



## 4MRV Working Group Meeting

March 15, 2017

7 – 10 PM

### Questions for the Working Group on the Draft Park and Area Plan Concept Alternatives

The following were questions posed to the Working Group in advance of the March 15 meeting, intended to spark conversation at meeting, on the Park Planning Area and Area Plan Area Concept Alternatives that are currently being discussed and refined, as well as address areas of overlap with the two planning areas, including potentially creating new pedestrian connections through the area and identifying areas where arts uses could expand. *(The Park Planning Area questions were handed out at the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, but not discussed.)*

These questions were discussed at the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting with the goal of reaching consensus among Working Group members, if possible. Some of the questions, below, are open ended or asked Working Group members to “fill in the blank”. It was suggested to Working Group members that they may choose to print this document and write out thoughts, but this is not a survey and responses were not collected. Members were asked to bring their ideas to the meeting. **Working Group discussion from the March 15 meeting is captured following each question.**

### Park Master Plan

1. For the Park Planning area west of Nelson Street, do you prefer:
  - a. The County continuing to acquire property to expand Jennie Dean Park if there are willing sellers
  - b. The currently owned public properties to be developed with park/recreational uses in a synergistic relationship with the future redevelopment of the privately owned properties?
  - c. The currently owned public properties to be developed with arts uses?
  - d. Encouraging the inclusion of arts related uses on the privately owned properties?
  - e. Other

### Working Group Discussion – Question 1:

- Still looking at three options.
- 1d – need for businesses and their services; way to sell air rights/add floors to existing buildings to rent to arts organizations to create additional value/uses
- Good idea; 1c – Signature Building is currently used by Signature and they want to expand; want to use the building in a way that it has historically been used; expense of additional properties is massive; look at improving existing County resources before even thinking of buying additional land
- County currently owns Signature building and they are leasing it
- Public properties should be focused on park/recreation uses (prefer 1b); confusion regarding so many walkways (regional parkway, south side); park planning area needs a facility for sports uses; competing desires for the space
- 3700 has tremendous potential if properly renovated; that building alone could be a fantastic arts showpiece for the County; build out/up
- Prioritize natural resources; two options show a path near stream all the way to Walter Reed and that is up high and away from the stream – one near the stream would let you see the resources

- Plug for the POPS process and that a land acquisition strategy is being developed
- Define better the acquisition of property; plan to acquire WETA, etc. for open green space would be good; expanding for the sake of expanding “no”; recreational opportunities on Shirlington Rd that may not be part of Jennie Dean Park
- Not sure buying additional properties to expand Jennie Dean is a good idea at this time; delays until the properties are sold; enhance what we already have and use the spaces we have; arts district should not be considered because there are so many existing businesses there that are not arts related; help make those businesses better looking/performing
- Whichever option is chosen, people need to be able to move around easily/access the area
- If we were to talk about further acquisition, in using scarce public dollars we need to include the possibility of acquiring land along Shirlington Rd for a potential multi-use facility that would include parking; this seems too confined to Jennie Dean; spreadsheet that was developed by a WG member – acquisition costs are only the beginning as there is also a building cost; may want to seek County Board guidance
- County has properties/buildings that are eminently reusable with some rehab – drawn to 1c; a lot of jobs and businesses there – this reality needs to be a part of the conversation; while a fan of green space, those buildings may not need to be taken down in the parks area
- Agree with comments on acquisition of WETA; it is the absolute top priority – without it our ability to implement a top notch green space is severely hampered; 1b – shocked when told that current landowners can build up to 75’ because no one has done it because they can’t park their sites; substantial redevelopment hard to do because parking is difficult here
- Parking is an issue and the road diet will help to dramatically increase the on-street parking supply/overall parking supply without fighting over dedicating space that could be used in another way to parking; multimodal transportation environment; angled parking gets more parking than parallel parking
- 2500 units with no green space; acquire as much land as possible; access to green space is important
- Open green space is currently missing and so important
- As much green space as possible
- Green space that is usable for passive recreation, sit on, play frisbee
- Inadequate amount of green space in South Arlington; people will use it
- Disturbed by car diet for 4MR Drive – need to see traffic studies; hearing about no turn lanes is idiotic; need turn lanes to go up Walter Reed and to go down; 2 lanes is not a good idea for the residents and businesses in the area
- Un-programed green space needed; a serious deficit here; population density is increasing fast
- WETA has to be the greatest priority to complete the Jennie Dean footprint
- South Arlington is very lacking in green space
- Top priority is WETA and then buildings near Weenie Beanie
- Use existing arts buildings for the arts; need more info on the stream improvements re shoring up the banks, etc. – need details to know if we need to pull back the dog park
- Unscientific poll of Wakefield students indicates there is desire for passive open space
- Look at private partnerships for arts rather than expending County funds

2. There has been discussion of public access to Four Mile Run for a new walkway along Four Mile Run Stream. Which of the following do you prefer, you may select up to 2 choices:
  - a. A walkway (only) along the north stream bank from Walter Reed Dr. to Nelson Street behind the buildings.
  - b. A walkway from Walter Reed Dr. to Nelson Street behind the buildings, co-exiting with, but separated from, the Dog Park.
  - c. A walkway from Walter Reed Dr. to the end of the current dog park that then leads out to Four Mile Run Drive and continues along the sidewalk until it connects to potential new walkways within Phase I (the existing Jennie Dean Park).

#### Working Group Discussion – Question 2

- Focus on WETA and few properties along Four Mile Run first in terms of acquisition; donut hole should come later; work with the property we have now; no walkways – walkway near dog park wouldn't work
- Safety issues with walkway near dog park; very high costs to stabilize stream bank to allow for walkway; don't want people walking in a dangerous area
- 2c was unclear – doesn't make sense to do this option
- Option to go not on a riparian trail or towpath but is a real promenade where people can walk and connect to the community
- Improve walkability along Shirlington Road first; why didn't question talk about access through the park; need bridges to south side and back could help with a promenade; need to clarify what we can/cannot afford
- Improvements are planned to Walter Reed crossing; can't support another walkway at west end of dog park – east end makes more sense
- Focus on better using/activating the south side walkway – with a crossing it could be better connected; public art, gardens, etc. are ways to enhance the existing walkway as opposed to shoe-horning in another walkway
- Could a walkway coexist with the dog park – need to see a drawing of this; the loop idea happened at TJ Park and loops get used
- Want a loop around Jennie Dean; our parks are built where you can't just walk around the ball field – barriers, fences, etc.; think about walkers and put in pathways; 4MR Trail between Shirlington Rd Bridge and first part on Shirlington side – least attractive part of trail – make it more aesthetically pleasing and is not on the list
- Parking – Chair was sent a request for staff to look at parking at the Shirlington Road intersection at the Shirlington Gateway in Alexandria – 200,000 sf building with a few hundred parking spaces not used in evenings/on weekends; can we use this parking?; this would influence how the pathways should run; it's already there; check all of our options; pedestrian pathway across the Run would need to be a higher priority if we used the Gateway parking

3. Although pedestrian enhancements are planned for the Walter Reed Drive and Shirlington Road bridges, there has been discussion of additional pedestrian crossings of Four Mile Run Stream. Which of the following do you prefer?
  - a. A new bridge built at the west end of the dog park that crosses to the south side of Four Mile Run, even if this requires shortening the length of the current dog park.
  - b. No north/south bridge crossings of Four Mile Run that split up the dog park.
  - c. Other location: \_\_\_\_\_.

### Working Group Comments – Question 3

- Don't shorten the dog park; bridge near end of the dog park without affecting the dog park would be good
  - If Walter Reed Bridge becomes more pedestrian friendly, then we don't need another bridge that close to it on the west end of the dog park; on Shirlington side, that bridge will be enhanced too; let's look at how these two bridges will function prior to building another expensive bridge – cost/look at access
  - Essential to add a pedestrian bridge no matter the design to enhance accessibility from south of the Run
  - Shirlington Road Bridge – we need to know more what it will look like and this would inform whether or not additional bridges will be needed; what is the traffic pattern for pedestrians there? how will they use it?
  - Look at pedestrian pathways to the Gateway building if we are able to use their parking spaces
4. If you could add one new park use in addition to those already occurring in Jennie Dean park, what would that be? **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**
5. Please share what you feel is the single biggest challenge with arranging the park uses within the Jennie Dean Park Planning Area? **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**

### Area Plan

1. There has been much discussion of retaining / supporting existing businesses. Is this a community value you support? Strongly / Somewhat / Not at all **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting, but one comment included from discussion of other questions)**

### Working Group Comments – Question 1

- Strongly support existing businesses
2. The three Alternatives exhibit different levels of potential change. In your opinion, which alternative provides the best balance between creating opportunities for new development/uses and retaining existing uses? Alternative 1 / Alternative 2 / Alternative 3 **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**
3. Within Subarea D, east of Shirlington Road should additional development be considered (pick one):
- a. For the hotel site [at 24<sup>th</sup> Road and Glebe Road] only?
  - b. For the hotel site, with height tapering considerations at/near the Lomax church site?
  - c. For all of Subarea D?
  - d. For all of Subarea D, with height tapering considerations at/near the Lomax church site?
  - e. None of the above (keep the existing land use, allowing industrial or hotel development similar to what currently exists)

### Working Group Comments Question 3

- Need thoughts, recs and numbers on impact on potential bus routes (ART, Metro, Paratransit) and parking minimums; only three outlets for this area and only 1.5 are of any major size; this level of density has the potential to add many trips with minimal outlets; how will transit and number of residents with SOVs be managed – the two impact each other

- Add street for large industrial vehicles that need to get in and out; new County staging area – don't want the vehicles coming out along Shirlington Road
- Need a ramp to 395 or some other way to get the trucks out; a lot of height and density
- Lot of height and density there
- Zoned RA-H which isn't for high rise apartments
- Oakland Street already has arts uses
- Likes Oakland Street. A lot of overflow parking for auto businesses so it would be good to have some kind of overflow parking for them – then the angled parking would work.
- Likes concept 1.
- Look at where more of the mechanic shop cars are being parked. Maybe have some metered parking and some dedicated to the shops.
- Likes suggestion that we use parking at Shirlington Gateway. Worth exploring.
- Yes, please on stream restoration. Absolutely critical.
- 225 species he has documented. Area is a conduit up through Arlington. Very important. Not as many species out there as there could be. Restoration is important. Stream must be nurtured. Wildlife votes with its feet and they won't be there if we don't restore this. Wildlife watching is an activity everyone can participate in.

4. Within Subarea D, is the potential height and development shown for the “Champion Billiards/Lucy’s” site and adjacent vacant parcels (west of Shirlington Road) appropriate? Yes / No **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**

5. Planning staff suggests that arts oriented uses, as well as a broad range of complimentary uses, could be concentrated/located in the Subarea B [between the Park Planning Area boundary and Walter Reed Drive], which could be in addition to arts uses or other features within the Park Planning Area. Do you agree that these types of uses should be located in Subarea B? Yes / No **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**

6. Please assess the following list of potential public improvements in terms of their potential to contribute to implementing the 4MRV vision [H = highest priority/most impact or L = lowest priority/least impact]: **(Not discussed at 3/15 meeting)**

Priority #	Potential Public Improvement
<i>Pedestrian Access</i>	
___	a. Pursue pedestrian and bicycle improvements on existing vehicular crossings of Four Mile Run Drive
___	b. Explore implementation of a pedestrian walkway/path on north side of Four Mile Run Stream.
___	c. Shirlington Road intersection improvements (at grade): Pursue improvements to intersection crossing markings for pedestrians, and dedicated bicycle crossings with green paint.
___	d. Explore a mid-block crossing at Oxford Street to cross Four Mile Run Drive and connect to the neighborhood across the W&OD Trail.

- \_\_\_ e. Pursue public pedestrian access (easement or public trail) at west end of the Parks area, to Four Mile Run Drive or along rear property lines to Walter Reed Drive.

#### ***Four Mile Run Stream Crossings***

- \_\_\_ a. Shirlington Road Bridge crossing of Four Mile Run stream: Pursue pedestrian and bicycle accommodations to both sides of the bridge when the County proceeds with the upcoming improvements to Shirlington Road Bridge, linked to existing pathways.
- \_\_\_ b. Explore additional pedestrian bridge crossings of Four Mile Run stream.

#### ***Street Design***

- \_\_\_ a. Explore potential for festival street design on S. Oxford Street.
- \_\_\_ b. Evaluate re-striping Four Mile Run Drive as a three-lane section for traffic calming with a new parking configuration (adding more on-street parking), and bulb-outs for street trees; reallocate the additional space for sidewalks on each side.

#### ***Environment***

- \_\_\_ a. Explore improvements to Nauck Branch as part of County improvements in Subarea C. Include green infrastructure with new County development to improve water quality and serve as a demonstration project.
- \_\_\_ b. Explore stream/bank improvements, and public art (phased over time).

#### ***Trail Improvements***

- \_\_\_ a. Study a pedestrian/bike flyover bridge “gateway feature” connecting the W&OD Trail and Four Mile Run Trail as an independent project to reduce the bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle conflicts along Shirlington Road.
- \_\_\_ b. Pursue coordination with NVRPA to provide better lighting and signage on the W&OD Trail; incorporate public art.

### **7. As these draft Area Plan Concepts are refined, what other ideas would you like to see incorporated?**

#### **Working Group Comments – Question 7**

- When can we hear more about stream restoration and the environmental work that needs to be done? Nature, fauna and native plants, etc. along the stream are such an asset. Dog waste and auto related waste. Discuss environmental impact of activities near the stream on the Run.
- Agree.
- Agree.

**Other Working Group Discussion (from meeting agenda).** Questions and comments from the Working Group are summarized below.

#### **Four Mile Run Drive Road Diet Presentation and Parking Comments**

- Would the dimensions for Four Mile Run Drive be wider than examples from Seattle given the number of trucks that drive on Four Mile Run?
  - The consultant confirmed that the diagrams show 11-12 foot lanes.
- One example with two lanes and diagonal parking and no center turn lane is Columbia Road in Adams Morgan, and it is a nightmare. Why would it work on Four Mile Run Drive?
  - The consultant responded that the proposed center turn lane (not provided in Adams Morgan) provides ability to go around someone who is trying to park.
- Nobody will be able to park because when you put on your brake lights someone will be right behind you. The consultant responded that some of this is due to driver behavior, however, if people are looking for parking, they will learn pretty quickly.
- Road diet idea has potential for Four Mile Run Drive but wondering if the traffic is slowed down and civilized on Four Mile Run, what will be the impact on Arlington Mill Drive?
- Would venture that the larger share of vehicle traffic on this road are motorists driving past the area. This working group exists because of changing the share of motorists that are driving to the area because the park is improved there is an arts district; then you simply are going to need more parking. The question about what Four Mile Run Drive should look like needs to be in this context, and therefore, what do we want this area to look like – as a destination. It might no longer be appropriate for a road just built to carry people through it.
- Dangerous intersection at Four Mile Run and Shirlington Road was identified at beginning of this process, especially in the morning, plus weird bike passing and trucks coming out, so how does new traffic configuration (road diet) address that issue? Also no recognition of the Nauck Branch stream?
  - The consultant responded that during the charrette, that intersection was addressed, and shown (not the focus of tonight's presentation); also proposed a serpentine bridge that would connect the trails and take trail users off of the ground plane altogether.
- Do we have data on number of collisions and conflicts on Four Mile Run? If we are planning for an additional influx of people to use the park, it makes sense to add parking, but this does not even solve the issue we have with parking today – it will just escalate the problems we have now by bringing more traffic to the area; another member responded that the angled parking is the method for getting as much parking as you can get and much less expensive than building a parking deck.
- Love the car diet – works great on Wilson Blvd (even though it is too narrow on Wilson for parking). Tree bump-outs shown are excellent – the only way to get trees is with the bump-outs. Whoever said they see lots of dead trees in medians, they are right. We used to think a hole would support a tree. Now there is more technology with structural cells give great examples of trees surviving in areas like this.
- What about people who park commercial vehicles on Four Mile Run Drive? If we put in angled parking don't know where commercial vehicles will go.
- Do we know what types of collisions occur on Four Mile Run Drive? At intersections? With pedestrians and bicycles?
- Agree that road diet makes great sense and that similar changes on Wilson Boulevard have been great. Like the trees - make the area much more inviting.
- On the fence on the road diet. Has potential to be beneficial in creating additional parking spaces, but also there is already a large amount of unmet parking need and will need more if we bring

more people here – the angled parking will not be enough. Don't understand how the center lane helps, and also don't understand why the center lane does not exist in front of Jennie Dean. Please share accident data with working group.

- Like the three lane idea. It is important to have the angled parking near the park, also need a parking deck – not mutually exclusive. People don't like to walk far from parking. Also angled parking creates a buffer between park and traffic.
- Agree that we need to layer the solutions. Cannot build a parking deck large enough, but angled parking will help supplement. Also angled parking does a lot visually to calm things down. Great idea.
- Road diet design is attractive. On Taylor Street they have angled parking – it will dramatically slow down traffic on Four Mile Run. Almost too bad that we are not looking at Arlington Mill drive as well, because whatever we do on Four Mile Run will impact Arlington Mill Drive.
- Road diet. Came here a skeptic, and now I am convinced. Good presentation. Especially because I want the parking in the street.

#### **4MRV Area Plan Alternative Concept Review**

- Why not showing any improvements to subarea c? Has potential to do something now to improve area where cement plant and ABC distributor used to be – hopefully County will acquire at some point, so seems like wasted opportunity. The consultant clarified that in the “blue” zone, it is not necessary to keep those exact buildings, but concept shows preservation of existing industrial zoning; whereas pink area shows a greater mix of uses and more intense development, as opposed to more uses that are similar to those that are there today.
  - The Chair added that a briefing on the land swap in that area is planned for a future meeting.
- Were we to build those really interesting buildings up in the Nauck area, you would really need more green space down below.
- We want this area to be industrial. But when we look at the drawings they look like typical boring suburban drawings, and the trees make it look like suburban, fake created space as opposed to an industrial area. Don't know why we need Oxford Street as a festival street. A promenade would address the walkway issues we have been talking about. Prefer the “before” La Jolla example over the “after,” which is too congested.
- Adding sidewalks and trees would make the area more inviting and useable, really appreciated the presentation.
- Confused by feedback provided by the working group discussion. Consultant work is fantastic. Examples are very helpful. Consultants seem to know what they are talking about and the road diet seems logical – appreciate this work. We want the area to be more inviting. We want the experience to be better and more walkable, but some say we want it to be industrial and not suburban - my observation is that feedback is very confusing.
- With all that density along Shirlington Road, we will need more green space. Pocket parks in that area would be needed.
- Like Oxford festival street. Also confirming that on diagrams, those are just massing diagrams. We need an awesome park and should use every inch of it in a creative way.
- If we have that kind of density in area d, we need all the park space we can get.
- Area a – was there any exploration of a gradual evolution of that area? E.g. for uses to change over time and potentially for arts uses to expand into that area?
- Area c. Must be multi-use/multipurpose – need to co-locate. Valuable space; County has to think about spending money there to create underground bus parking and additional uses on top.

- Also think area c is a good option for the swap. Area d will transform that area as well – if we were to sign off on that, would want to ensure Nauck residents are aware of proposed higher density and transformative nature. Once you allow housing, it is on the road to Clarendon; and we may then need to drive 20 miles to get to light industrial services
- Area d (massing study). Option shown with all the density is a nightmare. If we have any high rise, it should be restricted just to Glebe Road. Don't like imposing buildings next to the church – better option there is townhouses. Plus anything we do here, must include a park in the middle of this development.
- Oxford street is a low priority for me – because you don't get anywhere at the other side. Maybe if you put a bridge in, but not if it does not go anywhere. Like idea generally, but not at Oxford.
- Does the County have an easement to build a sidewalk without the road diet? Staff responded that it depends on the property; in many cases, property owner owns all the way up to the curb.
- Area d. Proposals to add density to the area – would like to see thoughts, recommendations, numbers for impact on potential bus routes (Art or Metro), paratransit and parking minimums that would be recommended in that area.

#### **Meeting review/next steps**

- Will see area plan concept revisions at April 19th meeting. Will be first and last time to see it before County Board work session. However, concepts do not have to be final for County Board work session – may be presented as “work-in-progress”
- Three options shared with the general public will be developed after the County Board work session, which may clarify some decisions, at which time staff will continue to work with working group to refine concepts in preparation for sharing with broader community.

**Subcommittees.** There was a discussion about potential for subcommittees.

#### **Comments advocating for subcommittees**

- We should have subcommittees to discuss discrete issues.
- Appreciate perspective of working together, but think good work can be done in subcommittees to bring back to group – size of group is a bit unwieldy.
- Subcommittees could prove very useful here.
- Had advocated for subcommittees early on – want environmental information, but however we get that info is good
- Defer to group on this but will say that on community facilities study there were three groups to discuss. outstanding issues and came up with interesting and creative ideas and it moved us forward.

#### **Comments advocating for single working group**

- Prefers that entire working group works together.
- Group is beginning to work really well together. Agrees no subcommittees.
- Do not want subcommittees.
- Concerned that if we break into committees at this point it will drive us farther apart. We have creative ideas now, and need to come to consensus sooner or later and subcommittees will just separate us more.
- Like the idea of subcommittees, but we are not there yet. Need to get base information out and build the trust first. We are sixty days away.
- Prefer to keep as committee of the whole. We are working better than we give ourselves credit for.

**Dog park.** The working group discussed whether there is consensus on moving/not moving the dog park.

- If people feel strongly that there was no consensus among the working group members, then members should argue for options showing it somewhere else, because all the options show it not moving.
- Many indicated that more information is needed about environmental implications before making an assessment as to whether it should stay or move.
- Request for DES to speak to working group about dog park and stream. Staff responded that it initially brought four concepts, showing multiple locations for the dog park; all showing alternative locations were rejected by working group. However, there are no conclusions yet among staff on implications of moving/not moving the dog park. Staff agreed to assemble consultants and staff across departments to provide additional information to the working group.

#### **Public comment**

- Property owner at 3800 Four Mile Run Drive. Concerned, because if some resent thinking about moving dog park, shouldn't private property owners in the study area resent how our properties are not talked about at all. Would like to be included in subarea b (area plan) rather than be designated as part of the park - we are private property owners and request that the park boundary be adjusted to exclude our property. Briefing book specifically talks about the five properties the County purchased being included in the master plan for the park, but did not talk about using the private property for the park. Repurposing is great. Making alleys and promenades is great. Painting buildings is great. Give us incentives (e.g. gross receipts incentives).
- Performing arts are a priority of the County Board.
- Need for passive recreation spaces has been discussed a lot. People seem to be forgetting about Allie Freed park, which is 100% passive recreation space. Also - something that has not been brought up: are you consigning every business that backs up to the dog park to be a one direction business because it backs against the dog park? – what if someone wants a western sunset and windows on that side? Location of dog park has an impact on future development options for that block. Subarea b and Nelson Street area as arts area: why are we precluding arts uses in any other space? Sometimes these things develop organically when you have a seed e.g. Signature Theatre – should not be so rigid in our prescription of what goes where.
- Agree with a working group member that it is confusing about where working group is going at some points. This is the last industrial area in the County, and half of it is gone, right off the top (park planning area). Then you have the arts area in b, so all that is left is a and c. Subarea d especially makes no sense going to high density. We have plenty of that elsewhere.
- Nauck resident. I use two main pedestrian pathways: 1) between dog park and brewery; 2) walking down the hill to Oxford, and then I take my life in my hands and run across the street. So in response to those saying Oxford doesn't go anywhere, this is not true – I do walk to Oxford in order to go to dog park, doggie day care, and dog wash. There are a lot of uses and do not assume that those areas are not being used.
- Citizen. Lots of good ideas tonight. If it goes in green space direction, I will be one of the people using it. But I also use the businesses and appreciate having them there. Also like idea of a path connecting Oxford Street to the community, path over Shirlington Road connecting the two bike trails, and like the S-curve idea.