

**Site Plan Review Committee**  
Community Engagement Comments and Responses  
Crystal Plaza 1 (2000/2001 S. Bell St.) – SP #458

**Project Contacts**

**SPRC Chair**

Daniel Weir  
[daniel.a.weir@gmail.com](mailto:daniel.a.weir@gmail.com)

**LRPC Chair**

James Schroll  
[jmschroll@gmail.com](mailto:jmschroll@gmail.com)

**County Staff Contact**

*CPHD Planner*  
Adam Watson  
703-228-7926  
[awatson@arlingtonva.us](mailto:awatson@arlingtonva.us)

*DES Planner*  
Joanne Gabor  
703-228-3692  
[jgabor@arlingtonva.us](mailto:jgabor@arlingtonva.us)

**Applicant Contact**

*JBG Smith*  
Robert Vaughan  
240-333-3836  
[rvaughan@jbgsmith.com](mailto:rvaughan@jbgsmith.com)

*Represented by Venable*  
Kedrick Whitmore  
703-905-1514  
[KNWhitmore@Venable.com](mailto:KNWhitmore@Venable.com)

**Site Plan Project Information**

**Project Name:** Crystal Plaza 1 (2000/2001 S. Bell Street)

**Items Requested:** Rezoning, Block Plan, PDSP Amendment, Site Plan Amendment, and New Site Plan

**Engagement Session:** December 28, 2020 – January 11, 2021

**Review Focus Topics:** (All Topics) Site Layout, Building Design and Architecture, Underground, Transportation, Open Space, and PDSP/Other



**Contents**

About this Document .....	1
Responses to Common Topics.....	2
SPRC Comments: Building Design and Architecture .....	7
SPRC Comments: Underground.....	9
SPRC Comments: Transportation .....	11
SPRC Comments: Open Space and Landscaping.....	17
SPRC Comments: PDSP/Other .....	20
Community Member Comments.....	23

**About this Document**

This document contains all the comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee’s online engagement for the Crystal Plaza 1 project between December 28 and January 11. Additionally, the matrix below includes some comments that were directly emailed to staff during the engagement period. The comments are categorized by the topics that were highlighted in this review (Site Layout, Building Design and Architecture, Underground, Transportation, Open Space, and PDSP), with SPRC member comments appearing first in the document. All comments not pertaining to the above topics are categorized as “Other.” Use the table of contents to easily jump to a particular section, or click on the “Return to Table of Contents” link at the bottom of each page to return to the first page of this document.

## Responses to Common Topics

Below are common topics or themes received through the online engagement session that were identified by County staff. The list includes a summary of the topic and responses from County staff and the applicant. Please note that the topics have been summarized in order to provide an overview of the common themes and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual commenter.

- **Building Design and Architecture**

- 1. Tower Separation – East Tower**

Several respondents expressed concern about having less than 60-feet of horizontal separation between the face of the proposed East Tower and the Crystal Plaza Apartments, and requested clarification on how the proposal will maintain light and air between the buildings and/or how the applicant will satisfy the tower separation requirement.

*Staff Response:* The proposed separation between the East Tower and the existing Crystal Plaza Apartments is approximately 48 feet. The Zoning Ordinance (ACZO) requires that a minimum horizontal separation of 60 feet between building towers above the fifth floor be provided. However, this provision may be modified when the County Board finds that additional tower separation on the block will likely be achieved through future redevelopment, based upon the Crystal City Block Plan. The applicant is requesting such a modification and has coordinated with the property owner of the Crystal Plaza Apartments (Dweck) to provide a Block Plan scenario meeting the ACZO modification requirement. This Block Plan scenario will capture and illustrate Dweck's agreement to redevelop the future Crystal Plaza Apartments building such that at least 60 feet of tower separation is provided.

*Applicant Response:* Consistent with the Sector Plan and the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant is seeking a modification of tower separation requirements above the 5th floor based on the current location of the neighboring property owner's building to the south. Our resubmission will contain a scenario that has been coordinated with the adjacent property owner and shows the redeveloped Crystal Plaza Apartments located so as to create the 60-foot tower separation shown in the Sector Plan. The Applicant has conducted shadow studies and has designed the tower in such a way as to maximize the penetration of light and air and minimize negative impact as a result of the building separation.

- 2. Architecture and Massing**

Overall, staff received mixed comments on the proposed architecture and tower designs. However, several respondents requested greater explanation on facets including the Architectural Feature (East Tower), the West Tower composition, podium designs, and tower sculpting/setbacks.

*Staff Response:* Staff appreciates the different perspectives on the proposed building design and architecture, but will defer to the applicant to elaborate on its proposal.

Applicant Response: The entire East building site is identified in the Sector Plan as an Architectural feature. Sector Plan 3.11.3 notes that innovative architectural expression should be given wide latitude in feature locations and that guidelines on massing and setbacks are relaxed. Per this section, an Architectural Feature may be a complete building tower, and the design of the East building has been carefully crafted with this concept in mind. The proposed building employs several strategies to set it apart as an Architectural Feature, including the bold use of green brick and dynamic building top. In addition, the folding and cantilevered facades are explicitly intended to create a sense of forced perspective, drawing the eye toward the building and accentuating its verticality. A setback above the podium in this location would stunt the tower's verticality, we believe reducing its overall effectiveness as an Architectural Feature.

The Applicant will include in the West Tower opportunities for bioretention plantings and the West Tower podium will be created with trees on the top to give the presence of an expanded podium while still making the building relatable to pedestrians. The West Towers mass will be moved back to the south to reduce the effect of shadows on future Center Park to the extent possible while opening up future possibilities for bioretention and plantings. The Applicant will incorporate horizontal elements to more clearly define the base from the rest of the tower.

The beginning of Sector Plan 3.11 provides explicitly that these are simply guidelines “and not rules” “intended to be flexible, to recognize the economic and program forces that influence the form of buildings and development, and to acknowledge that the vision for Crystal City can be achieved by a variety of means and methods.” Both the RBL and setback recommendations are for the purpose of achieving specific goals (creating an urban edge and visual interest/pedestrian scale, respectively). The Applicant has incorporated building elements in its design to meet these specific Sector Plan goals.

### **3. Bird-friendly Glass**

Several respondents asked that the applicant confirm and/or incorporate the use of bird-friendly glass.

Staff Response: Staff has encouraged the applicant to incorporate bird-friendly glass. While not a requirement, the addition of bird-friendly glass supports various policy goals aimed at achieving a more environmentally-friendly building design.

Applicant Response: While the Sector Plan and standard site plan conditions do not require bird-friendly glass, the team has taken the mitigation of bird strikes into consideration based on the following: The site is located in a heavily developed area. The Potomac River is about 2 miles to the east, separated by the Airport; and Roaches Run is about 1.5 miles away separated by urban development. Both towers are a consistent combination of windows and solid facade area, with minimal expanses of glass. The glass reflectivity is low. At the street level, the general urban street wall and tree spacing parallel to the building are intended to channel bird movement parallel to the building. In addition, the more landscaped pedestrian path to the east has a very low glass percentage.

- **Underground**

- 4. Proposed Underground Design**

While respondents preferred the new, fully-internalized Underground design option, there were concerns that the design may feel "unwelcoming" or "claustrophobic." Respondents noted that the applicant should consider design measures, such as wider pathways, wayfinding systems, and enhanced lighting and art to improve the pedestrian experience.

*Staff Response:* Staff finds that the new, fully-internalized concourse design is an improvement over previous design proposals and more closely aligns with the guidance provided in the Sector Plan. However, staff will continue to work with the applicant on refining the design to ensure a safe and welcoming connection.

*Applicant Response:* The proposed design was crafted by the Applicant in response to community feedback and conversations with the public and has been revised to include certain elements (including widening the pathways where possible) that enhance the pedestrian experience. The Sector Plan recognizes that modifications to the Underground may be necessary to ensure the long-term viability of the system. The Applicant looks forward to working out the remaining issues with staff and the community as the project moves forward.

- **Transportation**

- 5. Clark/Bell Street – Protected Bicycle Lanes and Build-to Lines**

Staff received numerous comments requesting that protected bicycle lanes be provided in both directions along the new Clark/Bell Street segment. Related to this, several respondents also noted concern about the proposed 72-foot right-of-way width ("build-to line") for the new Clark/Bell Street, versus having an 80-foot-wide right-of-way, as recommended in the Crystal City Sector Plan. Respondents expressed concern that allowing an 8-foot reduction in the Sector Plan-recommended width will negatively affect the pedestrian and bicycle networks.

*Staff Response:* Staff has reviewed the proposed design of Clark-Bell and is supportive of the proposed street section as it supports the needs of the transportation network for vehicles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. The north-south section of Clark-Bell is the permanent alignment and section, while the east-west section south of the west building is an interim condition to connect the new section with the existing Clark Street location. The Sector Plan street section is comprised of sidewalks on both sides, three travel lanes, a bike lane, and parking. The proposed design provides all these elements except the parking area. A northbound contraflow bicycle lane is proposed on the east side of the street as proposed as part of the larger County led Crystal City Bike Network project to deliver a network of enhanced bicycle facilities east of Richmond Highway from the Alexandria border to Long Bridge Park. The public engagement for the Crystal City Bike Network is currently being conducted with the next public engagement session on February 24. A streetscape with trees adjacent to the curb and a sidewalk are provided that meet the Sector Plan standards. Three travel lanes are provided, two southbound and one northbound.

Applicant Response: The Applicant made changes to the plans in accordance with staff and community comments which enable the connection with future development by other property owners. More specifically, these changes address staff and community concerns regarding bus turns leading to the redesign of the building and right of way. A comprehensive transportation analysis was conducted as part of the development of the Sector Plan. The Sector Plan’s recommended building densities and development patterns are reflective of this study. Additionally, staff is currently working on a comprehensive Crystal Drive study. The Sector plan speaks to the need to balance multiple uses within the right of way and the Applicant is working on achieving this through coordination with staff. The Applicant also has evaluated the right-of-way width and found it sufficient for traffic and movements.

- **Open Space and Landscaping**

- 6. Pedestrian Passageway**

Several respondents expressed concern about the size and design of the proposed “pedestrian passageway.” Generally, respondents encourage the applicant to add further biophilic design elements such as additional trees, living green walls, or water walls. Commenters also expressed concern about the “usability” and lack of natural light in the space, and for the applicant to confirm the size of the passageway. Moreover, respondents asked whether the passageway will replace Open Space #8 (as shown in the Sector Plan), and where the net open space be allocated within Block M.

Staff Response: Staff will continue to work with the applicant on refining the design of the Passageway to incorporate greater use of green or biophilic design elements. Under the current proposal, this Passageway is not proposed to replace the (mostly) adjacent future Open Space #8, but rather is being provided *in addition* to it. Only a small portion of Open Space #8, as shown in the Sector Plan, is within the subject site area, but that space is being provided with this site plan. The remainder of Open Space #8 would be achieved through future redevelopment, as shown in a Block Plan scenario. The proposed Passageway, while not shown in the Sector Plan, does not preclude future Open Space #8, and is therefore not inconsistent with the Sector Plan.

Applicant Response: The Applicant will give open space on the plaza in the future and is adding additional biophilic elements to the pedestrian pathway, to include more plantings and outdoor seating, which will weave together public spaces and natural resources and provide connectivity throughout the block that incorporates visual connections with nature and natural systems. Full implementation of Open Space #8 depends on future development on the block, however, the Applicant is providing a 7,200 square foot pedestrian passageway that does not currently exist and, in the future, can connect to the balance of the open space shown in the Sector Plan, including Open Space #8. The inclusion of the pedestrian passageway is not a replacement of Open Space #8. Open Space #8 is not located completely within the site area, and it is included in the future Block Plan scenario. Moreover, the ultimate condition that the Applicant proposes for Block M will provide significantly more open space than is currently called for in the Sector Plan, albeit not necessarily in the same way it is currently configured. The Applicant appreciates these comments from the community and will continue to work with staff to link parks and open space throughout Crystal City.

- **PDSP/Other**

- 7. Sustainability**

Several respondents expressed disappointment with the proposed LEED Silver certification and encouraged the applicant to further improve the sustainable design elements of the buildings. Respondents generally encouraged a higher LEED score, electric vehicle charging stations, greater energy efficiency, and improved biophilic design (such as green roof features).

*Staff Response:* Staff appreciates the feedback and recommendations on the proposed sustainable design elements. While participation in the Green Building Bonus Density program is voluntary, staff will continue to work with the applicant on improving the overall sustainability of the project.

*Applicant Response:* These buildings were designed and the project was filed prior to the adoption of the updated 2019 Community Energy Plan and the Applicant has made changes to achieve greater energy efficiency, such as: achieving 12% energy efficiency consistent with the 1900 Crystal Drive project and completing a Carbon Neutral analysis in order to help staff as they continue working with developers to advance the Community Energy Plan goals. Additionally, the Applicant is looking at potential EV capacity in the garage. The Applicant will continue to discuss with Green Building staff ways to enhance sustainable design elements of the buildings.

# SPRC Member Comments

## SPRC Comments: Building Design and Architecture

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-BD-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>I support the overhangs as an elegant solution to softening the curves in the street to better accommodate buses and preserve sidewalk width. I find it to be visually interesting.</p> <p>The architecture of both buildings is an improvement over what is there now (not hard to do). It is appropriate that the two buildings have different styles. The color palate is a good change from the all-to-common beige buildings. I support the ground level "saw tooth" for the west building entrance. The trees above the retail on the podium are very welcome. Will there be bird friendly glass above and below? The buildings' roofs are amenity space - can they also have green roof features?</p>
SPRC-BD-2	Elizabeth Gearin	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>Not clear the design as proposed provides for the necessary architectural feature (identity of place, point of interest, gateway) - again, the SPRC repeatedly requests guidance as to how to determine this. I appreciate the greater detail provided in this presentation. Does the oxidized copper tone wear off/ age well? Are there mature examples we can review?</p> <p>How will the mechanical space on the roof be designed and/ or landscaped to present as appealing a view as can be to residents whose view may include this roof? And, what is the viability of the proposed rooftop trees?</p> <p>Confirm this design uses bird-friendly glass.</p>
SPRC-BD-3	Jane Siegel	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>Architecture: "Beauty is due more to harmonious relationships among the elements of a composite than to the elements themselves." I have a hard time understanding the two elements, vertical and horizontal for the 2000 S Bell Building. These two elements are confused by the complex design for each; recommend simplification of the ornamentation -- so that the two major building masses make a clearer statement.</p>
SPRC-BD-4	Christer Ahl	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCRC)	<p>BUILDING SITING, MASSING AND ARCHITECTURE: these aspects should really be regarding in the context of their impact on streetscape and transportation; but viewed in their own right, the two buildings fail to Impress favorably, especially in the context of the many attractive new buildings in Crystal City and Pentagon City in recent time; the 2001 building is more traditional and has some interesting features; the 2000 building will be the first one of what could become a series of nine major buildings lining Route 1 from 23rd to 15th Street. One would then hope for a true landmark building, but is being proposed seems to more of combination of many quirky concepts and designs into one building. The relationship between podium and building also removes any hope for a 'human scale' experience.</p> <p>Going back to the impact of siting and massing, it is absolutely flabbergasting to see that not just the applicant, but also staff through the mere mention of the idea in its documents, would ever entertain the acceptance of a deviation from an objective and fundamental Sector Plan requirement, such as the tower separation, on the grounds of a faint hope that the deviation just might disappear 20-30 years from now!!! Is this approach to allowing applicants to meet formal requirements becoming a new countywide policy?</p>

SPRC-BD-5	Pamela Van Hine	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PAC)	<p>Architecture issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential entrances: Each building has only one residential entrance, although the East Tower appears to have an exit as well. Entrances for both towers are mid-block on the new block of Bell. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This is not a convenient location for residents who will want to walk to the METRO, down 20th to restaurants, movie theaters, or grocery store on Crystal Drive, or run to the Crystal City Connector or Long Bridge Park.</li> <li>o The mid-block of Bell is also a dangerous location for PUDO for both Towers, whether it's dropping off people, meals, groceries, or packages. Bell will be a busy street, with buses, cars, trucks, bikes, and pedestrians competing for space. PUDO drivers will need multiple, safe, convenient designated locations that will not impede traffic, including cyclists and pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Tower Separation: The CCSP requires a minimum of 60' horizontal separation between building towers above the 5th floor (B6, p. 28), but slide 9 of Arch 2 shows a separation of only 49'3" between the East Tower and Crystal Plaza (whose address is not 1901 S. Bell, as indicated on the slide).</li> <li>• I am not an architect and I do not usually weigh in on developers' proposed building designs. However, I have strong reactions to the proposed building designs that I want to share. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o East Tower: I like and support the overall design for the East Tower, although it is too close to the existing Crystal Plaza building (see above), and I wish it had a residential entry along 20th. I think the design for the East Tower reduces the impression of its bulk, the color pallet is appealing, and some of the details, such as the cantilevered corner and balconies on the corners are a nice touch.</li> <li>o West Tower: I do not like or support the design the West Tower. I find it unattractive, ungainly, and uninspiring – and that its bulk is not reduced by the design. I accept that it can be 250' tall, per the CCSP, and I understand that the plot is an awkward shape and that the land slopes a bit to the east. Please rethink the design; I think we can do much better for this highly visible site. Please also consider adding more residential building entrances – on Route 1 and/or 20th, so residents can use the crosswalk at 20th and Route 1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
SPRC-BD-6	Ben D'Avanzo	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Aurora Highlands Civic Association)	<p>Tower Separation</p> <p>The staff report notes that the east tower is less than the required 60 feet from Crystal Plaza apartments and that an exception may be made in the presumption of future development on the Crystal Plaza site. However, the owner of that site has made clear that development is expected any time soon (which I'll add, is something I see as positive, given Crystal Plaza's potential for market rate affordable housing down the road). In the SPRCs, I would like to hear what the day to day privacy and shade implications of the narrower gap will be for residents.</p> <p>Architecture and Design.</p> <p>The east tower's proposed architectural feature, proposed for compliance with the sector plan, appears fairly minimal in nature. There appears to be a trend of sites in the area requiring an architectural feature that, when proposed, appears fairly indistinct from the rest of the building.</p>

## SPRC Comments: Underground

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-U-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	I have no problem with rerouting the Underground but continue to be concerned about the design. The renderings of the enclosed passage option is not acceptable as designed. It reads as a narrow rabbit warren and would not feel safe or pleasant to walk. The unenclosed option is just a walk through a garage that is not climate controlled. If kept so narrow, the enclosed option could be improved by it being lined by windows on the garage side. While not an ideal design, it would at least feel safer (more potential eyes on the passage) and would be climate controlled.
SPRC-U-2	Jane Siegel	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	4) underground: comment: I am happy to see that nothing has been foreclosed regarding the Underground as a general matter; If the enclosed tunnel design is chosen, windows should be provided to eliminate a claustrophobic feel. 5) I like the underground surfacing at an above ground plaza at 20th Street: please indicate whether this area counts as community benefit.
SPRC-U-3	Christer Ahl	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCRC)	For many in the community this is a 'sacred cow' from the days when a north-south walk along Crystal Drive had nothing to offer; during the Sector Plan process, I fought and wrote on behalf of the community, using all the arguments in favor of retaining an uninterrupted interior passage; however, I am therefore also very conscious of the reality that the Sector Plan explicitly provides an 'escape clause' precisely for the current situation where an existing building in the path of the interior walkway. In fact, it was/is clear to me that the County and the then major landowner would never have agreed to support the continued existence of the Underground in the absence of such a clause. So at this point, I am simply pleased that, beyond formal requirements, the applicant has collaborated with the Civic Association to develop a 'hybrid path; which keeps the pedestrians in the interior.
SPRC-U-4	Pamela Van Hine	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PAC)	<p>The Underground, the pedestrian passageway, and missing trees:</p> <p>The initial Block M proposal changes would have forced pedestrians to give up rare places to roam without conflict with drivers, cyclists, and micromobiles riders, and would have created gaps in the continuous North-South pedestrian connectivity from 12th St to 23rd St. – both above ground and through the Underground. And the “continuous pedestrian connection extending from 12th Street to 23rd Street” of the Underground is supported in the CCSP (3.7.6, T6, etc.) I wrote comments about the potential impact of these changes and the value of the current spaces in my LRPC meeting comments:  <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1G4VMnUaR4Nu-oWgc0W0AAx4NzSpKK7LgmMEft1tJaY4/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1G4VMnUaR4Nu-oWgc0W0AAx4NzSpKK7LgmMEft1tJaY4/edit?usp=sharing</a></p> <p>Evolving JBG Plans for the Underground through Block M            Because the alternative above ground NS route will be totally gone with new development, the value of keeping the remaining NS Underground passage becomes even more critical for pedestrian safety and convenience while traveling through Crystal City. But the JBG plans presented at the second LRPC meeting, which combined a park plaza with an outside pedestrian passage to connect to the Underground, did not meet the needs of either pedestrians using the Underground or park visitors. Fortunately, JBGS proposed yet another revision of Underground plans in preparation for the SPRC meetings for the project. The good news is that continuous connectivity through the Underground has been preserved in the new version of the plan, albeit with stairs/elevator to make the connection between the main NS Underground section on Block M and the ES section under the East Tower on a different level.</p> <p>The revised plans are a vast improvement over prior versions, and I support them overall. I have specific remaining concerns, suggestions, and several questions however:</p>

			<p>Passageway on G1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the width of the passageway, and does it vary along its length?</li> <li>• What is the slope between B2 and C2, and why is there a slope here?</li> <li>• Can JBGS continue to try to develop a creative barrier between pedestrians and the vehicular traffic in the garage on G1?</li> <li>• Can you update the compiled 4.1 Arch 1 plans (slide 2 shows an older version of ped passage on G1)</li> </ul> <p>Passageway on G2: Continue to explore how to widen tunnel, but removing walls is NOT desirable.</p> <p>General suggestions and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use art creatively on walls on both G1 and G2 levels, as has been done in the rest of the Underground. The art can make a drab walk interesting and enticing, especially using the prize-winning photographs.</li> <li>• Keep the entire route well-lit.</li> <li>• Don't forget wayfinding signage.</li> <li>• How can building residents access this space?</li> <li>• Can pedestrians on the passage access the general garage space and/or building?</li> <li>• How does the Underground now connect to the above ground pedestrian passageway?</li> <li>• Will the existing Crystal City Underground entrance on 20th remain?</li> </ul>
SPRC-U-5	Ben D'Avanzo	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Aurora Highlands Civic Association)	<p>I appreciate that the current proposal maintains the continuous indoor passageway from 23rd St to the Crystal City Metro. This is an important community amenity that I greatly valued during the years I lived in the Buchanan. I will note that the plan does degrade the current, if unappealing, passageway between the Crystal City Shops and the tunnel under 20th St, adding additional stairways and narrow passages. It is, however, an improvement over the plan submitted to the Long Range Planning Committee.</p> <p>I encourage the applicant to consider the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Installation of a blue-light system for emergencies here and throughout the whole Underground</li> <li>-Evaluate whether the pedestrian passageway along the G1 level can be turned into a ramp down to the G2 level, rather than ending in a stairway/elevator to that level. While this may necessitate an additional level of stairway up to the pedestrian plaza, having a ramp down to the G2 level to continue to the passageway overall could improve the pedestrian experience in the Underground if the grade change would allow it by eliminating one set of stairs for those choosing to utilize the internal route.</li> <li>-As mentioned in the applicant's presentation, expand the width of the tunnel as much as possible.</li> <li>-Utilize light, art, color, and flooring to make the experience as pleasant and as interesting as possible. Consider a unique opportunity for improving commuter's daily commute.</li> <li>-Include wayfinding, including signs and landmarks, along the pathway.</li> </ul> <p>I also wish to note that the applicant asks for the minimum parking ratio allowed by the county on this site, at 0.3. The Underground will be a major route for residents of these buildings to access the Metro. If the experience of using this portion of the Underground is unpleasant, feels unsafe or is difficult, residents may be more likely to use cars.</p>
SPRC-U-6	Christopher Wimbush	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Crystal City Civic Association)	<p>Finally, we reiterate the importance of maintaining Underground connectivity from 12th to 23rd Streets. Although we would prefer to keep this connectivity without traveling through an open garage, we appreciate JBG Smith's effort to adjust its original plans. As a result, we acknowledge JBG Smith's "hybrid proposal" for a new tunnel passageway from the Crystal City Shops to a G2 corridor, elevator to the G1 level, and a passageway through the garage to the connecting 20th Street tunnel, as a possible solution. However, we strongly suggest the following. First, the G1 Passageway through the garage should be as light and pleasant as possible, potentially through a guardrail extended by a glass wall to enclose the passageway. Second, we suggest the G2 corridor be wider than 6 feet and as attractive to pedestrians as the existing tunnel is. Third, we encourage JBG Smith to</p>

			<p>conduct additional outreach to surrounding buildings that use the current passageway to get to the Metro (e.g., Crystal Plaza, The Buchanan, Deloitte, etc.) if they have not yet done so. Finally, we support JBG Smith’s commitment to the CCCA to propose a holistic approach to revitalizing the entire Underground. We are looking forward to meeting with the community in the next few months to provide additional feedback on several suggestions that have already been made.</p> <p>The CCCA appreciates County Staff and JBG Smith’s efforts to respond to the community’s aspirations for Crystal City and site-specific concerns and questions regarding individual private development within the neighborhood. We look forward to engaging in the SPRC process going forward.</p>
--	--	--	--

## SPRC Comments: Transportation

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-T-1	Jane Siegel	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>2) The parking ratio for the two buildings is impressive: .3 and a request for modification exists here, but doesn't this modification correspond to the recommendations of the residential parking study? hence what is the need for request for modification 3) Parking: please provide additional exhibits showing existing parking for block M and proposed modification so community can understand comprehensively what is happening to these spaces deployed underground. This area CC and PC--22202-- will be experiencing additional population, employment in the next three to five years, and there are as yet unforeseen but potentially valuable uses to which this space may be put.</p>
SPRC-T-2	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The idea of this new street is to have an alternative north-south alternative to Crystal Drive. It needs two way bike facilities. All the more so given the failure of the Crystal Drive bike lane that are almost always blocked by double parked cars and delivery vehicles.
SPRC-T-3	Christer Ahl	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCRC)	STREETSCAPE, TRANSPORTATION AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS: a mere ten years after its implementation, the Sector Plan is already coming up against more modern and enlightened County practices regarding safe provisions for biking and pedestrian traffic. Clearly the conclusion should then generally be that the modern practices override the outdated ones, rather than having the Sector Plan provisions remain ‘gospel’. Also, there is no excuse for the tolerance of a 72ft build-to-line, given how much this forces a sub-optimization and totally unnecessary hazards for pedestrians and bikers.
SPRC-T-4	Pamela Van Hine	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PAC)	<p>Build-To Lines: I concur and support Transportation Commissioner Buck’s comments on this proposal, especially on the inadequacy of the proposed build-to lines and how to use and interpret CCSP guidelines. The CCSP clearly shows an 80’ build-to line for Bell (Fig. 3.5.3, p. 47). 72’ is not acceptable. To save space, I will not repeat his comments here.</p> <p>Pedestrian Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crosswalks: Desire lines across 20th and across Bell are not met: The plans for 20th &amp; Bell show crosswalks only on the east and south sides, not north and west sides. We need crosswalks on ALL sides, especially for residents of the West Tower. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The METRO escalator entrance is on the west side of Bell. Residents of the West Tower will want to cross 18th on west side and then continue on the west side of Bell all the way to their building entrance. To make them cross Bell TWICE to reach their building is not right. Pedestrians will just cross Bell and 20th illegally, as they do now.</li> <li>o The block of Bell between 20th and 18th has only ONE EW crosswalk, at 18th, for two long blocks!</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<p>Currently many pedestrians randomly cross Bell throughout the block, especially as they approach the Marriott end. Since the new intersection of Bell and 20th will be signalized, why not add the other crosswalks to increase safety and convenience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian ramps are not aligned with crosswalks - anywhere - on the plans.</li> <li>• Sidewalk Widths around both Towers: I am resubmitting my recommendation from my LRPC comments in August (with slight edits):</li> <li>• That all clear zones, café zones/shy zones, landscaping/furnishing/utility zones be clearly defined and be in accordance with the CMMTS guidance (Table 5.1)</li> <li>• That the developer plan NOW for adequate anticipated café zone space that allows for more outside dining and social distancing space. This space needs to be totally separate from the clear zone. Please consider inverted café zones to expand options for outdoor dining that do not conflict with pedestrians in the clear zone.</li> <li>• Please remove the multiple illustrations of the new block of Bell as a café zone that spans the entire street and block. Bell is a street that will have major traffic of all kinds on it, including buses and other large, heavy vehicles. It is NOT a café zone.</li> </ul>
SPRC-T-5	Ben D'Avanzo	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Aurora Highlands Civic Association)	<p>My name is Ben D'Avanzo and I am the representative for the Aurora Highlands Civic Association on this Site Plan Review Committee. I am also a former resident of the Buchanan and am intimately familiar with the site area, having passed through it daily on my commute at that time. In general, I echo the comments of Darren Buck, Pam Van Hine and the Crystal City Civic Association. In particular, I echo their concerns about the adequacy and design of pedestrian and bike facilities on this site and the poor precedent they create for future sites, as well as concern about a lack of clarity for when the Sector Plan should or should not be adhered to.</p> <p>Parking and Loading While I understand the angled loading in the west tower is needed to achieve goals in the street cross-section, it also creates a very large curb-cut. This is reminiscent of the design on the 13th St side of the Bartlette, which is an unpleasant pedestrian experience. I would point to the Witmer's success in reducing the curb cut for its loading space. Can something similar be achieved here?</p> <p>I also wish to note that it appears there is only one underground parking entrance for the two buildings, off the alleyway south of the east tower. Assuming that it's placement does not create traffic problems, I appreciate the single entrance, which does serve to reduce curb cuts.</p>
SPRC-T-6	Darren Buck	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (TC)	<p>I am prefacing these comments to let you know that, unless substantial and collaborative revisions are made to public space plans for the new Clark/Bell Street during the upcoming SPRC process, I will ask my colleagues on the Transportation Commission to vote against recommending approval of this site plan by the County Board, for the reasons described herein.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed revision of the build-to line from 80' to 72' shown in the initial Block M documents continues to appear in this site plan without justification. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I do not recall a consensus from the LRPC meetings that revising the build-to line to 72' was appropriate. The LRPC consideration of the substantial revisions to the Block M plan seemed intended to reach consensus around critical elements of any block plan, including build-to lines, such that the Block M projects could proceed to site plan review having resolved issues with block-wide implications. Having reviewed by own correspondence and the presentation materials, I see no evidence of such consensus.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Further, the LRPC discussion of the Block M plan explicitly excluded detailed discussion of specific streetscape elements. However, the shortcomings of the streetscape proposed in this</p>

			<p>site plan are almost entirely a product of the 72' build-to line, where again, I do not believe that any resolution was reached. I raised general concerns about several transportation-related concerns associated with the 72' build-to in a September 15th email to DES staff and the LRPC chair after the LRPC meeting, and my questions and concerns related to bicycling and walking facilities were never subsequently addressed.</p> <p>b. I do not understand why County Staff do not object to the build-to line revision as a prima facie violation of this requirement of the CCSP. Please recall that staff and this applicant relied upon build-to lines shown in the CCSP in rejecting any alteration of the 1900 Crystal Drive project in order to provide enhanced adjacent public right-of-way on 18th Street S during its SPRC meetings.</p> <p>c. I do not see in the submission or recall hearing why this substantial deviation from the Crystal City Sector Plan (CCSP) was sought by the applicant. Given the amount of excess density sought, I am left assume that the County is being asked to fully privatize an 8' by 150' area of promised new public easement and improved public realm simply to increase the return on investment by providing a larger, penalty-free building footprint for adding density.</p> <p>d. I believe that relieving this applicant of the 80' build-to resembles unjust enrichment. The applicant seeks to have this project folded into the area-wide PDSP contribution scheme to compensate for FAR over the CO-Crystal City maximum. I vividly recall that the Staff-determined "benefits" were a source of significant community controversy, particularly around the transportation aspects, and that no alterations to that portion of contribution were ever seriously considered by staff. If I am interpreting the relationship between reduction of public space, excess density, and the PDSP proffers correctly, here is how I would summarize this situation:</p> <p>This project will provide smaller and thereby degraded public easement, due to the larger-than-planned footprint that provides a base to build more gross floor area, while complying with other dimensional criteria (such as building heights and bulk plane angles). If approved, this project would provide this narrower public easement without any penalty or consideration. The community will only be paid back for the resultant density over and above CO-Crystal City residential zoning maximum FAR (4.8) in a way that transfers that payback from something we want and were promised in the CCSP (a better, more flexible 80' public easement for transportation) located directly on site, to some as-yet-unknown component of a PDSP benefits package, where the public's perception of the value of that compensation will not be substantially considered by staff in making their recommendations.</p> <p>Please correct me if I am misrepresenting anything in the above.</p> <p>2. The revision of this build-to line from 80' down to 72' makes it nearly impossible to correct the antiquated bicycle planning practice that informed the CCSP.</p> <p>a. Staff and applicant have not considered how to apply 2019's revision of the Bike Element of the Master Transportation Plan to Clark/Bell Street in general, or this segment in particular. The Crystal City Bike Plan directed by the County Board in March 2020 would hopefully have</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>resolved the conflict between the contents of the ten-year-old sector plan, and the 1.5-year-old Bike Element. Despite the Board’s direction that outreach on initial concepts begin by December 31, 2020, no public outreach has been done for this plan to date. So, a third Crystal City site plan since March is now beginning, and like those before it, defaults to the out-of-date bicycle facility guidance from the 2010-vintage CCSP. But this site plan proposes a constrained build-to clear zone that would prevent us from ever correcting the out-of-date CCSP bicycling facilities.</p> <p>As background, the Bike Element included the entire Clark/Bell/Long Bridge corridor as a “Primary Bicycling Corridor.” Primary Bicycling Corridors are major routes identified by public outreach conducted for the Bike Element as “the most frequently used, or desired, bicycling routes within and across Arlington County.” (p. 31) They aim to connect across neighborhoods, and play a similar role as arterials do in the street network hierarchy. The Bike Element places an emphasis on planning and designing Primary Bicycling Corridors to feel safe and comfortable for riders of all ages and abilities. The Bike Element also highlights the significant role that County staff, developers, and corridor-level planning have to play in realizing the ambitious plans.</p> <p>The Bike Element provides contextual guidance on what type of bicycling facility is needed to feel safe for riders of all ages and abilities, given what type of street it will be located along. For most arterial streets in Arlington, a protected bike lane is indicated. Providing protection for only northbound riders (as proposed in this site plan), and thus accommodating all ages and abilities in only one direction, is far out of date with contemporary bicycle planning practice, and fails any reasonable interpretation of a “Primary Bicycling Corridor.” It is like building the Beltway’s Outer Loop without the Inner Loop. We are also ignoring the demonstrated willingness of riders to travel the wrong way in a protected facility when their own direction of travel is not protected from drivers, as demonstrated by the 15th St NW Cycletrack in DC in 2010.</p> <p>Notably, the County project that will build new protected bicycle facilities on S Clark St, between 12th and 18th Streets, provides two-way travel for riders of all ages and abilities. This project accepts the simple intuition that people on bicycles may wish to ride in equal comfort in the same two directions as drivers on that section of street, rather than searching for and deviating to safely travel in the opposite direction on an adjacent street.</p> <p>[Image] Concept plan previously posted on DES project page for 15th Street/Clark/Bell Realignment <a href="https://projects.arlingtonva.us/projects/15th-street-clark-bell-street-realignment/">https://projects.arlingtonva.us/projects/15th-street-clark-bell-street-realignment/</a></p> <p>The proposed County concept design shown above is a desirable and logical enhancement over the outdated bicycle facilities described for the corridor in the 2010 CCSP, is consistent with the evolution in bicycle planning generally in the past 10 years, and is in accord with the County’s own Master Transportation Plan. It is a wasted opportunity if the remainder of Clark/Bell does not also provide safe and comfortable facilities for riders of all ages and abilities in both directions where it is possible (and it is possible on this SPRC site, through the long-term alignment of Block M, and the entire length of Clark/Bell).</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>The shortcomings of the CCSP plan and applicant’s proposed bicycle facility are accentuated by the fact that new two-way connectivity is simultaneously being provided for drivers on this segment of Clark/Bell, and Block M. We are repeating the mistakes of Crystal City’s planning past (where one-way streets for motor vehicles were a substantial barrier to access), except for the mode that is cleaner, cheaper, healthier, and whose users are far more sensitive and exposed when taken out of direction.</p> <p>The consequence of failing to provide bidirectional protected facilities for riders on Clark/Bell means that no single north-south street in Crystal City will likely ever allow riders of all-ages-and-abilities to travel in both directions south of 18th Street S. VDOT’s design concept for Route 1 Multimodal study does not include any bicycle facilities (unlike the National Landing BID’s proposed concepts for the revised Route 1 ), while DES staff has already gone on record to state that they do not believe that protected facilities are possible in both directions on Crystal Drive (for the record, I disagree with their assumptions).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The applicant is proposing roughly the minimum of the various CCSP specifications for off-street pedestrian space. This is noted without judgment in the staff report. The residents of Crystal Plaza, who are unlikely to enjoy continuous maintenance of a safe, direct, and accessible walking route to the Metro station throughout construction, should expect an honest attempt to attain more than the minimum plan-contemplated permanent pedestrian facilities when the dust clears.</li> <li>c. The applicant’s Clark/Bell plans are unclear on how pickup and dropoff (PUDO) will operate. The applicant’s plans show a small stepout/door-swing zone between the street and landscape pits. This streetscape element is noted in the CCSP as a strictly optional treatment (as it should be). Its inclusion here implies that the applicant and staff are planning flexibility into the streetscape to allow for possible curbside street parking or PUDO. However, the southbound curbside lane is presumably still intended for transit-exclusive use in the long-term alignment, and a protected bike is shown along the northbound curb. With both residential entrances located on Clark/Bell, it appears that the applicant is assuming that PUDO will be happening in the future bus lane and the protected bike lane. An 80’ build-to would enable flexibility in the street to properly incorporate parking or PUDO space if needed, but is unlikely in the 72’ scenario without removing the bus lane or single protected bicycle lane (assuming, of course, that the new bidirectional car travel is considered sacrosanct for applicant and staff).</li> <li>d. Crystal City SPRCs rarely iterate adjacent walking and bicycling facilities. If/when the parties are prepared to revise plans for Clark/Bell Street, I am happy to provide suggestions for implementable cross-sections for walking and bicycling facilities that better conform to County transportation plans for either build-to dimension. Walking and biking facilities adjacent to recent developments in North Arlington (such as the Ames Center in Rosslyn, and the Landmark block in Courthouse) are discussed in SPRCs there, and have resulted in design iterations that deliver better public spaces. Additionally, the applicant has plainly put some effort into refining their design for the Underground, in an attempt to improve that aspect in response to community feedback. Why do we so rarely get that collaboration for South Arlington walking and bicycling facilities adjacent to new development?</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

3. It is unclear if or how this proposed 72' build-to line will be a limited deviation from the CCSP for this single project only.
  - a. Is this a de facto modification of the entire Block M plan? Or the entire Clark/Bell corridor? Regardless of intent, allowing 72' for this site will be used in future projects by this and other developers as precedent and license to design for a 72' build-to line for the entire Clark/Bell corridor. Besides the immediate problems with narrowing the build-to dimensions in this block, it is irresponsible to modify plans for an entire block, or provide precedent for the entire corridor, where we have been provided no basis for it as stated in my first point, and where the transportation shortcomings stated in my second point would set the form for the remainder of the Clark/Bell corridor, based solely on the request from this single project team, and without a public process that would accompany such a change if the County was altering a long-term roadway plan outside of the development review process. This is entirely at odds with the stated intent of the Crystal City Block Plan process described in the 4.1 Administrative Regulation, which strives to ensure in part that, "Proposed new buildings do not preclude the future planned, nearby improvements."

Conclusion

This is a 100% new street segment. We should be taking full advantage of the rare opportunity to build a street segment entirely from scratch that is a showcase for how comfortable, safe, and attractive every street would ideally be for all users. Instead, the applicant proposes compromising it from the beginning, with no explanation, and no clarity on how that impacts long-term options for the remainder of the corridor. Staff, meanwhile, appears to be putting the burden on the community to stand up to the applicant to enforce compliance with a foundational component of the sector plan, and to perform the bicycle planning tasks assigned to staff in April 2019 by the Master Transportation Plan.

I personally want to see substantial added density, particularly residential, particularly in such close proximity to Metro and straddling the Metroway. However, providing that density at the sole expense of the non-automotive components of the streetscape is a perverse way to develop our community in general, and this site in particular. I sincerely hope that the applicant team, staff, and County Board find ways to make up that density (and more) without diminishing the promised public right-of-way in the manner proposed. This zero-sum battle between more housing and high-quality non-auto transportation networks that all of our land use plans and processes seem to result in needs to change.

Finally, the role of the Crystal City Sector Plan must be addressed. The issues described with this submittal, the neglect of active transportation concerns in prior South Arlington SPRCs, and the ongoing Route 1 at-grade study have shown a disturbing pattern: The strict terms of the CCSP are used to justify refusing or ignoring minor deviations from the plan sought by members of the public (particularly in regards to nonmotorized transportation), while substantial deviations are advanced when they originate from an applicant. Here, an 80' build-to can be used to better meet transportation goals if staff would rethink cross-sections from a 10-year-old plan to better align with our contemporary Master Transportation Plan. But instead, because the applicant proposes that we receive a minimal version of the streetscape shown in that 10-year-old sector plan, while allowing them to privatize more public space, that is the proposal that we are forced to consider. The outcome of this proposal may then control what ultimately gets built on the entire extent of Clark/Bell Street. Is this why we plan?

## SPRC Comments: Open Space and Landscaping

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-OS-1	James Lantelme	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The proposed open space on the east end of the site is welcome but could also be improved. More biophilic features are the way to go.
SPRC-OS-2	Elizabeth Gearin	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	The open space pathway is underwhelming and feels disappointing. Is it a path or an open space? Not sure how useable this is. Please share alternate visuals or otherwise describe how this will feel to the pedestrian.
SPRC-OS-3	Colt Gregory	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PRC)	<p>The opportunities for green space are in Block M are rare and precious. Park #8 in the Sector plan has 9,700 sf that is part of that limited space and opportunity. It is important to remind ourselves this project will change the proposed location of that space but should not reduce the overall sector plan requirement or public need for it within planning Block. Moving forward with the JBG redesign removes 9,700 square feet of open green space and substitutes 5,200 sf of privately-owned public space for a pedestrian passageway. The original 9,700 feet must be reclaimed in future design efforts in Block M.</p> <p>The design for this location should be more than an a passageway. It is an opportunity for a small linear park that should result in a pleasant walk for our pedestrians and a relaxing open space for County residents and visitors. Seating should be available as pedestrian rest spots and support outdoor 'bag' lunches. The area space should be accessible to all and provide the healthful well documented benefits of biophilic design that brings nature to the space. Permeable surfaces with native trees, shrubs and grasses that support our pollinators and natural ecosystem should be incorporated. Sound reduction elements like green walls should be considered to make it a pleasant and navigable space. The current proposal is limited in scope and vision. We look forward to seeing the various design options that move the concept from a passageway to a pleasant green linear park in Crystal City.</p>
SPRC-OS-4	Christer Ahl	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCRC)	Of many aspects which give reasons for objections, open space is the most obvious ones; this was already discussed in the LRPC; the Sector Plan has two glaring weakness; first, as recognized by the County at the time, the aggregate open space is quite inadequate and, second, each applicant so far has refused the follow the resulting County Board exhortation that "for each site every effort should be made to offer more than the absolute minimum"; this Site Plan, part of a huge block, is now realistically the final chance to remedy the situation, but the applicant instead insists on maximizing footprint and density; a small outdoor corridor is cynically all that is being offered; this is intolerable! There should be a meaningful open space added and a 'condition' should be placed on the future development of the WeWork site.
SPRC-OS-5	Pamela Van Hine	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PAC)	<p>Opportunity to remake the pedestrian passageway into a green park</p> <p>With the revised plans, the pedestrian passageway will no longer need to serve two conflicting purposes: as a substitute for a section of the Underground and as an open space. Now pedestrians traveling through the Underground will not need to pass through this open space, leaving more room for an actual park.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please use this opportunity to redesign this space to serve as a real, green pocket or linear park, perhaps modeled after Paley Park in Manhattan <a href="https://www.pps.org/places/paley-park">https://www.pps.org/places/paley-park</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More on well-designed pocket parks is here: <a href="http://depts.washington.edu/open2100/Resources/2_OpenSpaceTypes/Open_Space_Types/pocket_parks.pdf">http://depts.washington.edu/open2100/Resources/2_OpenSpaceTypes/Open_Space_Types/pocket_parks.pdf</a></li> <li>• Well- designed pocket parks often use the walls that surround them as key elements - cascading fountains, green walls, interesting art.</li> <li>• These parks minimize the "clutter" at the ground level - seating is often smaller and flexible, trees are smaller and fewer - so that the space can be used as a quiet refuge, for lunchtime gatherings, or for small special events – even pop-up cafes and retail.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrians still need to be able to walk through it comfortably</li> <li>• Alternatively, I also support the park recommendations of Ben D’Avanzo, the AHCA representative.</li> </ul> <p>Some questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the existing large “planter” against 220 S 20th be removed or at least redesigned?</li> <li>• What is the connection between the pedestrian passageway park and the proposed alley on the south side of the East Tower – and can any connecting space here be used to enhance the park (e.g. trees, green walls, water feature, seating)</li> <li>• Can green walls and a water wall be added in this space on the east side?</li> <li>• Can more trees be added, while still providing sufficient flexible space?</li> <li>• Would the County or JBGS design the space and would there be a public design process?</li> <li>• Where will JBGS build the remaining 2500 sf minimum of green space required for Park 8 in the CCSP?</li> </ul> <p>Trees</p> <p>In addition to losing an above ground north-south walking route across Block M, pedestrians will also lose the beautiful above ground park-like spaces with the redevelopment – and apparently most of the trees that have thrived there. Slide 9 of the Landscape and Renderings PDF for the project shows both the 19 trees on top of the retail section of the West Tower and the JBGS calculations for tree replacement for the project. The Tree Canopy Summary indicates that 91 trees need to be replaced, but that only 57 are being replaced: 17-19 of them are above the retail level on the West Tower, and most of the rest appear to be planted above the garage in tree pits along the streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include illustrations that show the actual impact of planned street trees along 20th with the tight row of trees above them, on the retail overhanging roof of the West Tower.</li> <li>• How will the trees thrive in the proposed environment?</li> <li>• Where will the missing 34 trees be planted? Perhaps some can be added to the park described above.</li> </ul>
SPRC-OS-6	Ben D’Avanzo	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Aurora Highlands Civic Association)	<p>Pedestrian Plaza</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Considering the plaza does not have any major retail or residential entrances, it appears to be struggling for a reason to exist Again, it requires changing grade to continue the pedestrian experience if one chooses that route through the Underground. Instead, I propose making the entirety of the plaza a connection to the upper level future park, combining the two into one park, to create the one identified in the Sector Plan.</li> <li>-For example, instead of connecting to the upper level in one stairway, considering a concept of a longer ramping pathway that incorporates trees and greenery in a winding concept, up to the park 8 site and down to the shops. This could incorporate or replace the planters on the east side of the project, which appears to make the plaza narrow.</li> <li>-Considering swapping the residential amenity space and retail space in the east tower, so that there is a retailer, such as a cafe, on the plaza itself, to activate the space</li> <li>-Consider a major water feature on the south end of the plaza, such as a waterfall connecting it thematically with the Crystal City Water Park.</li> </ul> <p>I am confused by the relationship between the Plaza and 220 20th St. The renderings make it appear that there is a blank wall, with new seating and tree planters, along this building, but in fact there is an entrance to the existing building at these points. Are the existing trees and greenery being eliminated or retained? If so, are the trees included in the cost tree counts in the report? In future renderings, please include a portrayal of how the Plaza will intersect with 220 20th St.</p> <p>Trees</p> <p>This site would eliminate 91 trees but only replace 57 of them. How does the applicant propose to make up this</p>

			<p>difference? Park 8 provides this potential, making its non-inclusion in this plan difficult.</p> <p>Some of the trees proposed to be made up for are not accessible to pedestrians, but instead are on the podium of the west tower. Can there be clarification as to whether sufficient soil depth is being provided for these trees to allow them to flourish? And how will they be irrigated? Given they are northern facing, they may face difficult circumstances in achieving sufficient sunlight.</p> <p>Similarly, is enough soil available to those trees being planted on the planters that end up situated above the garage?</p>
SPRC-OS-7	Christopher Wimbush	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Crystal City Civic Association)	<p>The Executive Committee of the Crystal City Civic Association (CCCA) provides the following comments at this stage of the public engagement process related to Arlington County’s consideration of JBG Smith’s proposed redevelopment of an existing office building into two (2) residential towers with ground-floor retail at a 2.4-acre (104,404 sq. ft.) site – located at 2001 S. Clark St. in the CCCA neighborhood. We respectfully reserve the opportunity to raise additional issues during expected meetings of the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) and in response to the development of JBG Smith’s plans.</p> <p>As an initial matter, the Executive Committee notes that the Long-Range Planning Committee (LRPC) and the SPRC processes are vital mechanisms for community engagement. Because of the importance of these two processes and the value they add to ensuring that development in Crystal City is consistent with the Crystal City Sector Plan (Sector Plan), we believe the LRPC process utilized for this development failed to meaningfully address long-range planning issues implicated by the proposed site plan, like open space, as intended by the Planning Commission’s bylaws (“[t]he LRPC shall advise the Commission on matters coming before the Commission related to land use, urban design, long-range plans, the Comprehensive Plan, and the General Land Use Plan”). As a result, important questions regarding the availability of open space in Crystal City will not be addressed holistically by the County. The site plan’s extraordinary breadth – involving multiple owners, acreage, and anticipated future development – compounds this issue. The Planning Commission’s decisions and those ultimately of the County Board will shape Crystal City development for decades to come.</p> <p>Next, we believe the Pedestrian Passageway from 20th Street to the Crystal City Shops contemplated by JBG Smith’s site plans is inconsistent with the Crystal City Sector Plan, which calls for a “[p]ark with trees, gardens and benches along a path connecting the park to Crystal Drive.” We recognize that developers require flexibility in the design, placement, and composition of open space they are responsible for developing.</p> <p>However, any design should be consistent with the Sector Plan’s requirements; the current plans for Open Space #8 are not. Instead, as currently proposed, Open Space #8 is a pedestrian plaza rather than a park, as it is a hardscape. The proposed space also encompasses less square footage than contemplated by the Sector Plan (7,200 v. 9,700). Moreover, without the benefit of a shadow study for space, and based on our review of the plans, it appears from its location, the area will be in the shade most of the time. Rather than proposing a thoughtful and inviting space, it instead seems that this space is an afterthought.</p> <p>As an improvement to the proposed Open Space #8, we urge the consideration of installing an alternative park along the length of 20th Street or South Bell Street, an expansion of park space on 23rd Street or making the proposed interim park #11 on 23rd Street permanent. As a final alternative, the County Board could require that any future development of Crystal Plaza include increased open space (though we note this could be 20 years from now or more) as contemplated by the Sector Plan. Lastly, the timing for the availability of the proposed open space is unclear. We would appreciate additional detail on how the build-out for both interim and permanent open space will be phased on the site.</p>

## SPRC Comments: PDSP/Other

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Comments
SPRC-PDSP-1	Elizabeth Gearin	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>Why is the applicant only planning for LEED silver (or 'at a minimum, LEED silver')? Our (admittedly) recent standards require a higher level of LEED; additionally the SPRC has consistently expressed frustration with this. Please say more about the proposed report to consider carbon analysis versus economic tradeoffs of taking a building to carbon neutral - what is the timing and scope of this? Who will conduct the research and share in its review?</p> <p>What is the current discussion about meeting affordable housing requirements? Of 750+ units, and with strong community support, seems reasonable to push for at least some of these onsite, representing a unit mix.</p> <p>What are the expected benefits/ amenities?</p>
SPRC-PDSP-2	Jane Siegel	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (PC)	<p>1) Addition to CC PDSP: what elements are under consideration for additional community benefits: the underground? open space? other? Please provide a list, prioritized if at all possible.</p>
SPRC-PDSP-3	Christer Ahl	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (CCCRC)	<p>COMMUNITY BENEFITS: in recent time, the community has had to observe that virtually all other claims for high-priority benefits have been overridden by the demand for resources related to affordable housing; there is great apprehension about the potential for a repetition also for this Site Plan; however, in light of 'recent events' (e.g., Crystal Houses), the County is now urged finally to allow the opportunity to have other urgent priorities being given serious consideration in the context of the SPRC dialogue.</p>
SPRC-PDSP-4	Ben D'Avanzo	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (Aurora Highlands Civic Association)	<p>I want to note the positive change of site-use in my opinion. Given the badly needed housing in our area, as noted in the Livability 22202 Housing report, it is good that an underutilized parking lot and office building are being converted to residential use. I will note the loss of green and open space, which should be made up for in ways made clear in this process, not after. I also look forward to discussion of how the developer will contribute to affordable housing in our neighborhood through this site plan.</p> <p>Additional Density I support the additional density proposed to be earned on the site beyond what is allowed in the zoning district, given its ability to allow for additional housing and community improvements. I hope that the applicant will be able to exceed the LEED silver standard to higher levels in future submissions. I encourage the county and applicant to be transparent about negotiations over how the additional density will be earned.</p>
SPRC-PDSP-5	Joan McIntyre	Site Plan Review Committee member for this project (C2E2)	<p>As the Climate Change, Energy and Environment Commission (C2E2) representative to the SPRC, I welcome the opportunity to comment on the 2001 S. Clark St. (Crystal Plaza 1) project.</p> <p>C2E2 has a wide portfolio including greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental and climate impacts, stormwater, and green open spaces. I have reviewed each area of interest and provide the following comments:</p> <p>Based on a review of the project design documents, the overall sustainability elements are minimal and are inconsistent with Arlington's Community Energy Plan goals for carbon neutrality by 2050. As new buildings constructed now will still be in existence in 2050 it is critical that they be designed and built to be carbon neutral to the extent possible. I urge County staff and the Applicant to seek design and technology solutions in the following areas:</p> <p>LEED Certification: The proposed commitment to LEED Silver represents a minimal commitment to sustainability and is not in alignment with the current requirements to address climate change. While the County is allowing</p>

applications such as this to proceed under the old (2014) Green Building Policy, the newly updated policy that will go into effect on March 12 sets LEED Gold as a minimum requirement for bonus density. Relying on the minimum standards of the outdated 2014 policy for buildings to be built in the 2020s demonstrates a lack of ambition in terms of sustainability.

I welcome the Applicant’s commitment to conduct a Net Zero Carbon analysis and urge the Applicant to use the findings to identify a pathway to meeting this more desirable standard.

Electrification: All-electric buildings are essential for achieving the County’s climate goal of carbon neutrality. While the documents provided do not specifically identify systems using natural gas, HVAC and hot water systems for multifamily residential buildings conventionally rely on natural gas for such systems and would risk “baking in” an infrastructure dependent on fossil fuels for decades to come. In a recent study on building electrification done for the County, Steven Winter Associates concluded that electric technologies for HVAC systems are mature and, with careful design, constraints related to building height can be addressed. Centralized heat pump hot water systems for large residential buildings are still maturing but pilots currently underway should offer a pathway to electrifying these systems.

For any building system designed for onsite fossil fuel use, can the Applicant describe steps being taken to make the system “electric ready”?

Energy Efficiency: Energy efficiency is a key component to advancing carbon neutrality goals. The LEED checklist indicated that the Applicant has committed to achieving 12 percent in energy cost savings. This is less than the 15 percent required as a minimum for bonus density by the revised Green Building Incentive Policy. I urge the Applicant to strive for at least 20 percent but ideally 25 percent or higher.

EV Infrastructure: A rapid transition to electric vehicles is another key element to achieving the County’s carbon neutrality goal. The current plan calls for 7 parking spaces (out of 248 total) with EV chargers or 19 spaces EV ready. Current Green Building Incentive Policy standards require 15 percent of all spaces to be EV ready, as a minimum, and 4 percent to have EV charging equipment. I urge the Applicant to make at least 50 percent of all spaces EV ready to meet the future demand needs for a full transition to electric vehicles and avoid the need for much more expensive retrofitting.

Renewable Energy: The submitted plans make no mention of the inclusion of onsite renewable electricity but indicate a possible willingness to purchase green energy credits. Onsite solar would make an important albeit modest contribution to the project’s energy mix and could be co-located with green roof features with native plants for stormwater management to improve the efficiency of the solar panels. Committing to securing renewable energy through a virtual power purchase agreement would advance the County’s goal for 100 percent of its electricity to be powered by renewable sources no later than 2035.

Open Space/Biophilic Design  
The LEED certification scorecard indicates no plans to earn credits for providing access for residents to open spaces. The document indicates only 17 percent open spaces on the site and 6 percent accessible vegetation. The landscape plans do call for some green roof components on the terrace and roof. The proposed pedestrian passageway will offer a welcoming green space for residents and the public if well designed. We urge the Applicant to incorporate biophilic principles into the building design as well as the pedestrian plaza to help reduce the urban heat island impact and to provide health and wellbeing benefits to residents. What plans does the

			Applicant have for using bird-friendly glass to prevent bird collisions?
--	--	--	--

The world is facing a catastrophic climate crisis, which requires immediate action by individuals, governments, and businesses to avoid the worst consequences and all future development needs to align to these goals. I urge the Applicant to move into the forefront of offering climate-friendly buildings with this project.

## Community Member Comments

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
CM-1	Chris Benson	Community member or neighbor				X			Two way bike lanes are critical for enabling safe use of roads for bikes and children on bikes.
CM-2	Dominic Pinciotti	Community member or neighbor		X					I would prefer a more traditional design rather than glass
CM-3	Denise Lee	Community member or neighbor		X		X	X	X	<p>I really like the realignment of Bell St and Clark St. This will help traffic out a lot.</p> <p>I am concerned about the architectural style of the buildings and how they will fit in with existing buildings. It would be better if they would fit in to make a better community picture.</p> <p>My major concern is that there will not be enough green spaces. Crystal City already is a concrete jungle and this project is getting rid of a dog park and landscaped places. How will this be addressed? The small proposed 'park' by 220 20th St is way too small for this area. More parks need to be in the immediate area: trees, grass, playgrounds, dog parks, etc.</p> <p>The builder should consider Leed Gold for the building. The builder should also consider installing a green roof on the building.</p>
CM-4	Aaron Lee	Community member or neighbor		X			X		One of the major draws to living in Arlington is being close to DC and having activities but still having some open spaces. It seems like the amount of green space in the area is going to shrink with this project. What will be done to ensure there will still be spaces? It seems like we are adding people and removing space. Second concern is with regard to the 60 foot distance requirement that is being relaxed with the apartment building to the south. I am concerned about how close these will be to 220 20th St as well.
CM-5	Sandra Stolt	Community member or neighbor			X				How actively have landlords and employers, whose tenants or employees use the Underground to access Metro or the VRE, been engaged in the review process? Has JGB Smith or the County reached out to these landlords and employers to let them know about the changes to the Underground so they can gauge the impact on their tenants or employees? What precedent is being set when the direct Underground connection is replaced by a rerouting through a parking garage? When will the

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									Underground routing through the parking garage be completed? Until the construction of the rerouting of the Underground is completed, what will the access be from 20th Street to the Metro?
CM-6	Hannah Follweiler	Community member or neighbor		X		X			<p>Please include low-stress protected bike network. Reduce the amount of parking in the area. The area is well served by public transit. Space included for pick up and drop off is important but no street parking.</p> <p>At least one of the two towers should be residential. Their amenity spaces can be shared. Since Amazon's announcement we haven't had any new for sale units. They have all been for rent. There are many options to choose from in 22202 when looking for units built in the last 5 year for rent, but none for sale. I live in a newer rental building in 22202 but there is nothing for me to buy. I would love to be able to stay in this neighborhood long term.</p> <p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
CM-7	Laurel Curry	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p>
CM-8	Jerry Cowden	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>I agree with Sustainable Mobility for Arlington County on the subject of the new piece of street proposed for Crystal City. A protected bike lane should be provided in both directions, not just one. Here's Sustainable Mobility's comment on the current proposal:</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.
CM-9	Bradley Harmon	Community member or neighbor				X			Please make sure that the Clark/Bell street protected bike lane runs in both directions. This is a key part of the cycling network, and as someone who regularly bikes in Crystal City, having this key spot be only one direction is going to ensure that the extremely dangerous Crystal drive lanes are the only north-south option. Thank you!
CM-10	Bob T.	Community member or neighbor				X			This new street needs another protected bike lane in the other direction. Bikes need a safe place to travel just as cars do. There is no good reason to design a street that puts people in danger. Please redesign the streets cape and make safety the primary design concern and movement of motor vehicles a secondary concern.
CM-11	Jennifer Weiss	Community member or neighbor				X			Crystal City new street—for bike safety, please add protected bike likes in each direction
CM-12	Katherine Benson	Community member or neighbor				X			Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.
CM-13	Taylor Reich	Community member or neighbor				X			Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
CM-14	Susan English	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X	X	<p>I live in the larger 22202 community, but have been an ARCA rep to the CCCRC for a number of years. Main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Narrowness of the new Clark-Bell realignment (reduced tower separation), and resulting constraints on streetscape, pedestrian and bike widths. The large footprint of this project forever limits the vision in the sector plan for a more pedestrian-friendly environment, and the newer vision in the County's Bike Element. Disappointing. I support Darren Buck's comments.</li> <li>2. Open space. This project, together with 2001, will introduce a lot of new hardscape with limited tree canopy and plantings. While I understand the difficulty posed by the grade changes, and have seen attractive 'between buildings' hardscape in other cities, it's still disappointing. The proposed future Modified Park 8 doesn't happen for a long time/uncertain, so the area and block will remain VERY short on open space.</li> <li>3. Underground. (comment applies mostly to 2001 building) Lacking a normal street grid, and having an overloaded Crystal Dr., the superblock at least had the underground connection to Metro as an alternate pathway. Having the east-west link via a garage tunnel that takes pedestrians up and then down, essentially via outdoor landings and stairs (although made to look appealing in illustrations) is visually interesting, but overall harder on pedestrians, especially in cold wet weather carrying things. Well-maintained horticulture, wayfinding, and programming should help.</li> <li>4. The building massing and architecture is striking, but perhaps a bit over-the-top, although a welcome improvement over the dated boring building it will replace. Such a large footprint, though, really squeezes the space needed to create a more welcoming, livable environment around it.</li> <li>5. Am I allowed to say this? I continue to be disappointed at the idea that the bonus density may be used for other county needs instead of the community amenities envisioned in the sector plan. I get it that "the revenue has to come from somewhere" and I absolutely understand the current emergency created by the pandemic, but poor long-term planning is how Crystal City got developed badly in the first place (and also how other taxpayer responsibilities got avoided). I would explain to shareholders how an investment in urban livability takes time to pay off, if I were allowed to speak to them.</li> </ol>
CM-15	Annie Ebbers	Community member or neighbor			X				<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in both directions on Clark/Bell. If you only protect one lane, people will ride the wrong way on it, which obviously is dangerous. The nonsensical one-way blocks in Crystal City are slowly being rectified for cars; don't make this old mistake for bikes. Safe north-south routes in Crystal City are currently lacking, because the lanes on Crystal Drive are constantly blocked by double-parked (or sometimes single-parked) cars. Further, Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan, and a one-way protected</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									bike lane does not exactly sound like a primary bicycling corridor to me.
CM-16	David Howell	Other Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	X	X			X		<p>The layout and massing are the primary influence on shadow studies. The studies indicate that the shadow impacts are within minimums. However, those studies do not include the impacts of all other structures in the immediate area, and underestimate the general shadow patterns in all seasons by all structures. Whether or not currently required, the reality on the ground in densely developed blocks is important to the viability of landscaping and open spaces, and should be more fully informative.</p> <p>The building design is interesting. The exterior patterns will assist somewhat in preventing bird collisions. However, all window glass at ground level, terrace levels and top floors should be made with bird-friendly glass.</p> <p>Biophilic design of all spaces is important, but in this case the ground level "park" areas are critically challenged by both shadows and potential soil volume problems. The landscape design must include means of ensuring both a natural feel in the space and also the viability of the plantings in all areas. With underground structures, berms and raised beds are helpful, but the overall effect of natural space will be enhanced best with more organic shapes and arrangements of features and paths that provides easy traffic flow while creating small, biophilic spaces for relaxation, conversation, work and eating alone or in small groups.</p> <p>Has there been consideration of rooftop gardens or vegetation? Explain.</p>
CM-17	Julie Kozminski	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>The bike lane needs to be two-way. This has already been tried on Crystal city drive and was just fixed. I often ride on Crystal city drive to go to a restaurant. On the return trip, there aren't easily accessible streets without crossing route 1, so if the bike lane isn't available, I'll ride in the street or the sidewalk if the street is one way. Dc has a few one-way streets for cars with bike lanes going both ways.</p>
CM-18	Judy Freshman	Community member or neighbor		X	X	X	X		<p>The Crystal City Civic Association has submitted comments on behalf of the membership. My comments below are my own, as a long time Arlington planning and zoning volunteer, and 13 year Crystal City resident.</p> <p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>I concur with comments from Darren Buck and others about the 80' build to requirement. This project is at the north end of an unusually large block and how the street section, bike lanes and pedestrian sidewalks are designed for this project sets the pattern for the entire street. We have the opportunity to update recommendations first stated in the Crystal City Sector Plan ten years ago and subsequently amended by County policy, such as for bike lanes, and wherever possible to NOT repeat mistakes such as those revealed on Crystal Drive demonstrating inadequate space for competing users.</p> <p>UNDERGROUND</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									<p>I appreciate the effort applicants have made to maintain pedestrian connectivity within the Underground, as well as promised collaboration for future uses in that space. I find the compromise proposal acceptable, if confusing. There be clear signage and I suggest applicant provide handouts with directions and illustrations, to help user negotiate changes of levels and figure out how to get where they are going absent any visual clues.</p> <p>ARCHITECTURE</p> <p>The east building has interesting materials changes which break up the massing. Unfortunately, it does not provide the required tower separation from the Dweck property and as that property isn't slated to redevelop for many years, the applicant should revise the plans for acceptable separation as soon as this project is constructed. For residents' convenience and safety there definitely should be a secondary entrance on 20th Street.</p> <p>I find the west building overwhelmingly unattractive. The podium is too large and imposing for the pedestrian, the trees overpower the streetscape and the undulating tower appears to be about to fall down into the street. As the tallest building in the area and presumably seen as a landmark structure from Route One, it calls for a much more distinguished and remarkable design. It too should have a 20th Street entrance for convenience and safety, especially for those residents using Metrorail.</p> <p>OPEN SPACE</p> <p>The proposed 'park' (#8 on the CCSP) is disappointing and unacceptable. It is a paved building entrance, shaded and too small.</p> <p>Hours of LRPC debate on the location and size of the three parks called for in the CCSP have quite honestly resulted in confusion, as if the walnuts are being moved about and we're to guess which one has the pea.</p> <p>It's understandable that during construction at both the north and south ends of the block, open spaces may not be in their permanent location or be their permanent size. However, one goal of the CCSP clearly states that an increase in public open space be achieved through redevelopment. This huge block has opportunities for significant open space, larger than concept plans, to be provided by JBGS on the 20th and 23rd Street ends, and ultimately by Dweck midblock.</p> <p>Redevelopment means there are blank slates to be filled. Applicants CHOOSE the footprints and placement of their new buildings and, as with the proposed buildings on 20th Street, they have chosen to narrow the new street to enlarge their footprint. It's a choice that staff should reject out of hand. In that case, the template for the new street along the entire block is compromised. In the case</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									of the east building, the choice results in a smaller and duller open space and should not be approved.
CM-19	Grant Mandsager	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Having one-way bike traffic on this street is nonsensical and will inevitably lead to unsafe conflict.</p> <p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area.</p> <p>The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p>
CM-20	D.B.	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p>
CM-21	Amanda Lowenberger	Community member or neighbor				X			This street needs to have 2 way bicycle lanes. This should not have to be pointed out in 2021. Get it together.
CM-22	Josh Goodwin	Community member or neighbor				X			Please make the bike lane two way. Any new street in the county should be functional and low stress for all users. How else will we ever increase usage of environmentally friendly transportation and curb the dominance of cars in our urban corridors? Thank you.
CM-23	A. Holmes	Community member or neighbor		X		X		X	<p>Are all of these units for rent? Would prefer to see real estate for sale opposed to more rentals that further encourage short term occupancy. Would rather see CC/NL promoting long term stays having the ability to BUY condos here.</p> <p>Please dont make your walls paper thing, as in other rental properties here in CC.</p> <p>With the few balconies, they look more like office buildings instead of residential buildings.</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									One way bicycle lanes on the newly created street??? JUST NO! If we're promoting a bicycle friendly environment, a one way bike lane is definitely not that. People will undoubtedly go the "wrong" way potentially creating all kinds of conflicts. Please have a protected bike lane going BOTH directions.
CM-24	Gillian Burgess	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>I applaud those working on this project for tackling the important work of (1) realigning Clark &amp; Bell and (2) redesigning the Richmond Highway/20th Street South intersection. However, plans for both of these should be improved to be consistent with Arlington's master planning documents and to better support active transportation. Additionally, this site should include convenient and safe parking for all types of bicycles, including cargo bikes, and should include charging for ebikes and escooters.</p> <p>Regarding Clark/Bell, it is unacceptable that an entirely new street built in Arlington today would not meet NACTO standards. As it is clear that this street will see volumes that necessitate protected bike lanes, this street should provide protected bike lanes in both directions. Failure to do so would be inconsistent with the Bicycle Element of the Master Transportation Plan. It would also mean that more people on bikes will choose to ride on the sidewalk for their safety, making the route less safe and comfortable for pedestrians. It would undermine smart school transportation policies that Arlington Public Schools is trying to establish by making it harder for children to bike to school or to a school bus stop or transit stop that will take them to school.</p> <p>Regarding the redesigned intersection between 20th Street S and Richmond Highway, overall this seems to be an improvement for pedestrians, but it is unclear whether the curb cut radii and widths will be adequate for people on wheels (wheelchairs, bikes, strollers). Moreover, it seems like the crosswalk for people crossing east-west on the south side of the intersection will invite danger, as many of these people can be expected to turn south, and the crosswalk configuration has them walk north. People will naturally "cut the corner" and take a straight line if they think it's safe, but if drivers are not held out of their way, that conflict could turn injurious or deadly. The crosswalk on the south side of the intersection should be widened to account for natural human behavior of wanting to walk in a straight line.</p> <p>Finally, increasing number of people are using cargo bikes, ebikes and other assist vehicles, like escooters, to get around Arlington. This trend is great - it means more people can get around without the damage and dangers that accompanies car trips. This development should support this trend by offer convenient and secure parking for these vehicles, including charging for e-assist.</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
CM-25	Emily Thomason	Community member or neighbor				X			The protected bike lane should be two-directional to make sure the street provides a safe way to bike in each direction. As has been seen in other places, some people biking will use the one-way protected bike lanes in both directions because it still feels safer than biking with vehicle traffic. Please make the protected bike lane two-directional from the start! I regularly walk and bike near here to get to my office and look forward to using this new facility (hopefully in both directions).
CM-26	Nancy Iacomini	Community member or neighbor		X	X		X	X	<p><b>Building Massing</b>  <b>Podium Differences:</b>  I would be interested in hearing the applicant articulate the reasons they chose podium designs for both the East and West buildings that deviate from the Design Guidelines of the adopted sector plan—particularly explaining the decision to have the structures essentially rise straight up from the ground plain without sculpting.</p> <p><b>Build To Line:</b>  I find the deviation of the “build to” line in the West building to be acceptable – and in fact find the pulling back of the face of the building in a “saw tooth” configuration to be an interesting feature of the building.</p> <p><b>Architecture</b>  In general, I find the architecture of both buildings to generally be very pleasing. I particularly like the palette and materials proposed for the east building. The bricks using a glaze that imitates the oxidation of aging copper is interesting for one of the towers with a more grey palette its foil on the other tower of the proposed building. On the west building, the juxtaposition of verticality on one tower with a more horizontal expression on the other is very interesting. Both of the buildings would add some diversity in architecture to Crystal City – with a few modifications. (See Architectural Feature...)</p> <p><b>Architectural Feature</b>  I will be interested in hearing the applicant further discuss how they believe the proposed eastern building comports with having an architectural feature at its northwest corner. In recent Crystal City site plans, it has become clear that the definition of architectural feature differs among citizens as well as staff and the applicants. For me, a feature is something that is prominent from the pedestrian</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									<p>viewpoint (so not at the top of a building only) that provides a unique sense of place for its corner. In some ways it contributes to wayfinding. In Pittsburgh, a prominent architectural feature of Kaufmann’s Department Store was a very large clock mounted on the second story that projected over the sidewalk. When someone said, “Meet me at the Clock,” you knew to be at 5th and Smithfield Street.</p> <p>The proposed materials of the building – particularly the verdigris brick – I suppose could be seen as ‘locatable’ in a redeveloped Crystal City. But is this really an architectural feature as the Sector Plan intended? I would posit that the indentation to create balcony area at the top – which will also have a contrasting color and special lighting in the amenity space – is too high up on the building to be a true wayfinding feature.</p> <p>Building Tower Separation with adjacent building I’m interested in hearing more about this as the applicant progresses with their discussions with the neighboring building owner.</p> <p>Open Space/Landscaping I am concerned that Open Space #8 not only has been moved (which we saw at LRPC) but also seems to have had its focus sharpened to be a pedestrian passage that might be seen as open space as opposed to open space that would provide a pedestrian connection. I look forward to staff’s comments and discussion with the applicant about possible design that would add more vegetation to the space. I would also welcome discussion about how to put more vegetated open space with public access at the ground level into this site plan.</p> <p>Underground I believe the current proposal for re-routing the segment of the Underground for this block is better than the one we saw during the LRPC process. For me, as a visitor and not a resident to Crystal City, having a continuous underground connection that is completely sheltered from weather is important. I also believe that any reconstructed segments of the underground should be designed so as not to feel like one is in a monotonous white hallway that you’d find in an old science fiction movie. I am not a fan of pedestrian connections being in garages. I do not think the one in the garage of the</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									<p>Pentagon City Mall that connects to Pentagon Row is a very salubrious experience. If the only option is to have a continuous underground Underground connection through the garage, could the walkway not be open to the garage but have a clear, perhaps patterned, wall on the car side so that separate ventilation could be provided in the hallway, but, because of the transparency, not feel too enclosed?</p> <p>Community Benefits I will be interested in the discussion of what benefits the developer is contemplating in the request to have this parcel included in the PDSP.</p> <p>Sustainability I would be interested in hearing the applicant's reasoning to have both building's aim only for LEED Silver and higher.</p>
CM-27	Eric Cassel	Community member or neighbor		X	X		X		<p>Overall, additional development is needed in Crystal City. A key concern has been the Underground. After providing input to JBG, they have come up with a tolerable solution of a two level Underground. While not ideal, it is significantly better than the original alternative. I would prefer some sort of clear enclosed walkway (glass?) over a rail.</p> <p>Open Space is a different matter. Who will own and operate the 'pedestrian walkway'? If this is NOT a County park, how can it count as a park under the Sector Plan? The entire idea of the parks in the Sector Plan is that they become County parks, not JBG parks. In addition, the park is in shadows, hardscape and generally not a park, but a walkway. Big difference.</p> <p>My overall opinion on the architecture is the west building is interesting and the east building looks too governmental.</p> <p>Lastly, the CCCA has provided a statement that is far better worded than this and I do support that statement.</p>
CM-28	Lori Bowes	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									<p>alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p> <p>Anyone who thinks a one-way bike lane is acceptable in this corridor needs to take a ride around Crystal City, preferably with their kids. Stop building with priority treatment for vehicles and start building for the future.</p>
CM-29	Dana Bres	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. It is essential that protected, low stress bike infrastructure be embraced to encourage cycling and embrace Arlington's stated goals of low carbon transportation. The complete lack of success with the unprotected Crystal Drive bike lanes demonstrates the need for protected bike lanes as they require less enforcement.</p> <p>Building a one way bike lane will force the skilled cyclists into the road and, worse, will discourage cyclists who are less confident from riding at all.</p> <p>Regardless of the decision on cycle lanes in both directions, the bike lane should not include the gutter pan as is shown on the drawings. Gutter pans collect debris and are not useful for transportation.</p> <p>If a decision is made to lower US 1 to grade at some point in the future, the ability of cyclists to use the Eads Street lanes will be significantly impacted so protected lanes east of US 1 are essential.</p>
CM-30	Kathleen McSweeney	Other Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member						X	<p>Planning for schools and public facilities in this area of the County are a necessity, and should be done in tandem with this process, as this site serves as an entrance to the Crystal City underground. Can we think about creatively using some of the underutilized spaces available in and around this area (like the Synetic Theater, Underground, first floor retail for the proposed building) to create some community spaces and secondary school seats? With its proximity to the new Virginia Tech campus right down the road which may also house NoVA CC (thus creating nearby opportunities for HS students to get college credit courses), green space at Long Bridge Park and the aquatics center a few blocks away, surrounding businesses (restaurants, tech, Amazon, Boeing) that would serve as terrific places for 11th and 12th grade students to do internships, the need for secondary school seats in the County, and the underutilized spaces that already exist in this area - a long-term lease by JBG Smith to</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									APS seems like a no-brainer.
CM-31	Dave Shaffa	Community member or neighbor	X			X	X		<p>1. Please increase the number of trees in this area and provide trees to create islands in the street</p> <p>2. Please consider alignment of 20th Street all the way to Fern Street as part of this project. 20th Street has to make a twist and turn through Crystal House to make it to the highlands neighborhood</p> <p>3. Please allow for increased bike lanes and pedestrian walkways to cross Jefferson highway at this intersection (20th and Jefferson).</p> <p>4. This area is desperate for retail that in fact faces Jefferson Highway and not only on Crystal Drive. Will this project provide for that as well?</p> <p>The more level the area and more walkable, the more live able it will be. Currently the neighborhood in Aurora Highlands seems quite disconnected to the Crystal City area and hoping with these changes there can be a union of these two fragmented areas of Arlington.</p>
CM-32	Lisa Davis	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>I am skeptical about changing Highway 1 to an at-grade roadway. As a resident of Pentagon City, I am excited about improving the pedestrian experience in the area. However, with the amount of traffic that uses Highway 1 to pass through the area, I am concerned about how this potential change could needlessly increase traffic within the Pentagon city area as cars look for a way to cut through the area. I am excited about the changes coming to the area!</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
CM-33	Patricia Heath	Community member or neighbor			X	X	X		<p>It is important that the Underground connection be maintained. The proposal to have part of it be through the garage will work only if it is clear that pedestrians and cars can coexist in the same space. Requiring those using the Underground to weave their way among cars or otherwise treat Underground users as incidental will defeat the purpose.</p> <p>The open space is not really a park; it is a glorified sidewalk with some planters and chairs added. I also wonder where all the dogs will be accommodated. It seems like the construction site will be using a good portion of the current "dog park" fenced-in enclosure outside 220 20th Street. And after construction is completed, there will be an additional 600+ units for which it does not seem any provision to take care of dogs' needs has been made. So much of the small amount of grass left in Crystal City is already unhealthy because of the failure to provide any adequate/attractive place for dogs to relieve themselves.</p> <p>I am concerned that making things difficult for buses to move freely will lead to diminished bus service in this area long-term. Snaking transit through makeshift transit corridors leads to decreased ridership</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									and decreased ridership leads to decreased service.
CM-34	Chris Slatt	Other Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member				X			<p>The new Clark/Bell needs protected bike lanes in BOTH directions. An 80' cross section is necessary to accomplish that. I have yet to see any convincing explanation for why the 80' right-of-way guidance in the Sector Plan should not be followed.</p> <p>Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it?</p>
CM-35	Michael Neubert	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>A design worth approving would provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. It has been demonstrated that providing a single protected bike lane results in cyclists using the lane provided in two directions. This is the time to do it right! I am a County resident who rides about 3,000 miles per year and we can continue to improve our cycling infrastructure so that more residents ride more. Thank you.</p>
CM-36	Bill Ross	Other Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member		X			X		<p>First, I wanted to align myself with many of the comments offered by the Crystal City and Aurora Highlands Civic Association, and the LRPC's Pedestrian Advisory Commission and Park and Recreation Commission representatives concerning the concept, size and layout of the proposed Pedestrian walkway or plaza.</p> <p>I agree completely with the objections to referring to this walkway as a legitimate open space such as called for in the sector plan. A park provides a destination, respite, and/or recreation. A pedestrian connection that breaks up a superblock is welcome, as are thoughtful designs with natural, but this is not a park. Its major function will be for pedestrian transportation and will require, as shown in the depictions, a significant amount of non-parklike hardscape. I agree with the staff report questioning of the definition of this space and the need to discuss other/additional open space solutions that can be provided to the community.</p> <p>In other recent projects both in Crystal City and elsewhere, where there is no or little on-site open space being proposed, the county and applicants have been negotiating cash contributions for open space improvements in the neighboring community. A review of recent projects suggests that around \$5,000 per residential unit might be considered reasonable. With the 766 units proposed for Crystal Plaza, an open space contribution of <math>766 * \\$5,000 = \\$3,830,000</math> might be considered a part of a solution. The charge per unit provides a reasonable gauge for reflecting the impact of the development on the community. Perhaps, such funds could be used to enhance or develop other</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									<p>anticipated open spaces such as at Central Park or the Crystal Drive/18th St. park. Here are a couple of other comments:  The walkway appears to be smaller (5,500? vs. 7,200? vs. 9,700?) square feet) than the open space that was proposed in the Sector Plan. Whatever the number is, it's a huge decrease, which is a large difference in such a small area. In recent project after project, the county has approved plans that provide the minimally called for open space. For this project, the community is not even obtaining this for a space that is questionable by definition.</p> <p>Shadow Studies. In the first presentation it was shown that the tall buildings will fulfill sun exposure requirements for the Central Park. But what about the pedestrian walkway? It wasn't clear about what was being said about the sun exposure for this space, which is being proposed as the project's open space. This walkway, which will only be (12?, 13?) yards wide, will lie between two, very tall buildings. Can the shadow study information be discussed? The information on the Central Park area is useful for the future, but a fulfilled Central Park is probably decades away.</p> <p>In one presentation there was the discussion of a public access easement being "anticipated" for open space on the project. This makes it sound like a topic subject to negotiation. It shouldn't be for any type of publicly accessible open space in Crystal City. The permanent public easement should just be offered by the applicant.</p> <p>We will look forward to further discussion of the design for the walkway and the biophilic aspects of it and the tower buildings, including bird friendly window treatments.</p>
CM-37	Henry Dunbar	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.</p>
CM-38	Adey Salyards	Community member or neighbor				X			<p>Please provide a protected bike lane in BOTH directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. Clark/Bell is designated as a primary bicycling corridor in the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. If we aren't going to build low-stress bike infrastructure in both directions on a brand new street designated as a primary bicycling corridor, then where are we ever going to do it? There are no good alternatives for north-south bicycle travel in this area. The Crystal Drive bike lanes are unprotected</p>

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Site Layout	Building Design & Architecture	Underground	Transportation	Open Space & Landscaping	PDSP/Other	Community Comments
									and constantly blocked by pick-up and drop-off, and Eads Street is all the way over on the other side of Route 1, with few safe crossings to get there.
CM-39	Collier Cook	Community member or neighbor				X			This project lays out the foundation for the new Clark/Bell Street. Therefore it is critical we get it properly designed now. As neither nearby Route 1 nor Crystal Drive have two-way protected bike lanes, we need it here. So please adjust these plans to include a protected bike lane in both directions on the new Clark/Bell Street. This will align with the bicycle element of the Master Transportation Plan. Remember unprotected bike lanes will get blocked by waiting vehicles. Let's get this streetscape adjusted so that it can be safe and comfortable for all users.
CM-40	Paul Pisano	Community member or neighbor		X		X			I'm fine with the proposed structures, but do not support the traffic flows. Adding yet another traffic signal at S. 20th & S. Bell will only increase delay. And making Bell a through street between the two new buildings only encourages more vehicle traffic. I think it would be better to not extend Bell to bisect the parcel, but instead to make it bike/ped friendly open space.