

May 17, 2017



Anthony Fusarelli, Jr. AICP  
Principal Planner  
Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development  
Planning Division  
2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Anthony:

On behalf of Ballston-Virginia Square Civic Association (BVSCA), I want to again thank you and your staff for offering the recent walking tour (requested earlier by BVSCA) and open house for our residents living closest to the Washington Boulevard-Kirkwood Road Special GLUP Study "Plus". We greatly appreciate the time and attention you and LRPC members are devoting to this study.

Throughout this LRPC process, residents as well as BVSCA have been extremely concerned about height, density and bonus density as well as proximity to homes as modeling of potential redevelopment has been presented.

As we accomplished recently with the comparatively small 11th and Vermont Streets Special GLUP Study, BVSCA wants to, at the conclusion of this process, come away with specific protections for the well-established single-family neighborhood to the north while allowing for reasonable and responsible growth along Washington Boulevard. As such, I again want to thank you and Elizabeth for meeting with me recently to specifically explore whether this very large study area could be considered as a special district and, if so, how it could be done in order to provide the protections we seek.

During that meeting I asked if we were to use the established height of The Wentworth (N. Monroe Street at Washington Boulevard; what 5 stories represented) as a guide/limit using available GSI data you mentioned, how that would play out in terms of building heights moving down the topography of Washington Boulevard towards Kirkwood Road...with the obvious exception of the properties which most closely back to the homes on N. 12th Street where the height limit would be much lower.

BVSCA encourages and appreciates LRPC's and staff's continued careful exploration of all options for this land study including a special district in order to best address our and our residents' concerns. We look forward to continuing to work positively and constructively with you and our residents throughout this process. Should you have questions or need additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

  
Nia R. Bagley  
President

cc: Elizabeth Gearin, LRPC Planning Commissioner



## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Carol Singer <csinger@greatpromos4u.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 21, 2017 8:46 PM  
**To:** egearin@egearin.com; Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** A new YMCA in Arlington

**Importance:** High

Dear Ms. Gearin and Mr. Fusarelli

I have been a member of the Arlington YMCA for over 10 years. I go to the Y seven days a week, not just because I enjoy the exercise classes and private trainers, but because I have made many friends over the years. This is not like any other gym. It's a community where a new member is welcomed into the fold. It's a great place because it brings together young and older members of the community, from babies to senior citizens. There is nothing quite like the Arlington Y, where people stay members throughout their lifetime.

I support the building of a new Y, and the density required to achieve that, so that the community can benefit from what the Y offers onsite and throughout the community.

Given that the Arlington Y is a nonprofit organization and has no other resources for funding, the Y's ability to construct the envisioned new branch is solely dependent upon changes in the GLUP designation and related zoning

YMCA Arlington has been a thriving part of the YMCA of Metropolitan Washington, serving the Arlington Community for more than 70 years. The revitalization of YMCA Arlington and the Arlington Tennis & Squash Center is critical to the overall goal of the community reinvestment strategy; which is created to ensure delivery of innovative programs and transformative responses to urgent social challenges effecting meaningful and enduring change in the communities we serve.

The Y is a nonprofit organization with a mission to provide programs that support Youth Development, Healthy Living, and Social Responsibility. The Y believes in the inclusion of all races and ethnic groups, regardless of ability or inability to pay. Since 2010, the Arlington Y has provided almost \$700,000 in scholarships and financial assistance to those in need. This help has allowed them to participate in our programs.

Please let me know how I can get the new Arlington YMCA built.

Thank you

Carol

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Karin Price <karinaps@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 22, 2017 9:51 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** YMCA development

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Dear Anthony,

Carolyn Miles spoke for all of us who use the Y. We could not stay until the end of the meeting but I realized that a huge amount of work has gone into the development already and much more to come.

I want to stress the importance of the Y for me; I try to exercise daily and enjoy the members from all walks of life. We have formed friendships and take part in the various type classes offered.

But- the Y is old, the rooms too small for bigger class sizes, the pool very small but so nice in summer, and summer camps are totally overfilled with happy kids.

We need an upgraded facility! I like the plans with more green spaces. It's beautiful and healthy and Arlington does not keep enough green space in new developments.

With kind regards,

Karin Price

Sent from my iPhone

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Jeane Stetson <jeane\_stetson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 10:41 AM  
**To:** egearin@egearin.com; Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Arlington YMCA

Dear Ms Gearin and Mr. Fusarelli,

I am a member of the Arlington YMCA, use it frequently and love having it in my neighborhood. I fully support it and increased improvements and expansion. It is an integral part of my workout and close enough for me to walk to fitness classes. I've met a number of friends through the YMCA and would like to see it continue to grow. I hope you will do everything to make the YMCA an active part of Arlington. Thank you.

Please feel free to contact me.

Jeane Stetson  
826 N. Jackson St  
Arlington VA 22201

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Henry Staples <henry@staplessolutions.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 10:07 AM  
**To:** Elizabeth Gearin  
**Cc:** Anthony Fusarelli; Nancy Iacomini  
**Subject:** RE: Timeline for Kirkwood/Washington GLUP study?

Thanks so much, Elizabeth.

>> Henry

**From:** Elizabeth Gearin [mailto:[egearin@egearin.com](mailto:egearin@egearin.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 9:37 AM  
**To:** Staples, Henry <[henry@staplessolutions.com](mailto:henry@staplessolutions.com)>  
**Cc:** Anthony Fusarelli <[afusarelli@arlingtonva.us](mailto:afusarelli@arlingtonva.us)>; Nancy Iacomini <[nancy\\_iacomini@dem-sec.senate.gov](mailto:nancy_iacomini@dem-sec.senate.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Timeline for Kirkwood/Washington GLUP study?

Hi Henry,

Thanks for your message, and being so candid about the experience of the neighbors. Nancy Iacomini (cc'd here) and I met with County staff (including Anthony Fusarelli, cc'd here) on Friday to talk about next steps for this study. Staff is working to identify the best steps for the Study in the next few months. We discussed a walking tour of the site as one component. In any case, there will be additional public meetings, and time will be allotted for public comments.

I may be able to offer clarification about the timing, in general. The Special GLUP Study is the first step. As designed, it is meant to offer an opportunity to determine what is the 'right' height and massing for the site. (Practically speaking, this may be a new General Land Use Plan, or GLUP designation and/or new zoning, and this is why we discuss that at our meetings, although no decisions have yet been made.) Once this Special GLUP Study public meeting and planning effort concludes, each of the applicants still need to undertake the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) process when they are ready to move forward with a new development that will take advantage of the new GLUP or zoning designations. This usually involves 3 (sometimes more) public meetings (usually spaced about a month apart) to further refine any proposed development on a site (that isn't by-right development.) There is a proscribed agenda for that process (see <https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/planning-commission/sprc/>) that considers some of what has been raised in the Special GLUP Study meetings thus far in greater, more precise detail. Nia Bagley and Collier Cooke have participated in several of these on behalf of BVSCA, and they may be able to share more of how that works from their perspective. After the SPRC process concludes, the proposal for development is heard at a public hearing before the Planning Commission (at which any one can submit a speaker's card and comment with regard to the proposed development); and after that it goes to the County Board for their review and ultimate decision-making. This is a very general timeline for what happens at and after the SPRC stage, which in turn occurs after the Special GLUP Study process.

Please feel free to stay in touch during the process.

Best,  
Elizabeth

---

Elizabeth Gearin, PhD, AICP  
[egearin@egearin.com](mailto:egearin@egearin.com)  
703-980-2258

**From:** <Staples>, Henry <[henry@staplessolutions.com](mailto:henry@staplessolutions.com)>

**Date:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 8:31 AM

**To:** Elizabeth Gearin <[EGearin@EGearin.com](mailto:EGearin@EGearin.com)>, "[bvscaorg@gmail.com](mailto:bvscaorg@gmail.com)" <[bvscaorg@gmail.com](mailto:bvscaorg@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Timeline for Kirkwood/Washington GLUP study?

Good morning Elizabeth,

I am just dropping a line to see if y'all have any idea of the timeline for the Kirkwood/Washington GLUP study?

I was at the BVSCA monthly mtg last night and Nia mentioned that y'all may be doing some sort of walkaround to look at things again. Nia has been communicative for the BVSCA and for that we're thankful, both telling us what is happening and also submitting our viewpoint. That being said, it seems like we're all over here guessing at timeline / next steps for the study. Maybe the study was to be finished in early spring, but there might be some intermediary steps added in now; would the study just wrap up at any point without add'l feedback? Because of that, on the block and around, I would classify it as "other shoe dropping" emotion and some communication on timeline would probably help.

So, that being said, what's your take on how the study is going, next steps, timeline?

Thanks and have a great day!

Henry

---

This email has been scanned by the Boundary Defense for Email Security System. For more information please visit <http://www.apptix.com/email-security/antispam-virus>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Boundary Defense for Email Security System. For more information please visit <http://www.apptix.com/email-security/antispam-virus>

---

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Thomas Viles <tcviles1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 11:58 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** LRPC consideration of development of YMCA property

Dear Mr. Fusarelli:

Thank you for your presentations to the LRPC on options for the property owned by the YMCA of Washington DC. This note follows up from them—the public was instructed to address questions and comments to you.

At some point between the 20 December 2016 LRPC meeting, and the 21 February 2017 meeting, a decision reportedly was made that the LRPC would no longer consider “scenario 1A” and “scenario 1B”—which would have limited development of land fronting 13<sup>th</sup> Street North to single-family dwellings—because they were deemed “unfeasible.” Those scenarios had disappeared from your 21 February presentation.

I asked the question at the meeting, but do not recall hearing an answer, so I ask again: Who decided that the LRPC would no longer consider these scenarios, and when was the decision made?

And I have another question: Why does the LRPC now find these scenarios to be “unfeasible,” if that is the reason for their disappearance?

Thank you,

Thomas Viles

3447 14<sup>th</sup> Street North

Arlington 22201



## **Anthony Fusarelli**

---

**From:** alexandra tabova <atabova@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 11, 2017 9:10 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** egearin@egearin.com; Guus Bosman  
**Subject:** LRPC scenarios for the YMCA property

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Dear Anthony,

This is in regards to the LRPC for the YMCA/Kirkwood properties. We live on 13th Street (backside of Lynnbrook Dr).

We strongly urge the County to not allow the rezoning from R5 to higher densities for the area along 13th Street. As such, we would like to request the LRPC to keep considering the scenarios 1a and 1b that provided for lower density on 13th Street.

13th Street from Quincy St to Kirkwood are all single family homes. Changing the zoning for the YMCA along 13th St to higher densities, as all other scenarios would entail, conflicts with the character of 13th Street.

Best regards,  
Alexandra Tabova & Guus Bosman

1336 N Lynnbrook Dr  
Arlington, VA 22201

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Dennis Whitehead <dwhitehead@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 12, 2017 1:37 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** LRPC re: YMCA

Dear Mr, Fusarelli,

It appears from your March 9, 2017 note to Mr. Viles regarding the issues of excessive density along N 13th Street that they have been dismissed without public discussion, particularly with the neighborhood directly impacted. This sadly reflects an increasingly secretive and closed form of government, and woefully miserable planning, whether short or long-range.

L-imit  
P-ublic  
R-ecommendations and  
C-omments

Sir, you work for us, not the other way around.

Sincerely,

Dennis Whitehead

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Steven Leutner <steven.leutner@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 12, 2017 1:00 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Washington Blvd & Kirkwood Rd GLUP+

Mr. Fusarelli,

I am writing you concerning the LRPC's decision to take options 1A and 1B for the Washington Blvd and Kirkwood Rd GLUP+ off the table for consideration, and to correct a misperception that there is no support for them. There is, in fact, very strong support for these options in the surrounding neighborhood. As you know, the area being studied is inside the boundaries of the Ballston-Virginia Square Civic Association, and as such they deserve the single-strongest voice in any conversation related to re-zoning.

In this specific review, support for options 1A and 1B was directly communicated through a letter dated 9 January 2017 from the Ballston-Virginia Square Civic Association. It reads in part that to help preserve the character of our long-term, well-established neighborhood of single family homes located behind the study area this civic associations asks that density be kept on Washington Blvd and Kirkwood Rd, and taper to single family homes and townhouses (no higher than 3 stories) closest to 13th St and Kansas St. My understanding is that these options were removed due to a false County perception that there is little to no interest in them. This could not be farther from the truth. I can personally attest to being present at three community meetings to specifically discuss this GLUP+ study that were attended by 20 to 40 citizens at each meeting, and that there was unanimous agreement that single family homes should be considered to the south and west of the study area.

To further reinforce this position, it is notable that the neighborhood conservation plan that encompasses the GLUP+ area being reviewed states: 1) "The County should maintain the residential zoning between I-66 and Washington Boulevard between Glebe Rd. & Kirkwood. Changes in existing R-5 and R-6 zones should be considered only for site plans of exceptional quality and originality in transition areas". 2) "Development should be tapered downward in height from Fairfax Drive to Washington Boulevard." 3) "Neighborhoods are being threatened by new office and commercial development...It is necessary that buffers be established between planned high density development and the neighborhood." and 4) "The essential character of Virginia Square as a residential neighborhood is to be encouraged and preserved."

I appreciate your attention in rectifying this matter, and I look forward to working with you, the Staff, and the dozens of engaged neighbors as we determine what is sensible and appropriate density in a low density residential neighborhood.

Regards,  
Steven Leutner

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Aaron Faust <aaronmfaust@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 13, 2017 10:13 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** LRPC for the YMCA/Kirkwood Properties

Dear Mr. Fusarelli,

I live at 1305 N Lynnbrook Drive, right across from the YMCA, and attended the recent 3rd LRPC meeting at Key Elementary School. Thank you to you and your staff for taking the time to provide such thorough designs for the space so that the planning committee can make a decision about the zoning. A lot of work clearly went into it.

I'd like to provide some feedback about the process and our view about the proposed rezoning thus far. As I mentioned in the public comment section of the meeting, we're very concerned about:

1. How the redevelopment could affect school enrollments in the Taylor/Key/ASFS school neighborhood, as these schools are already full with trailers, and
2. If it's actually feasible to put all the parking underground at the site, as if it's not, that will increase crowding on the surrounding streets significantly. People already have trouble finding parking for the tennis center at busy times.

Additionally, we would very much like to see a scenario for development if the zoning is not changed, as you mentioned was possible. We'd also like to understand why lower density scenarios presented at previous sessions were taken off the table (I believe these were 1A and 1B). At present, we don't support any of the current scenarios, as they're all much higher density. I think the county and the planning committee do themselves a disservice - and could potentially shoot themselves in the foot - after taking so much time to provide public hearings if they then make decisions in an opaque fashion.

What's more, has a study been done to see if various residential units will actually be filled, and, more to the point given all of the vacancies in downtown Clarendon let alone close to properties, which have much less foot traffic, will they be able to fill the retail properties? The last thing we'd like to see are vacant lots become vacant store fronts.

Finally, although we tried to get information about what was going on related to the LRPC for the properties, we could never get any good information from the county, or found out about meetings the day or or before, which meant we couldn't get there, so the third meeting was the first we could make. Given this, and our general lack of knowledge about the whole process, we would find it very useful to hear two things to provide some better context at the next LRPC:

1. What the whole process entails, from beginning to end, for the LRPC, and possible rezoning. This need not take a lot of time. It could be done in a quick 5-10 minutes with one PPT slide.
2. What the current owners of the various properties included in the site's considerations are, and to give the public a chance to ask them questions. E.g., why does the YMCA feel the need to partner with other developers to redo its facilities? What are its financial considerations? What kind of facilities does it intend to build? If the properties are not rezoned, what do the owners plan to do? I realize they may

refuse to answer some of these questions, but it would give those of us who will have to live with their decisions a chance to get a sense for what their intentions are and how we should best engage with the process.

We'd very much like to see this process move forward smoothly and get to a solution that will satisfy everyone's basic needs. I'd be happy to discuss any of the above points with you at any point.

Best regards,

Aaron Faust  
1305 N Lynnbrook Drive  
Arlington, VA 22201  
860-478-2317

## **Anthony Fusarelli**

---

**From:** Ruth Woollett <rgwoollett@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 13, 2017 10:30 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** LRPC

Dear Anthony,

This is in regards to the LRPC for the YMCA/Kirkwood properties. I live in the Ballston/VA Sq neighborhood.

I strongly urge the County to not allow the rezoning from R5 to higher densities for the area along 13th Street. I would like to request the LRPC to keep considering the scenarios 1a and 1b that provided for lower density on 13th Street.

The Ballston/VA Sq neighborhood north of Washington Blvd is mainly single family homes. High density development at the YMCA/Kirkwood site and potential light industrial uses of the nearby Buck property could add a lot of stress to the neighborhood streets and change the character of the neighborhood. Now the neighborhood is very conducive to walking with many students and parks.

Ruth Woollett  
3711 N. 14th St.

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Albert Lewis <azlewis@iblf.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 20, 2017 2:42 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** tcviles1@gmail.com; egearin@egearin.com; Larry Blackwood; Paul Ashin; Steffanie J Lewis; Neil Wills (nlbwills@yahoo.com)  
**Subject:** RE: LRPC consideration of development of YMCA property

Dear Mr. Fusarelli:

As a homeowner for some 30 years on 13<sup>th</sup> Street, I am UTTERLY ALARMED at the statements contained in your email (which I just discovered) indicating "little or no interest" in exploring the 1A or B scenarios, which to my mind are the only ones that would not irrevocably destroy the quality of our neighborhood. Earlier I did receive some information on the various proposals for the YMCA, yet found no particular way to respond, other than a belief that something would be scheduled in July. The remaining proposals will destroy the character of our neighborhood, largely through traffic chaos on 13<sup>th</sup>, Kirkwood St, and Washington Blvd, all of which are at maximum use, and situated on a critical transportation artery that feeds the heart of Arlington, both Clarendon and Ballston. If further taxed, this would transform this critical center of Arlington into 2-mile car train during rush hours, and a crude industrial severing of the urban village concept at other times.

- 1) **Walkable Neighborhood Street:** The 13<sup>th</sup> Street neighborhood is a continuation of the band of single family dwellings that provide walkable and bikable streets, a few blocks away from the high-rise areas along Courthouse-Clarendon-Ballston corridor. Many students, families, dog owners, and new parents walk or cycle our streets to the schools nearby, the parks, the Y, and the Tennis center, all the way from Rosslyn and past Glebe.
- 2) **Open Space Parking:** The parking lot at the Y accommodates visitors from around Arlington who make use of that facility, and provides a spot for open air festivals, sunlight and the occasional bus bringing kids together, perhaps to exercise or engage in communal activities.
- 3) **The Washington Blvd Artery:** The businesses on Washington Blvd are now low volume, though the boulevard is clogged every day at the Giant Food traffic lights, and an increase in traffic by seriously increased commercialization or apartment traffic will unbalance the current flow in a highly destructive way, causing drivers seriously elevated blood pressure, and the increased pressure to go speeding down 13<sup>th</sup> Street or other routes through the walkable neighborhoods. Traffic analysts have found the intersection at Washington and Clarendon and Wilson to be one of the most amazing working intersections, handling a massive volume with relatively little accident generation, despite its unusual configuration. Tightening the spigot at Kirkwood will destabilize that intersection, unpredictably but perhaps horribly.
- 4) **The GLUP vs \$\$\$:** The GLUP reflects the realization that parts of the community need to be preserved for walking and communal non-vehicle-intense use. Whether or not the YMCA can get more money for jamming and selling a bunch of apartment buildings or some other higher financial return for the property is NOT a valid consideration for changing the GLUP which has existed for some time. What is valid is the character and quality of the development, with respect to the adjacent properties and the overall value to the surrounding community, much of which is NOT measured in strict economic return, but in that concept of Arlington's urban village. The Y is an important resource but embedding it's facilities in an airless, sun-less apartment and commercial development will destroy a serious part of its value to the community.

I know I speak for virtually all my neighbors on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>, Nelson and Lincoln that are worried everyday by the increased traffic, that resulted in one pedestrian injury recently. We have all invested in our single family neighborhood for our children's safety, a walkable corridor to the nearby parks, the safe access to the local high school and elementary schools, and the preservation of some high tree canopy in the area that was once Ball's Farm.

Please register my strong objection to the elimination of the lower impact scenarios for the YMCA property, and any massive commercialization of Washington Blvd between Kirkwood and Lincoln.

**Albert Z Lewis Jr.**

3511 North 13th St Arlington VA 22201

703 522-1198 / cell: (703) 568-8860 / [azlewis@iblf.com](mailto:azlewis@iblf.com)

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: Anthony Fusarelli <Afusarelli@arlingtonva.us <mailto:Afusarelli@arlingtonva.us>>

> Date: Thu, Mar 9, 2017 at 4:32 PM

> Subject: RE: LRPC consideration of development of YMCA property

> To: Thomas Viles <tcviles1@gmail.com <mailto:tcviles1@gmail.com>>

> Cc: Elizabeth Gearin <egearin@egearin.com <mailto:egearin@egearin.com>>

>

>

> Dear Mr. Viles:

>

>

>

> Thank you for submitting your follow-up questions below, and please accept my apologies for the delayed response.

>

>

>

> To best address your inquiry, I'd first like to provide background on how the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) of the Planning Commission meeting conversations typically occur, and how that relates to staff's role in the process. In processes such as this, staff works closely with the LRPC (and its leadership) to scope out the items to be addressed in the study, and then proceeds with the process based on that scope. In its meetings, the LRPC is a non-voting committee, so the conversations tends to be more of a dialogue around the subject planning issues. Given the non-voting nature of these discussions, staff will take notes and record a meeting summary to capture the most substantive and pertinent comments from the discussion. Following the meeting, staff will compile the summary and refer to it to help inform and guide the work we do to advance the study and prepare for the next meeting.

>

>

>

> With respect to your specific question, staff noted general input from the LRPC discussion on December 20th that suggested little to no interest in further exploring the Scenario 1A and Scenario 1B options (in addition to Scenario 4). This comment was also included among the wrap-up points summarized at the end of the meeting. Therefore, in progressing our work toward the February 21st meeting, staff factored these comments into our revised modeling for that meeting, which, as you know, did not include any further exploration of Scenarios 1A, 1B, or 4. At the February 21st meeting, staff did not receive any input from LRPC members suggesting any of those scenarios be further modeled for additional consideration. If it's clear that this question is still widely held and that further confirmation of this past input would be helpful, that could be something to be considered for a future meeting.

>

>

>

> Respectfully,

>

> Anthony

>

>

>

> Anthony Fusarelli, Jr., AICP

>

> Principal Planner

>

>

>

> DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY

>

> PLANNING, HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT

>

> Planning Division

>

> 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 700  
>  
> Arlington, VA 22201  
>  
> 703.228.3525 <tel:(703)%20228-3525>; 703.228.3548 <tel:(703)%20228-3548> (direct);  
>  
> [www.arlingtonva.us](http://www.arlingtonva.us) <<http://www.arlingtonva.us/>> [afusarelli@arlingtonva.us](mailto:afusarelli@arlingtonva.us) <<mailto:afusarelli@arlingtonva.us>>  
>  
>  
> All correspondence sent to and from Arlington County Government may be  
>  
> subject to the public record laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.  
>

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** cynthia gillespie <cpg6825@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 17, 2017 7:22 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Arlington Y

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

This is to let you know how important a renovated or new Y would be in Arlington. This Y is serving an increasingly large number of families drawing from every age group from toddlers to old-time toddlers. I notice more and more young mothers dropping off their child or children for an hour or two of day care so they can attend morning classes and, as we all know, the aging population is aging and in just as much need to help stay physically fit as the young.

Truly, I cannot imagine another institution that meets the needs of so many in the area as the Y does now and should continue to do so in the future.

The facility itself is old and in almost desperate need of serious renovations or rebuilding.

Please know my husband and I, who use this Y daily, are fully committed to making a new or substantively improved Arlington Y an actuality.

Cynthia Gillespie

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** C.J. Myles <cmyles1@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 17, 2017 3:49 PM  
**To:** egearin@egearin.com; Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Plans for the Arlington YMCA

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

It is my understanding that the county may be getting somewhat closer to a decision on the density of the area around the YMCA with the impending development.

While the whole project will have a tremendous impact on the neighborhood, I cannot tell you the significant influence it has had on the community. As a member, I have made many new friends – it almost seems as if the fitness programs are a wonderful by-product.

Remember the YMCA is open to all – no matter what their race, age, religion, economic status or gender. If we had more room, the Y could have many more programs to open to the community.

I know that many of the families in the neighborhood use the current Y, but it is sorely outdated and crowded.

I ask you to approve the higher density so that the Y can continue to have a meaningful impact on Arlington.

Carolyn Myles  
830 North Jackson Street  
Arlington, VA 22201

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Richard Levine <artisanrichard@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2017 11:58 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Expansion of the YMCA

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Dear Mr. Fusarelli,

My wife and I are long time loyal members of our "little" Arlington "Y". The services this organization provides to the community are priceless! Our good health, our social connections, our community involvement all stem from the wonderful benefits we derive from "Y" membership. Wouldn't it be better if the "Y" were able to provide even more classes, events, community outreach from an expanded facility? The current physical plant is sorely in need of both expansion to accommodate more members and renovation of the existing facility. The more the "Y" is able to offer, the greater the enhancement to the community.

It is our hope the Planning Commission will see fit to grant the permits necessary to begin construction on an expanded "Y" able to bring its important benefits to a wider population.

Sincerely,

Susan Levine  
Richard Levine

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** GUY JUNE MILLION <junemillion@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 19, 2017 2:23 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Our Y

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Anthony and Elizabeth:

I have lived in the Cherrydale neighborhood of Arlington since 1972. I've been a member of the Y since I retired in about 15 years ago. It has helped me in physically, mentally, and socially. I attend classes and yoga, play tennis, and use the machines normally five or six days a week. I have developed many new friends there.

The Y has a wide selection of classes and many benefit older people like me that helps keep us fit. (Nevertheless, I fully enjoy the Y because it's a place that children and families attend as well. I like the mix of ages.) Some of our classes, though, are so crowded now that it's often impossible to squeeze into some of them. The pool is so tiny it's not possible to swim laps or even hold an aerobics class. The tennis facility is inadequate in many ways....lighting, air conditioning. All the bathrooms and locker rooms are very dated and inadequate.

We've seen enormous changes in Arlington (I-66, Metro, etc.) since we moved here and understand how difficult change is for many residents, but it's time for a new Y to serve--at a reasonable fee--all ages, genders, races in Arlington.

With my Y membership I have participated in beautiful, spacious, well-equipped Ys in Maine, Ohio, Minnesota, and California. With our increased population--including many more children and seniors--Arlington needs a facility to accommodate us.

Please consider making changes necessary to allow Arlington to have a Y that will serve our community fully.

Sincerely,

**June Million**

1824 N. Lincoln St.

Arlington, VA 22207

703-527-1370

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Paul Ashin <paul.ashin@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2017 11:13 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** 'Ballston Virginia Square Civic Association'; egearin@egearin.com  
**Subject:** Neighborhood views on the Kirkwood-Washington GLUP Special Study  
**Attachments:** Quincy Park North community views on the Kirkwood-Washington GLUP Special Study.pdf

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Dear Mr. Fusarelli,

Attached please find a letter with two annexes that represents the work of a number of neighbors concerned about the possible impact of proposed changes to the GLUP for the Kirkwood-Washington special study area. The signatories are a drafting committee that was commissioned by a broader neighborhood meeting to develop a detailed response to the Applicant proposals and Staff presentations we have seen so far. We are confident, based on the views in that meeting and bi-lateral communications with neighbors, that these positions represent a broad consensus of neighborhood opinion. Since the letter contains operational requests that would have an impact on your preparation for the next LRPC meeting, we felt it best to deliver it to you now, before collecting more signatures from the community. Those will be forthcoming at the time of the next meeting.

In closing, let me reiterate the sentiment expressed in the letter: we are indeed grateful for the hard work of county staff and the commission and appreciate their openness to community views. We further appreciate the strong support shown by BVSCA leadership regarding this and other developments affecting our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Paul Ashin  
1302 N. Nelson St.  
Arlington, VA 22201  
703-841-1030 (h)  
202-904-7948 (c)

Anthony Fusarelli, Jr. AICP  
Principal Planner  
Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development  
Planning Division  
2100 Clarendon Blvd, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Mr. Fusarelli,

The community surrounding the Washington-Kirkwood GLUP Special Study area has developed some perspectives and recommendations on how that area could most appropriately be used, based on the principles and guidance outlined in Arlington planning documents and the desire of the community to preserve the character of a long-term, well-established residential neighborhood. We would like to thank Staff and the Commission for their hard work and their openness to hearing community views.

#### **Requesting revised modeling**

We would like to see modeling that more fully reflects the community's needs and wishes, even if it requires a relaxation of the timeframe originally proposed for the special study. Specifically we request that modeling be developed that:<sup>1</sup>

- **Fully utilizes the topography of the YMCA site to situate the taller, more massive buildings on Kirkwood.** Consistent with the principal of transition, any higher density allowed should be concentrated along Kirkwood and Washington. The areas abutting the existing single family homes and low-rise townhouses should be kept as low density and low mass. Building height in the study area should also taper in such a way that it does not encroach on the current residents on 13<sup>th</sup> St N, N. Kansas St and 12<sup>th</sup> Rd N.
- **Keeps a limited buffer zone along 13<sup>th</sup> St. N and N Kansas St. that would be Low Residential in the GLUP and conforms to the current zoning (R5).** Specifically, the buffer zone would start at the stand of trees in front of the current YMCA and extend to N. Kansas, and would protect the existing single family homes at 3426 and 3427 12<sup>th</sup> Road N.
- **Does not allow greater density or height on the North side of Washington Boulevard than is currently permitted on the South side.** As the South side of Washington Boulevard is zoned C-0-1.5, it would be inconsistent with the concept of transition for all of the North side to be zoned C-0-2.5. The South side currently has a density of 1.7-2.7 FAR, so proposals that would increase density on the North side to 2.5-2.7 FAR and above would also be inconsistent.
- **Returns to Transportation Framework Concept #3 from the 12/20/2016 LRPC meeting which directs traffic from the new projects onto Kirkwood and Washington, maintains the cul-de-sac at N. Kansas St. and 12<sup>th</sup> Road N., and does not provide any incentives for other traffic on Kirkwood or Washington to cut through the residential streets and add to the already high traffic load.**
- **Contains a bike/pedestrian pathway along the west side of the Study area to assist with the buffer concept outlined above as well as to provide N-S connectivity from the neighborhood to the Virginia Square Metro.**

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1 for more detailed discussion.

### Limiting negative impacts

The GLUP Study Area borders the Rosslyn-Ballston Metro Corridor but is not part of it. Historically the territory north of Washington Blvd has consisted of single family houses and low-rise townhouses, with the exception of the low-rise commercial area between Kirkwood and N. Lincoln St. <sup>2</sup> The Lynnbrook townhouses north of 13<sup>th</sup> St. N. were the first to be built in Arlington and their height was restricted to 27' in height to more closely conform to the characteristics of the neighborhood.

We are deeply concerned that Applicants' combined proposals could add around 700 new units of multi-unit residential housing. We feel that such density north of Washington Blvd, over 1200 feet from the Metro, would be unprecedented in the Ballston corridor. In particular, we are worried about the effect that excessive density and mass on the South side of 13<sup>th</sup> St. and the East side of N. Kansas St. would have on the residences on the North side of 13<sup>th</sup> St. N and along N. Kansas and 12<sup>th</sup> Road N. <sup>3</sup>

We also feel that the transportation modeling needs significant rethinking. The neighborhood is served by neighborhood streets that connect major arterials. We seek transportation solutions that do not significantly increase auto traffic through the neighborhood and make it more difficult for bicycles, joggers, pedestrians and homeowners. Community observations indicate that the traffic volume along 13<sup>th</sup> Street N is already over 1750 trips per day, not the 1250 shown in the study. <sup>4</sup> The Arlington Master Transportation Plan identifies 1500 as the threshold for "low traffic volume" which it associates with single family development. <sup>5</sup> In this regard, we regret that all of the scenarios modeled on February 21<sup>st</sup> propose new roads connecting either Washington Boulevard with 12<sup>th</sup> Road N and 13<sup>th</sup> St. N (GLUP Scenario 3) or between Kirkwood and 12<sup>th</sup> Road N (GLUP Scenario 5). We strongly feel that the kind of bicycle and pedestrian connectivity that we favor is more consistent with the draft guiding principle articulated at the same meeting. <sup>6</sup>

### Enhancing community services

Both the American Legion and the YMCA provide services to the entire Arlington community from their properties in the study area. The YMCA, in particular, received permission to build its facility on existing R5 land partly in consideration of the services it undertook to provide, which reduce the pressure on the

---

<sup>2</sup> Land Use Principle #1: *The County should maintain the residential zoning between I-66 and Washington Boulevard between Glebe Road and Kirkwood. Changes in the existing R-5 and R-6 zones should be considered only for sites of exceptional quality and originality in transition areas (1984, p. 7)*

<sup>3</sup> See the Draft Guiding Principle presented in the 02/17/17 LRPC meeting: *Reinforce effective and harmonious transitions between the edge of the Virginia Square Metro Station and adjoining single family residential neighborhoods, and preserve the primarily residential character of neighborhood streets west and north of the site.*

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 1 for details of the community traffic observation exercise. 13<sup>th</sup> S. North is less than 30 feet wide at its narrowest point, which should qualify it as a "neighborhood minor" street, like N. Kansas and 12<sup>th</sup> Road North.

<sup>5</sup> Master Transportation Plan, Goals and Policies, (Feb 25, 2017), p.7. We could not find other County guidance on appropriate traffic volumes for residential neighborhoods, but publically available sources and other jurisdictions (Rockville, MD, Modesto, CA) posit 1000-2000 trips per day. See Annex 1 for sources.

<sup>6</sup> *Encourage redevelopment that helps evolve this area from an automobile oriented development pattern to a pedestrian oriented mixed use place with exceptional quality projects appropriate for this transitional area.*

County to provide a number of these services itself.<sup>7</sup> In light of this, the County should ensure that the proposals and applications remain consistent with the original understandings with the YMCA and that **further development of that site be scaled to the actual financial needs of the proposed YMCA renovation** and significantly *enhance* the range, quality, and quantity of the services provided. Among the mechanisms at the County's disposal would be retaining the "Semi-Public" zoning on a portion of the property, making a specific note on the land use plan that would require any development on this site be contingent on significantly enhancing the delivery of such services, and reviewing site plans closely. Especially if concessions (including density and height bonuses) are made in recognition of the services that the YMCA and the American Legion provide, commitments should be obtained that this site will continue to be used to provide the services.

**Finally, the community is aware of other projects outside the scope of the GLUP study that will have additional impacts on quality of life for residents, including the proposed purchase of the Buck property, the development of the Red Top Cab facility, and the possible placement of a new 1300 seat High School adjacent to the Washington-Lee campus.<sup>8</sup> Some recognition of these impacts should be incorporated into the decision-making process for the GLUP.**

Sincerely,

Paul Ashin – 1302 N. Nelson St.

Albert and Stephanie Lewis - 3511 N. 13th St.

James Rosen - 3808 N. 14th St.

Howard Goldstein - 3447 N. 13th St.

Henry Staples - 3454 13th St. N

Larry Blackwood – 1215 N. Nelson St.

Guss Bosman and Alexandra Tabova - 1336 Lynnbrook Dr.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Annex 2 for a general list of YMCA services. The recent Community Facility Study found that most of these services are in extremely short supply within Arlington and none of the other "Semi-Public" zoned areas along the Orange Line corridor could provide this array of services. This shortage will be exacerbated as the County grows.

<sup>8</sup> Recent news about the sale of the Casual Adventure property to a development consortium is also relevant.

Annex 1: Specific modeling thoughts

**Procedural** - Schedule an additional LRPC meeting to discuss additional revisions to the GLUP presentation / model scenarios.

**Tapering Density and Mass**

- Model the impact of retaining an R-5 zoning for the residential area to the west (abutting 13<sup>th</sup> St/Kansas St/12<sup>th</sup> Road N).
  - Create a 120' R-5 buffer (totaling about one acre) between the residences along Kansas/ 12<sup>th</sup> and extending along 13<sup>th</sup> St to the stand of trees. The 120' buffer is from the east side of the existing YMCA owner residential property on the corner of Kansas / 12<sup>th</sup>. NOTE: This includes keeping the YMCA owned property on the corner of Kansas and 13<sup>th</sup> as R-5.
  - Recognize the 27' height of the Lynbrook townhouses and restrict the height of buildings facing them to no more than 35'.
- Model the impact of keeping the North side of Wash Blvd zoned C-O-1.5 (72 units/acre) instead of C-O-2.5.
  - The density in the proposed 11<sup>th</sup> St project is incongruent with tapering from the C-O-1.5 on the south side of Washington Blvd.
- Create models for the YMCA property that envisage 100, 150, or 200 units on the site, to test the impact of lower density that still might allow for a financial viable redevelopment.

**Traffic Modeling**

- Traffic estimates need to be revised on the basis of new professional counts.
  - Current modeling appears to be based on an estimate of 1244 average trips per day on 13<sup>th</sup> St. Preliminary traffic counts performed by community members show > 200 trips in peak hour and > 1700 trips per day. Please request a new traffic count on 13<sup>th</sup> St. Community observations are available for your review on the right. Yellow #s are placeholder estimates. Blue #s are observed counts, which do not include the highly traveled period between 6 and 8 PM.
- For each model (existing as well as new), indicate how many daily trips that would be added on the existing neighborhood roads.
- Explore options that could reduce traffic flow on 13<sup>th</sup> St
  - As noted above, the current traffic flow on 13<sup>th</sup> St is already high. Provide a model / scenario that lowers the traffic flow on 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Please cite Arlington's guidance for residential street traffic.
  - Jurisdictions have varying guidance for acceptable levels of traffic for similar sized residential roads. What is Arlington's guidance?

Hour	Auto
0000	20
0100	20
0200	20
0300	20
0400	20
0500	20
0600	60
0700	125
0800	60
0900	112
1000	75
1100	116
1200	94
1300	115
1400	102
1500	122
1600	155
1700	230
1800	60
1900	60
2000	60
2100	20
2200	20
2300	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>1727</b>

Generally available material indicates that even the existing levels of traffic are inappropriate for a residential community, let alone the increases that would be anticipated from an increase in residential units on the study area.

<http://www.mikeontraffic.com/numbers-every-traffic-engineer-should-know>

What's the daily capacity of a road?

2 lane local street: 1,000 vehicles per day based on livability

About how much traffic will my development generate?

Single Family Houses (per unit): 10 trips per day, 1 per peak hour

Apartments/Condos/Townhouses (per unit): 6 trips per day, 0.6 per peak hour

Office (per 1000 sq ft): 11 trips per day, 1.5 per peak hour

Retail (per 1000 sq ft): 43 trips per day, 3.7 per peak hour

See also, Ben-Joseph, Eran, "Residential Street Standards & Neighborhood Traffic Control: A Survey of Cities' Practices and Public Officials' Attitudes," Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley, available on the website of the National Association of City Transportation Officials, [http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/residential\\_street\\_standards\\_benjoseph.pdf](http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/residential_street_standards_benjoseph.pdf).

**Bicycle/pedestrian circulation:**

- Specifically, the proposed "buffer" path should start at the north side of 3427 12<sup>th</sup> Road North and turn south to run down the eastern sides of the properties at 3427 and 3426 12<sup>th</sup> Street North to Washington Boulevard. This could also connect with an E-W bicycle-pedestrian pathway linking 12<sup>th</sup> R. North and the Ball Cemetery to aid non-auto circulation.
- We would also suggest another N-S bicycle-pedestrian path connecting the stand of trees on 13<sup>th</sup> N with the Ball Cemetery and the two new streets contemplated in Transportation Framework 3 from the 12/26/16 LRPC meeting.

**Residential Units**

For each model (existing as well as new), indicate the total # of residential units that could be added, not simply the square footage.

- If any existing plans submitted by the developers vary from the maximum, indicate the variance (e.g. Applicant's submitted plan is 28 units less than the maximum 285 for the x acre parcel).
- Also include calculations for a reduced density (e.g. C.O.1.5 instead of C.O.2.5) or combinations of R-5 and other densities.

---

Annex 2: YMCA services

A short list of the services currently provided in the existing space would include:

- Childcare services (after-school care, onsite daycare, and preschool)
- Youth summer camps (and school vacation/holiday camps)
- Youth classes & programming
- Adult classes & programming
- Outdoor swimming facility
- Health & fitness facilities
- Athletic facilities (Tennis, Squash)

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Jim Gillespie <jgwg6825@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 22, 2017 9:01 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** A New Y Will Benefit All of Arlington

Dear Mr. Fusarelli:

When I moved to Arlington from Tucson, AZ seven years ago, I was fairly shocked to see that this otherwise progressive community had such a shabby and outdated Y facility. Nevertheless I joined for fitness and was pleasantly surprised at (1) how competent and efficient the staff and instructors are, and (2) the broad section of Arlington that it serves: all socio-economic levels, all races and all ages. The need for a new facility is really urgent; the current buildings are badly outdated in every way and much too small to handle the membership. Most hours of the day the place is bursting at the seams! I understand there is some neighborhood opposition; that is inevitable. However, looking at what is the greater good for all the people of Arlington this project is more than justified. Sincerely,  
James Gillespie (401 N. George Mason Dr., Arlington 22203)