



4MRV Working Group Meeting

June 21, 2017

7 – 10 PM

Comments and discussion by the working group are summarized below.

General Business

- Working Group discussion of its draft letter to JFAC regarding Buck property:
 - Letter should “strongly suggest” collocation;
 - Stronger point of letter is to recommend acquiring the property;
 - Clarify in the letter that there are RPA issues;
- Two subcommittees are being created – subcommittee meetings will be open to public, and all dates will be published on the web page.
 - Dog park, chaired by Carolyn Haynes, and including: Keith Fred, Adam Henderson, Nora Palmatier and Edie Wilson; first meeting to convene immediately following this working group meeting; 5 additional meetings scheduled.
 - Arts district, chaired by Robin Stompler, and including David Peete, Jeff Zeeman, Tom Prewitt and Matt McCrerry; members to be assigned research topics, which will be presented at a meeting of this subcommittee.

Subarea D presentation from Dover Kohl (consultant). Staff asked working group to discuss its reactions, and whether the concepts shown are moving in the right direction. Discussion is summarized as follows:

- Massing seems like a lot of change for the neighborhood. Does that line up with feedback?
- As previously discussed, we agree this is an industrial area and the County is clamoring for keeping it industrial, yet there is a lot of residential shown here. Residential will increase the value of the neighborhood, but will this price us out? The lack of industrial focus is concerning.
- Every meeting so far has been about retaining industrial use. Why not expand the M-1 zoning here if that is what Arlington needs?
- So little green space for the amount of residential shown.
- How wide does Nauck branch have to be for RPA standards? The consultant responded that what is shown is larger than what would be required to convey stormwater; it is shown as an area where a wider open space could be planned.
- Concepts lose sight of the light industrial we want to maintain here; depict gentrification happening over time.
- Moving all the arts to the other end of Four Mile Run does not make sense.

- We should recognize that the development shown along Shirlington Road in the concepts, is already called for in the adopted Nauck Plan; that adopted plan already eliminates the industrial uses there.
- We have all these neighborhoods in the County saying we don't want industrial uses. Here is a neighborhood saying we do want industrial uses.
- Staff pointed out the following:
 - One of the reasons the buildings envisioned in the Nauck Plan have not developed is because the sites are too narrow, so one concept staff is trying to accomplish in showing this model, is to show how the Nauck Plan might be realized where it is adjacent to the study area for Four Mile Run Valley.
 - The concepts shown are not a staff proposal, but rather an effort to show how it could develop under current zoning regulations, and compare that to development that aligns with the adopted Nauck Plan. This is provided for discussion purposes before we move on to other concepts.
 - Staff encourages working group to think about what happens on the ground floor regardless of any upper story use, which is under our control as part of this visioning (and future implementation) process, such as high ceilings that will allow industrial uses to use new buildings.
- Regardless of the mix of commercial/industrial that may be endorsed, has staff looked at infrastructure, sewer, water that would be required. Staff responded that it does not typically look at that at the Area Planning level, however, infrastructure is typically addressed as part of the site plan process where there are expectations that the developer would provide certain infrastructure, if needed.
- We need to know if County wants to continue M-1 zoning in this area. Staff confirmed that it does not intend to change the zoning here, but might add more flexibility to the existing zoning regulations as part of implementation of the Plan, depending on what the vision turns out to be.
- From D.C. Rental to Lomax, would like to see a reformatted model showing industrial and light industrial rather than residential, and with individual buildings rather than blocks.
- Hotel site can be taller; Bus lot lease property should be tall; Chester's property could be a multi-use athletic facility. What is shown here does not seem to reflect what the community has in mind.
- Why would it be so bad NOT to change the zoning? Change will not occur until a property owner says it wants a change. Why do we need to say what we want to happen in 20 years, rather than letting the property owners decide what they want first?
- The concepts shown are disappointing because they are so conventional. The models do not suggest anything about this area that you cannot find elsewhere in Arlington. Thought the whole aim of this exercise was to be different and distinctive.
- Cannot study Area D in isolation from the rest of the study area. As soon as you introduce residential, you have winners and losers – we should not do that anywhere in

the study area without understanding the tradeoffs for other areas of the Plan. In area A and B, landowners would not get the same return. Consider use of TDR to achieve more equity across the study area.

- We need general goals for the area before we propose a street network or rescue of Nauck branch
- One goal is to retain industrial but also provide for future improvements. Thought the goal was an entirely new zoning district that allows for 100 feet, for example; or special taxing districts that provide capital to retain industrial uses. This would provide a way to retain existing uses but include some upgrades.
- If we take area D to this extreme, does not seem like these uses would be viable. Maybe we should relocate some of the auto uses to Area D to create some kind of industrial hub. Economic analysis indicated not to pursue residential with industrial uses. Would like to see an option that would allow for an arts area, and then allow the displaced businesses in that area to go elsewhere.
- Like the effort to daylight Nauck branch and allow for more green space. However, the concept is a bit of a mish-mash, though understand that we are driven somewhat by the adopted Nauck plan buildings.
- Like the idea of residential over industrial – retains the industrial form and structure.
- Lower block should definitely be kept M-1, knowing it gets away from “like-facing-like”.
- Like how height is kept away from Lomax church.
- Having gotten to know some of the business owners, they are a significant and important part of Arlington. If they are gone, they will not come back; Need to be very sensitive to that piece.
- My kids went to school in Nauck. The Nauck I knew then is gone in this model. Question to the working group: is that an important value to us at the table? In the County? Look forward to hearing how the community feels about this.
- Agree with last point. The buildings in the Nauck plan are the death knell for Nauck. They change the face of Nauck.
- Agree that with heavy arts focus on Four Mile Run Drive, this group has not made any plans for the maker spaces we talk about, or artist housing or industrial uses we want to bring in. We are not making space for that.
- Do not feel strongly about the residential uses in the area, but opening up the area with new roads will open up the area and is a good idea; also like the green space woven in. Not as opposed to this idea as other people are.
- Why is the cement plant the holy grail and we cannot talk about a future where it is not there? EPA says cement plants are highly polluting. That space would be ideal for car repair uses and an environmentally sustainable industrial park. County can change the M-2 zoning which is the only way cement plant can be there; if changed to M-1, a new cement plant could not be there in the future.

- Plan should account for strong public support from visioning workshop in December, for an indoor multi-use recreational facility, assuming the land became available. Would be natural for areas C or D and ideal for collation including bus parking, particularly with good access to 395. Also consistent with retaining industrial uses.
- Would like to see public reaction to these concepts. It is different enough and would love to see what kind of feedback we get in July at public open house.
- Residential in Area D is probably not good, except on hotel site. Makes sense to have retail along Shirlington road and some kind of buffer behind, and then industrial. As far as grand vision, would like auto repair center, culinary center, just like we are taking about having an arts district. Could be an incubator for restaurant businesses.
- Like concept shown for open space around Nauck Branch – perhaps it could extend into Area C, connect to Four Mile Run trail and provide additional access to Jennie Dean Park. Also in favor of building up next to the highway – building up can allow for additional open space; there are opportunities to use residential zoning to accomplish goals of creating maker spaces, lofts and/or affordable housing.
- All for building up along the highway; do not want to see parking garages along the road; like what others have said about mixed community use center around where Chester’s is now. Could bridge Nauck neighborhood with Jennie Dean Park
- Interesting ideas on the table. How do we foresee coming to a point where we have goals so we know how we want to plan this? Without having goals, it is hard to have these discussions as a group - we keep on having the same one over and over.
- Important to add additional streets in the area. Shirlington road is the only way around.
- All for preserving Nauck Branch. We should not lose sight of economic reality that people who own that land have no incentive right now to do anything with it and the only way those incentives happen is for property owners to have great potential on that land so they can make more money than they make now. If we want industrial uses, we need to find a way to have industrial uses AND something else or it will just stay exactly the way it is right now.

75 vs 100 ft on County ART bus parking site within Subarea C ? What are reactions of working group?

- Yes to 100 ft
- Yes to 100ft – need another road from Shirlington road. Do not put green space between tall building and 395.
- Yes. If you can persuade DES to build recreation on top of buses, please do so.

Community open house planning - July 19 – 7-9 pm; Should we also add a day session 3-5? To capture business owners or neighborhood folks? Or is one enough?

- Just the evening session is fine.
- Staff to work with WG leadership on feedback comment sheets

- Make sure there is explanatory material on difference between area plan and zoning
- Some concern with showing some of these plans at the open house. May not accurately reflect discussion at County Board work session or the working group discussions.

Public comments

- Current Arlington Forest resident and Arlington resident since 2002: Make sure to highlight importance of softball and baseball fenced field preservation and retention; Perhaps there could be a way for community to provide comments like this to working group through web site
- Concerned about pictures that may be displayed at the open house on July 19. There should also be a discussion of some type at that meeting if possible.
- Signage for open house: since Drew School will be in summer session, make sure there are signs there before, and at neighboring playgrounds, Shirlington Park, Barcroft and Drew parks, and use social media such as *next door* and other mailing lists
- Founder of D.C. Play: group that sponsors adult sporting. There is not enough green space for recreational sports; Children and youth always get priority and reduction of green space will exacerbate that further. Encourage group to prioritize open green space; note that Arlington is top of the Trust for Public Land's list for dog parks, but not for adult sports.