with something that's working well.

It's bad enough now!

I would hate to lose the Urgent Care center so close to our home. With 3 kids it has been very useful. There isn't anything close that could replace this type of medical facility.

No additional low-income housing in our area. No roads through park or Glencarlyn.
Concerned about loss of Urgent Care Clinic.

We need more affordable housing in Arlington, including more multi-family housing. All the hospital space can be converted to affordable multi-family housing use, then I'm very happy to have that in my backyard and to count the residents as my neighbors.

Very concerned about real estate taxes

Comments in Response to Question 2:

Because the only access to the Urgent Care Center Property is from Carlin Springs Road, we have heard that the County or Arlington County Schools may consider making the property more useful to them by routing traffic through Glencarlyn, Glencarlyn Park, Forest Glen and/or the scenic easement to Route 50, Columbia Pike and/or 7th Road South (behind Campbell School). Indicate your views on this issue . . .

It would be helpful to know the source and credibility of this information because any professional with a modicum of training in landscape planning, ecology, community-based management, or urban development would be able to discern that Arlington County is in a state of development where ZERO loss of open space is essential. That only re-design - preferably with trained green architects - is viable and NO NEW DEVELOPMENT should be the goal of the county along with RESTORATION whenever possible. Any suggestion of road building on current 'scenic easements' or otherwise naturally based landscapes should be discarded. NO to destroying green space used by everyone in the area, not just from the single family homes.

Tremendously opposed to any road going through the park to Forest Glen, via 7th Road S, 7th Street S, or S. Greenbrier.

Routing traffic through current green space is a genie that can't be put back in the bottle.

I moved to Forest Glen from Penrose in 2004 to escape the noise from increased traffic and construction. If this were to happen, we would definitely move or rent out our house.

NO ROADS THROUGH THE PARK.

Leveling, widening, road building through scenic easements & park land would have big impact on Tree Canopy and could jeopardize Arlington's compliance with its municipal separate storm sewer obligations for controlled water run-off.

Glencarlyn was the first planned community in Arlington. As Glencarlyn is Arlington's oldest neighborhood, I would hate to see it destroyed by through traffic. Arlington county has a tradition of planning neighborhoods and keeping them separate from high density areas. I hope there is a way to keep Glencarlyn intact without thru streets.

Let me understand better, the County would be willing to essentially destroy the green space and park in our area to cut a deal for another school or whatever, but not do the same with parks and green space in other parts of Arlington? We moved to this area for the proximity to the park and green space and do not support at all any project that would change that. As for "expanding" some road in Glencarlyn for an access road, is that even feasible without major disruptions to residents?

We already have more density than we can possibly handle. Green space should not be taken away. Glencarlyn has more than its share of schools for the county. Why do all the schools have to use Glencarlyn? Why didn't they use the other side of Kenmore?

The very essence of the Glencarlyn neighborhood is due to its having no through traffic (parkland on three sides, only vehicle access from Carlin Springs Rd)

Traffic is a major concern!

Additional roads through Glencarlyn would obliterate the neighborhood

One of the main reasons I bought my home in Glen Carlyn is because there aren't through roads. Much safer for kids and pets.

The primary appeal of this neighborhood is the fact that it is a quiet island that is rich in history. Routing traffic through it will destroy the natural beauty, already taxed by heavy park use, and reduce the value of the neighborhood in every way

It's a Park- more traffic defeats that entire purpose and safety.

Traffic is a problem. In general I think we need more roads. Behind the school seems to minimize impact to residential neighborhoods.

Routing traffic through Forest Glen will dramatically change my neighborhood in many NEGATIVE ways. Nothing positive will happen to our neighborhood if our streets that currently deadend are opened to through traffic.

Parks are the vital buffer from urbanization and would diminish the characteristic of this pleasant neighborhood if developed. Nature, parks, are tranquil necessity away from the city.

NO WAY

I live on park front property. There are many hikers, bicycles, strollers, rollerbladers, etc., who use the park throughout the day. Using the park to reroute traffic is incompatible with safe use by these park users

Recommend anyone considering this option drive down a neighborhood street when cars are parked on the curb on both sides. This neighborhood is not designed for excessive traffic.

I like it the way it is

Recommend building a 2-lane tunnel from Rt 50 underneath Glencarlyn (several hundred yards) eventually emerging on one of scenic easements behind the VHC property and/or doctor's offices. A short road could be extended across Glencarlyn creek to connect to the Campbell Elementary School parking lot for access by faculty and school buses. A tunnel might actually work since Glencarlyn and VHC is at higher elevation than surrounding areas.

Carlin Springs Road is too small now and can no longer accommodate the volume of traffic. this will get worse over the years and something needs to be done to decongested.

The idea is an outrage

desecration of beautiful parkland-ridiculous consideration

With the open space already at a premium-it makes no sense to take any more parkland

Arlington is losing its green space at a rapid pace. Do not take what little is left for "more useful routing". It is not necessary.

I don't see it happening, therefore not concerned.

Creating roads that cause thru traffic into the Glen Carlyn Neighborhood streets would make it incredibly dangerous for the inhabitants and disrupt the neighborhood

Routing traffic through the Park or Glencarlyn could have a very NEGATIVE effect on the neighborhood, changing the nature of the neighborhood -- and not for the good. At present, we do not have commuters cutting through our neighborhood because there is nowhere to get to. If you put additional routes through the neighborhood and/or park, we can expect commuters to cut through, FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGING THE NEIGHBORHOOD. Please do NOT route traffic through the scenic easement to Route 50. Also, I am concerned about the protection of Moses Ball Spring in the Scenic Easement near intersection of 5th Rd S and Kensington St S. Cutting the community into 1/3 - 2/3 effectively diminishes that value for the property hedged in by the access road and Carlin Springs. Considering how the school buses already feel no obligation to obey the rules of the road - allowing a stream of them to rumble thru at the beginning and end of a school day is a recipe for disaster. One that makes me contemplate leaving sooner rather than later.

I might be willing to say okay to go through the park with a road but it would ruin the natural feel, safety and quiet of the park [Comment following selection of VERY opposed].

NO ROADS THRU THE PARK! I-66 was proposed thru the park years ago and, thank God, that idea was squashed!

Absolutely, totally no way! I already have to give directions to lost motorists on weekends who are trying to cut through Glencarlyn Park to get to the other side. (I live on 3rd St, near Harrison St entrance) They don't understand it is a dead end.

This is the worst of these plans. Don't ruin our parks!

Do NOTHING

This is a bad idea

We are adamantly opposed to routing any additional traffic through the park, our neighborhoods or the scenic easement

It's another way that Arlington Co. proves that it is insensitive to the needs of its citizens

It's bad enough now!

Opposed

We hate this idea!

No roads through Glencarlyn or the park.

There is no need for new roads through the neighborhoods. Access via Carlin Springs Rd is adequate.

I would be extremely opposed to roads being built through the park or access through Glencarlyn.

Years ago Lexington St went to the service road to East bound Rt 50. When the Rt 50 - Carlin Springs Rd overpass was redone/widened, it was shut down. This cut down on commuter traffic on Lexington St through the neighborhood.

NEVER, EVER run a road through the park or our neighborhood!

We are opposed to building more roads. Spending to conserve and maintain what we have makes more sense than trying to come up with new ways to spend money

After all these years I do not want ANY changes to Glencarlyn Park.

**Comments in Response to Question 3:
How important is it to you that the “scenic easement” remains green space only?**

The County can either choose to be a leader making a commitment to future generations or it can continue to focus on the short term, immediate pay-off. Leave natural areas alone, find ways to reclaim areas for natural resource development, and excel at redesigning existing spaces for environmental sustainability. If you focus on that aspect you'll automatically include the social and economic sustainability as well.

Even raising this as a possibility makes clear that someone wants to convert public space to private space (at public expense).

We have an incredible natural park that needs to be preserved in order for Arlington to truly be "green" as we claim to be.

It appears from the trend of these questions that the projected change of ownership has put the scenic easements into jeopardy for development. Arlington County Environmental Services should be engaged in process.

Leave the green space green.

Buffer zone needed to protect park, pond & Long Branch

Comments in Response to Question 4:

The County could set aside part of the Urgent Care Property for parks and recreation, even if it makes other use of the property, such as building administrative offices. The County calls that “co-locating” multiple uses at a site. Please indicate your views on . . . possible parks and recreation uses.

If the county turned the current facility into a state-of-the-art facility for natural resources conservation in Arlington County and got the nature center area that currently exists reclaimed as a restoration project that might be hugely interesting. Also, if the dog park were relocated where less environmental damage or at least damage could be mitigated better while still providing a play area. The picnic areas need help. Bottom line - if this space became the new home of Arlington Parks and Rec (instead of the industrial Four Mile Run area which is just SO depressing) then I think something super exciting could be created and the local schools could benefit greatly from this!

Arlington Mill probably covers the [community center] option in the county's view. very supportive to keep this space on the green conservation side of things

I oppose any development, even if for originally noble purposes. Once developed, the green space disappears.

If a truly "green elementary school" were to be built, I would be in favor of it if at least 85% of students can WALK to school. We already have overcrowding in S. Arlington elementary schools. An expansion of Campbell would be a great use of the space.

Please put in a pool!!!

Would oppose any reduction of currently open and green and park space (i.e., building a playground on green space that was once open field is not cool)

Interconnection with existing trails; access from Glencarlyn; sledding hill

There is a community center on Columbia and Dinwiddie with available space.

Forest Glen and Glencarlyn already have good access/availability to parks and recreation

Get rid of the concrete and do an extension to the park.

Taking away green spaces to put brick and mortar is a non-starter. An inspired design incorporating mixed use might be acceptable, but not adding another school. If they need to gain more automobile access to the school sites, the other side of Kenmore should be accessed.

I hate to see the natural habitat disturbed. Many people on both sides of the park enjoy it as is. turning it into garden plots, for example, or additional picnic area would lose the sense of nature that we all now enjoy.

Make it green with as few buildings as possible.

Community center serving as a sportsplex with pool

Highly support open space, walking paths

keep green space as is

Very opposed to basketball courts. Supportive of bicycle path. More park but less recreation and foot traffic. There's already a community center at 4-mile run and Columbia Pike, no need for another

NO NEW CONSTRUCTION

As other parts of Arlington become more urbanized, the need for and use of green space/parks has grown. This will only increase over time. The time is NOW to preserve this property that is contiguous to a public park. If designated for development it is unlikely to ever be retored as green space.

I would like very little changed

Add onto Long Branch and make additional nature center

NO TRAFFIC

Keep the parks we have. We don't need more.

The current dog park is destroying the natural park setting. All vegetation has been destroyed by dogs running around. When it rains a great deal of dirt, devoid of vegetation, washes into the nearby stream!

Highly supportive of green space

We are opposed to any plan to decrease amount of natural parkland, something that sets Arlington apart from other communities.

No more building

A community center might be underutilized because of location.

No more traffic. Stop creating traffic jams

Highly support a Natural Habitat Park. Prefer to keep the area as green as possible

Leave Property as is

Bike trail with connection to W&OD. Walking trail with connection to W&OD. Maintain as much green space as possible with low traffic use.

playground, mini golf, pool

A Botanical Gardens would be a beautiful addition to this area.

Additional County office space is not needed. We have enough county employees. We are opposed to "co-locating" period. Add the space to the park. We are particularly opposed to [community garden, arboretum, community center]. Money could be better used on existing projects/community garden (Bluemont) and community center on Columbia Pike.

Reeves Farm should be env. ctr./outdoor lab--it has room and solar access for alt. energy projects, wind turbines, community gardens, access to FMR for water quality monitoring, rain garden and rock garden demo projects. No community center needed because Carlin Hall, GC library, Arlington Mill Center, Barcroft Rec. Center all close by.

Question 5:

**What are your views on County or School Board uses of the property, i.e., PUBLIC uses—
use of the property for County or School Board facilities.**

This is too difficult to answer in this format. I cannot see having a homeless or any other type of shelter here. Why make people who are homeless travel to this location for support? Makes no sense! A county office for natural resources adjacent to one of the largest natural resource areas in the county is the only thing that makes sense other than a recycling center which could also be part of that - depending on noise impacts?

Because of having three schools in close proximity on Carlin Springs Road the traffic is unreal during the school year. It is quite different when school is not in session.

Could support moving Campbell, IF they make this a community school. Campbell creates traffic because of its poor layout for drop-offs

An Environmental Center/Lab Outdoor for students and the public with Arts potential and artfully created park areas.

My main concern is no new roads. If it can be done using existing access and buildings, then I can accept it.

The Carlin Springs corridor is over subscribed. Many drivers seem to ignore traffic rules.

Adding more services to the existing congestion is poor planning and deteriorates the quality of life.

County Emergency Operations to include a Urgent Care Center

Highly supportive of Historic Center. Somewhat Supportive of Library. Less people, less noise, less traffic

NO NEW CONSTRUCTION

I have not seen any needs assessment for these uses, except for schools. However, there are already 3 schools in close proximity to this site and the additional traffic cannot be reasonably accommodated, especially school buses. We do not need a community performance center when we already have Kenmore so nearby. It's ironic this would be considered while the County recently tried to eliminate Lubber Run Amphitheatre in Arlington Forest. Local government can make do with existing public facilities. I work for the City of Alexandria whose public facilities are far, far worse but the needs are being met.

Community services present traffic issues

Re: the recycling center, it should exclude toxic materials

Any idling vehicles destroy the whole park experience!

I don't support any services which will clog our area much more.

Turn into a park w/new access to park away from neighborhood

Any use of the property that is contingent upon a large staff entering and exiting at rush hour will only add more cars on an already overstressed traffic corridor. The heavy flow of traffic already effectively traps people trying to enter the community from the west lanes of Carlin Springs & creates a bottle neck trying to leave the neighborhood in the morning. Any plans for allowing "school type" use to the site will exacerbate a transportation nightmare.

As much of a park like setting as possible!

We have enough schools already in the area. I favor more parkland and maybe barbacue facilities and picnic areas.

Any facility that increases traffic and requires additional public parking spaces is going to be disastrous. And agreeing to any suggestion means virtually agreeing to Q#2-routing traffic through our quiet glencarlyn neighborhood-through 3rd St directly in front of my home which is next to the park. I didn't chose to live beside Glebe Road.

We're not near a metro, making homeless assistance and shelters unworkable. We have three schools here now. adding a fourth of any kind would be too much traffic.

We already have 3 schools (with the related traffic) within a few blocks in Glencarlyn.

Very opposed to any construction. No construction.

Key issue is to avoid heavy traffic. already stop & go on Carlin Springs during rush hour. Road can't take significant increase in traffic. Nieghborhood can't absorb a big increase in traffic.

I don't think it makes sense to build a school on this property. The schools we already have can be expanded or improved. There are already 2 elemenary schools and 1 middle school in close proximity. However using the building for a "swing site" would be OK.

A lot of the aforementioned public uses of the property would obviously bring a lot more traffic to our area than more private use of the property.

Increased traffic on Carlin Springs is a big problem with many of these choices. Also residential home values may be affected by some of the above.

None of the above [opposed to all options suggested].

Opposed to changing the environment of the Glencarlyn community. Would appreciate explanation of the need for these uses and other options for meeting such drastic development such as consolidating county schools in our area.

Swing school only if temporary! No more schools, no more traffic, no more noise!
No need for new schools there with Kenmore, Carlin Springs and Campbell so close.

Any use that would cause additional roads to be build through the neighborhood or through the park is completely unacceptable. It would be criminal. Any use that would require high density building construction is unacceptable. We already have 3 schools in a half mile area. Our neighborhood is not a neighborhood where the need for additional schools is strong. There are many other neighborhoods/areas where the schools are needed. Do NOT build a school here just because there is a piece of land.

Blend the entire property into the nature center/park.

No need for more county offices or government. Overflow meeting space available in Long Branch Nature Center and Arlington Mill. Question need for fire station in this area. School bus parking and garage should stay at the trade center.

VERY VERY opposed to a community services center with a homeless shelter

Question 6:

What are your views on possible PRIVATE uses of the property, where the County could make the property available for others' use.

If you live in this area then you know what traffic on this road can be like. When we first moved here 18 years ago it wasn't like this but then more affordable housing was built and the new school site for CS was built and it emerged as a problem with traffic flow. That flow isn't going to be solved by building a couple of roads to 50/Columbia Pike that have to funnel through existing side roads. I think the whole landscape should either be admin buildings for the County that wouldn't impact traffic. I think it should be used for a purpose that won't add to that. This area already has more than it's equitable share of affordable housing in the county.

I doubt retail would survive given the vacancies on Columbia Pike and traffic on Carlin Spring

A Waldorf or Montessori school with substantial financial assistance available to families who otherwise might not be able to experience this type of education would be a great way to utilize the existing nature center. The county could offer incentives such as pay bonuses for staff who walk, bicycle or take existing public transportation to work. (think "car free diet.")

Only if relatively low rise buildings with minimal traffic especially during rush hours.

Any building taking away green spaces is unacceptable. Is there any possibility of working with the natural surroundings and solving some of these other needs without creating parking lots.

Senior Day Care Facility

Again, my main concern is not changing the feel of the neighborhood. Housing that isn't high-rise would be fine, but adding a high-rise complex there would generate too much traffic.

This area is over-built. Maintain and improve what is here.

Forest Glen already has more than enough retail within easy driving distance from our neighborhood.

Highly supportive of Art Gallery, coffee shop. Highly supportive of historic center for the County. Development and developers stay out!!

We now have one retirement home, one nursing home and one middle school, one elementary school and one medical urgent care center and a library all within 6 blocks, plus a 7-11. The traffic is unbearable now!

If there is a NEED [for affordable housing], these facilities should go to North Arlington. It is an injustice to perpetuate the economic disparity between North and South Arlington by sending all of the needy to the South of Route 50! I will vote against every County Board member who supports this trend. The needy are citizens of ALL the County and should be accepted by ALL, including the North.

Affordable housing, both families and elderly, raise serious traffic flow issues

Highly supportive of Multiplex Cinema

Small retail depends on selection that would support the community—e.g., small family restaurant, dry cleaners, etc.

This quadrant of the county already has far too much affordable housing.

keep the urgent care center we have now

hospice facility

I think a small Montessori School would be a good fit for the property and the Glencarlyn neighborhood. Please note: I am not opposed to affordable housing. I just believe that dense housing should've located near other dense housing, such as condominium buildings. We are a single family community

I have lived "across the fence" from the Urgent Care Center for 16 years and had no issue with that type of operation - other than the fact they don't maintain their landscaping. Other ideas such as privately built affordable family housing would be financially unfeasible unless it was high density. Not a "good neighbor" for all the adjacent low density residential properties.

It served as Urgent Care Center and should remain so. If VHC is shutting it down, maybe some other company can operate the urgent care center.

The less traffic-and air pollution, the better

Affordable housing a high priority, but how much traffic would it generate

I do not want retail stores here. I really like having the urgent care center there-I'd like to see it stay there. If that's not possible-I have been involved in VOICE, which is a movement trying to get more affordable housing in Arlington. This may be a good location for affordable housing. However, I would NOT want a high-rise, and possible increased traffic needs to be taken into consideration.

Highly supportive of green/environmentally friendly housing for the elderly.

Affordable housing for families and elderly within reasonable size

Very opposed to High Rise housing. Very supportive of single family housing or garden style affordable housing.

No affordable housing! Retail only as relates to green space, e.g. snack shop for walkers and bikers.

Again, any use that would cause roads to be build through the neighborhood or through the park is completely unacceptable. High density construction is unacceptable. Our area has the highest concetration of affordable housing in the County. It puts an undue burden on schools and communities. Affordable housing should be built in other parts of the County, specifically North Arlington. Elderly housing ONLY if done like the Culpepper Gardens.

no need for retail because of nearby Baileys Crossroads, Culmore & areas along Columbia Pike, reasonably close. We should be suspicious of "small" foot in the door retail which can lead to more sprawling & higher structures that are unacceptable.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The county has proven that it cannot be trusted when it comes to affordable housing. Green space for regular public use is very important. Most fields are already used by leagues and the hill is great for kids, especially when it snows!

I'd LOVE to see Arlington County choose a path that's a big win for the environment, natural resources, existing affordable housing communities, GREEN LIVING etc. that prioritizes open space, nature, and the environment over everything else that the county is already heavily promoting. We lose this little bit of park that's left and it won't be worth all the traffic and noise and nonsense to live in Arlington.

Adding roads in the steep-hilled terrain would cost enormous amounts to comply with Chesapeake Bay watershed requirements and add nothing to minimizing traffic flows. It would cause years of disturbance for practically zero traffic flow advantage. Building ANY roads is an ill-advised action. It won't solve any problems and will likely create many more in its wake.

My main concerns are the safety of school walkers and the traffic congestion during opening and closing school times.

Any significant change to the green space surrounding our community, to the park, or to the traffic flow and buildings within hearing and sight of this community, would all dramatically impact our quality of life and our property values. Quietness and nearness to nature were major factors in our choice to live here. The potential loss is very upsetting

Thank you very much for this comprehensive survey. As you can tell from my choices, I am against the irreparable harm associated with development beyond the existing borders of the Virginia Hospital Center property. If new roads, etc. are developed, then the natural character of the area - and one which makes Arlington so charming and desirable - will disappear.

Please don't destroy the best sledding hill in Arlington

Though traffic on Carlin Springs is bad, I do not want any green space destroyed. Therefore I oppose any development that would increase traffic.

I am aghast at the County's consideration to develop these spaces. I predict significant objections by the community.

If a daycare or public Montessori school were to be built, there could be a pedestrian bridge built to connect young students with the elderly who reside on the other side of Carlin Springs. Studies in European countries prove that positive value that connecting youth to elders can provide. We went to story fest at the Nature Center today and watched the effect the 55+ community had on the children that they told stories to. Many Arlington children don't have the luxury of living near grandparents. This is one way we could literally help to "bridge" the divide between generations

I am very concerned with preserving the park and avoiding additional noise, pollution, and traffic.

Please put in a pool and baseball diamonds.

Whatever the county does with the property should not exceed the footprint of the current building and should leave the scenic easements permanently untouched.

I believe school use will have the least impact. I don't believe the county is going to destroy Glencarlyn Park with a road.

We are very familiar with this site as both of our children have attended the daycare center at the Virginia Hospital Center property. The county should not underestimate the natural beauty of the site and should make that green space more accessible—as green space. I would oppose any building outside of the existing building's footprint.

It is already impossible to get out of Glencarlyn in the morning because there is no enforcement of people constantly blocking the intersection. I witness road rage incidents every single day because people can't get out of the neighborhood. We are sick of it. We DO NOT need anything on this road encouraging more people to use it. We have already have THREE schools. Also, the people who use the dog park FLY through our neighborhood and since we don't have four way stops they assume every intersection doesn't have a stop sign. Many people walk dogs and children in the community and it has become very unsafe. Please do not add anything on Carlin Springs Rd that will increase traffic. It is very unfair to those who live on this road. If you do add something, please consider making Carlin Springs one lane like Wilson Blvd to discourage traffic and make it safer for people and cars.

I absolutely love where I live - Arlington County, but more specifically my neighborhood. It is quiet and adjacent to beautiful parks and trails that make me feel so far from the city. Additionally, the traffic, especially during school drop off/pick-up and weekends at the stores, is already congested. I respectfully request for the county to choose an option that puts current families and their quality of life at the forefront.

I have lots of concerns about environmental impact. The Associations need a liaison with Arlington County Environmental Services for sure.

We accept that Arlington may need more classroom space, but we already have three schools within a short walking distance of each other and Glencarlyn. Clearly there would be more buses and traffic each morning and evening with another school regardless of the short sighted concept of creating another street in the park or through current residential areas. Would North Arlington tolerate the same proposal for their park and residential areas - I don't think so. Is that really the Arlington Way?

What I think is missing is an well formed concept which includes the best of what Arlington is: artistic green spaces where cultural diversity meets.

Glencarlyn's identity, charm, and sense of community come directly from it being a neighborhood unto itself, mainly with dead-end streets. Most of the traffic is slow-moving cars of neighbors. Children play in the streets. Children and adults can walk without need for sidewalks. There is a natural country feel with the surrounding parkland, and narrow roads. Adding roads and traffic through the neighborhood would destroy it.

This is a wonderful neighborhood, and the park is a treasure used by many many local people. Please don't mess it up.

Carlin Springs road traffic congestion is terrible most of the day. Intersections are blocked routinely. Red lights are run by high speed vehicles often. More development will make traffic worse, if that is possible. The County does not maintain what they build in Glen Carlyn. The sidewalks put in my area a couple years ago are crumbling, and nothing is being done to fix it.

The proposal to recklessly plow through this neighborhood is extremely insensitive to the residents, to the natural beauty that is here and makes Arlington attractive and to the history of the place. There are many wide open places in North Arlington that involve less congestion. Plow through those.

There needs to be more societal balance between North Arlington and South Arlington, regarding development.

I would like to see more affordable housing on this site with a commitment to better public transportation with more and improved bus shelters on Carlin Springs Road. Improved side walks along Carlin Springs Rd. to improve safety for students walking to Kenmore.

While I am a progressive thinker about land use, we live in a special single family area of South Arlington that must be preserved.

Many of the options listed in the questions above can be located in existing office space in the private market. Those options should not be considered for this site. Given the limited recreational and open space in the county, that should be the priority.

Green space is scarce as it is but is one of the biggest positives of Arlington County. Why take some of what is already preciously limited away? This is not just a question of traffic and threatening green space- although those aspects are extremely important. Most of options under consideration would irreparably change a beloved neighborhood and the character of it- the reason why we live here.

Traffic routed through the Park or our neighborhoods is UNACCEPTABLE

This property is an opportunity to give back to this quadrant of the county some respectability after so much of which others in the county want no part, has been placed here. There is no way any affordable housing can go here. Arlington is one of the most segregated counties in the whole country. See the Post Article from [ca. week of May 9]. Steps need to be taken to correct this trend. It stops here.

We were considering buying the home we are renting. However, these site issues, poor roads, lack of FiOS, and way in which the County treats S Arlington single family compared to N is obvious. We will be looking in N Arlington.

A road through the neighborhood and/ or use of scenic easement are our two most urgent concerns. Please do everything possible to prevent this action!

Our community is already crowded enough; we don't need more! And where does the money come from for changes?

Our main concern is that there NOT be a thru street added to Glencarlyn. Also, if a high school is placed there we would need Glencarlyn streets zoned so that students don't park in our neighborhood.

This area of Arlington has enough affordable housing already. Any new affordable housing should be built/converted in North Arlington

Traffic volume and flow, environmental concerns and residential safety are our greatest concerns if the usage of this property is changed. We feel the urgent care facility and doctors offices serve a vital purpose and should remain.

Keep Glencarlyn and Glencarlyn Park the way they are!

I wonder whether there has been any discussion regarding which neighborhood association residents of any housing that might be built will become members of.

I am strongly opposed to any use that will impact the park or natural resources, or increase traffic on Carlin Springs Road or through the Glencarlyn neighborhood. I feel most of the scenarios presented will adversely affect quality of life and diminish the neighborhood's desirability. I hope that there will be NO ingress/egress from the Urgent Care Property onto 5th Rd S or Kensington St S. Please keep our neighborhood the way it is. Protect Moses Ball Spring and the scenic easements.

Already have 1 nursing home, 1 retirement home, 1 7-11, 1 medical center, 1 elementary school, 1 middle school, 1 library. ENOUGH

We believe affordable housing is one of the most important services that Arlington County can provide. Traffic is a big issue, but housing is more vital.

Yorktown area could use some racial/income diversity. Affordable housing would be great there.

Don't want the additional traffic and environmental impact.

Leave urgent care center as it is.

I like having an urgent care center close to our neighborhood. Prevented numerous trips to ER when Minute Clinic type places won't do.

Maintain the beautiful green space in the neighborhood, something with very low traffic and very low environmental impact.

What a travesty it would be to destroy what used to be George Washington's forest. Our neighborhood contains the oldest home in Arlington, the first library, an historic community hall, cemetery, park and so much more. My family has raised children here for 4 generations. Arlington is losing its precious neighborhoods and parks, replacing them with concrete jungles. Leave Glencarlyn alone.

Improve services we have. Do not increase community property in the County. We have too much.

Two conditions on acquisition: no increase in real estate taxes; no more traffic than generated by hospital

In case you don't get it, I want the County to leave Glencarlyn Park alone. After dealing with County for 56 years I know what the citizen & taxpayer wants will not be part of the County decision. I fully expect to see 1) a road, 2) a homeless shelter, 3) low-cost housing, 4) a Starbucks.