

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
Overall Feedback						
1		Overall a well organized and appealing presentation. It would be helpful to use headers to designate section being presented when a topic carries to the next page.	1	I. Malis		Doc Formatting: Further refinements to the document layout may be made as part of the Final Draft.
2		Cover photo. The adopted plan used similar images but the discussion about "our look" suggests that we may want to present a different image.	1	I. Malis		Doc Formatting: Further refinements to the document layout may be made as part of the Final Draft.
3		TOC: Should have expanded, more detailed TOC especially for online version; clickable to reach sections		staff		Doc Formatting: Further refinements to the document layout may be made as part of the Final Draft.
4		do closer views / bigger maps. The center should always be Columbia Pike. You are showing far beyond a 5 minute walk. The broad maps are then more difficult to read for the cross hatching and particular neighborhood existing issues vs. new framework		S. Pryor		Doc Formatting: Further refinements to the document layout may be made as part of the Final Draft.
5		Overall this Code is much more complicated than the Node Code. Section 2 that outlines the process is complex and makes references to other sections that then need to be looked up. At the same time it appears we are proposing more administrative approvals. I am a bit concerned about transparency. We have always stated that community members and developers alike should be able to understand the process and what is allowed. I have pored over this for hours and still am not sure I correctly understand. The number of questions below is not necessarily related to the quality to the work, just my lack of understanding.		I. Malis		Admin Regs for this Code will be prepared to help convey process. Process should be similar as with existing Code. Further refinements of Part 2 will continue with Final Draft.
6		Include "How to Subdivide..." in "How to" section; Some reformatting to make easier to read (i.e. more bullets)		T. Karantonis		Revisions will be further evaluated as part of the Final Draft
7		How to Use: Section should clearly indicate all properties along Code, include the different boundaries for Ex. District and NAP District, and ideally make online version clickable to reach regs for respective areas. Include Corridor map, like LU&H Study boundary map		staff		Revisions will be further evaluated as part of the Final Draft
8	p1	"How to use this code" should start with a resident-oriented query such as, "I want to find out what is planned (or, "what is allowed") in my neighborhood" (or on my block, or for my property).	1	Carrie Johnson		Revisions will be further evaluated as part of the Final Draft
9	p1 quest. 1	Explain where to find GLUP to identify SNR District boundaries.	1	Carrie Johnson		Revisions will be further evaluated as part of the Final Draft
10		No regs on Signs		C. Gordon		Sign standards are still under review. Staff will distribute sign standards in time for review at July FBC AWG mtg or before Final Draft.
11		change throughout - "Columbia Pike Neighborhoods - Special Revitalization District" (CPN-SRD)		staff		Revised
12		please add street names to the maps		S. Pryor		Revised
14		The level of prescription; materials, design elements, roads through existing properties, etc., in this plan seems to limit creative development opportunities at various points along Columbia Pike.		Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		The Neighborhoods FBC is intended to implement the policies set forth in the Neighborhoods Area Plan, including policies for expanded street grid. The Revised Draft has been adjusted to allow additional flexibility.
15	72-613	These requirements seem to restrict any new construction to specific architectural periods and styles. It appears that the designer cannot use something as simple as a round or hexagonal column. It has to have a tag designating it as having a Greek or Roman heritage. Please clarify.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		
16		Overall arch stds are limiting and restrictive. May be better to focus on form/placement/scale. These architectural stds are more limiting than current Code - perhaps regulating more than needed (i.e. columns, sill design may not allow for moderne/modern design, etc.)				
17		Suggestion to approach standards by mostly saying what can't be done instead		C. Gordon		
18		overall too restrictive		S. Pryor		
19		overall too backwards looking / historic, there is plenty of modern technology and design which can be part of Col Pike		S. Pryor		
20		keep Col Pike interesting, not cookie cutter (complaints from multiple different ppl at mtgs and Blues Festival for yet another red brick bldg w/beige accents)		S. Pryor		A specific period or architectural style is not intended. The Revised Draft has been modified to allow additional flexibility.
21		Support for more standards in/around the Conservation Areas, where appropriate for more controls and need for degree of interpretation to achieve compatibility.		C. Gordon		Conservation Area Standards now included in FBC. Architectural Standards have been modified to reduce degree of specificity.
22		Plan assumes everything is massive along Col Pike. Consider the single family townhomes and Mews structures fronting Col Pike on the East End. This document is geared to behemoth structures, which is not desirable for entire Pike.		S. Pryor		No change. The building type vision was established as part of the Neighborhoods Area Plan.
Part 1: General Provisions						
1	107.E.	Purpose of Gen Arch Stds and Conservation Area should be revised and separated (depending on final approach)		C. Gordon		Revised
2	p1 102.B.	2nd sentence "The Code shall be applied to all..." should be "may be applied"? i.e. not mandatory	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
3	p1 103.A	Clarify that the higher standards etc. in this Code apply whenever a developer has chosen to use the Code, i.e. they don't apply to ordinary by-right projects -- or do they?	1	Carrie Johnson		Correct; Revised
4	1	Is CP-SNRD FBC title the same as the "Special Neighborhoods Form Based District"?	1	I. Malis		CPNSRD (District) is boundary shown on GLUP; CPNSRD FBC is formal title of Neighborhoods FBC
5	2D	Streetspace Standards are a part of this section as are Open Space Standards	1	I. Malis		Correct
6	2E	architecture must complement "best traditions of Arlington County and Columbia Pike" probably needs to be restated based on what we decide they are	1	I. Malis		Revised
7	2E	need clarification on the "equivalent or better" standard and criteria to depart. How does this work if we use a prescriptive materials list?	1	I. Malis		Equivalent or Better: Revisions are still in progress to determine how best to use and/or allow the intended purpose of this statement.
8	107 E	how does resident prove to zoning administrator what is better? Need mediation option.		S. Pryor		
9	103 B	where is reference to county board if mediation needed? Current written that only county staff decides, which is not desirable; citizens need to be able to take it to our elected officials		S. Pryor		Part 2: Administration describes processes for when/how proposals that require CB review are to occur.
10	107 C	"BES aim for the minimum level of regulation necessary to meet these goals." Great statement but contradicting by the restrictive nature of the "design" and other parts of documents		S. Pryor		Revised
11	107 E	"best traditions" -- STOP only looking backwards. If artists and architects only looked backwards, we would still have only the Parthenon or Gothic style, we would never have van Gogh or Picasso		S. Pryor		Revised

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
Part 2: Administration						
1		Who is on FBC Administrative Review Team? I'm not familiar with it. Will it be the same for the Neighborhoods' plan?		N. Iacomini		A County staff inter-department team was specifically created for the original FBC to administer the FBC. A new set of Admin Regs, or expansion/revision to the existing set, for the new Neighborhoods FBC will be prepared as part of the Final Draft.
2	207B	The allowance for being a foot off here or there...how has this worked with the current FBC? In other areas of the county – even single family – if you're off on height or setbacks you need a variance. Would we want this in the area by single family?		N. Iacomini		This provision accounts for unexpected circumstances. Applicant will need to document new or changed conditions to ZA and determination made as to the basis of the change or hardship. Criteria are preset and are considered to be small in nature and would not negatively impact adjacent properties.
3	General	This code removes site size as a trigger for use permit review. Given the various new triggers for permit review it is hard to tell the result. Can we show on a map those sites that we expect to be reviewed by right and which would likely be use permit. Use permit review lets look off site and mitigate or make improvements that are not the responsibility of the applicant on issues such as traffic that concern the community.	1	I. Malis		A map has been prepared to show properties that may likely pursue, or would be required, a Use Permit.
4	General	It would be helpful to have a narrative explanation of the proposed approval process. Section 2 is zoning language that often refers to other sections of the the code. It should be transparent to the applicant and the community what is supposed to happen. As it is, it is hard to be sure what is being proposed.	1	I. Malis		This will be provided in the Admin Regs.
5	203 B	Is Adjacent capitalized because it has a legal meaning? Also, should be reworded so construction is parallel with A & C.	1	I. Malis		Revised
6	204A	Where is the membership of the Adminstrative Review Team established?	1	I. Malis		ART is a County staff team, established by the County Manager.
7	205A4e	Need to define "low and moderate income housing". Term is used throughtout.	1	I. Malis		Term is consistent with main ZO Affordable Housing Ordinance regulations. It will be further evaluated as part of the Final Draft.
8	205A4f	Is this asking for the income at which families would qualify to live in the AH?	1	I. Malis		This language is consistent with Aff Hsg Ordinance; will continue to evaluate
9	205A4i	Why are we asking what amenities are proposed? Are any amenities in AH required by this Code?	1	I. Malis		This language is consistent with Aff Hsg Ordinance; will continue to evaluate
10	205B2a	Rather than suggest an applicant is permitted to requests modification of the Regulating Plan could we refer to the allowable modifications list? Not all of them affect the Regulating Plan. Is it modification OF the Regulating Plan or modifications FROM the Regulating Plan?		I. Malis		Revisions still in progress
11	205B2a	What is the membership of the Use Permit Review Committee?	1	I. Malis		This will be clarified in Admin Regs. (Based on SPRC model; PC Chaired group with commission members; civic association participation)
12	205C1b	Affected civic associations also include the one within whose boundries the project is located.	1	I. Malis		Correct; wording will be revised
13	205C1	It appears there is no provision for a FBC checklist meeting or a community wide meeting for by-right projects. If that is the plan's intention I think that is a mistake. Having community members review projects is an important part of maintaining community engagement and support.	1	I. Malis		This will be clarified in Admin Regs. However, staff expects the by-right process for this Code would be the same as currently required for the existing Code which includes a Checklist meeting.
14	205C2	There appears to be no FBC checklist meeting or community wide meeting for projects that require use permits. See above. Or is Use Permit Committee the same as the FBC AWG?	1	I. Malis		This will be clarified in Admin Regs.
15	206A	Curious what "Modification of Aproved Development Plan" will say.	1	I. Malis		No Change.
16	207A	This says Administrative Adjustments are being offered to provide relief from minor conctruction and survey errors. Does this mean these adjustment are all POST-approval and POST-construction?	1	I. Malis		These revisions may occur post-approval, but would occur during Permit Review and/or during construction.
17	207B	What criteria does the Zoning Administrator uses to evaluate this series of adjustments to the standards. Is it automatic? Or is there a hardship being overcome? Need more info before I can comment further.		I. Malis		This provision accounts for unexpected circumstances. Applicant will need to document new or changed conditions to ZA and determination made as to the basis of the change or hardship.
18	207B2c	I would not agree that a changing the parking setback line by 6 feet (in front on the site) is minor.	1	I. Malis		Parking setback line is 30' behind RBL. If full relief of 6' is needed, resulting interior space between RBL and parking would maintain a dimension viable for a variety of uses. The relief for this section is intended to be minimal and to address construction challenges that frequently arise.
19	207B4a	I would not agree that a street or alley that has moved 25 ft is a minor post-construction adjustment.	1	I. Malis		This section is still under review to determine if needed post approval, if allowance for adjustments offered du
20	208B4	Node Code said "streetscape details", this code says "streetspace standards". Is that understood to be any provision of Section 504. This includes trees, on-street parking, pedestrian pathways, and bike-ped space issues. Is this saying anything in Section 504 can be modified?	1	I. Malis		Correct
21	208B2	"or amend the REGULATING PLAN". Wouldn't this require a zoning ordinance amendment?	1	I. Malis		Correct; wording will be revised
22	208B5	Design issues related to Conservation Areas needs more clarification. In Node Code there were only a few sites. In this Code there are many sites. This suggests complete latitude to depart from Code.	1	I. Malis		Additional revisions may be needed.
23	208C	Do the underlying by-right rules govern the physcial aspects of "additions of or enlargement of building" to building that exist today and are proposed to retained?		I. Malis		Correct; wording will be revised as needed
24	208C1	Says that the CB cannot approve mods that increase density, but 208C2 says they can approve mods to "site area, density, side and rear yards . . ." Does this say that the CB can override the provisions of by-right zoning? Or will the NP FBC be applied to these areas of existing buildings?	1	I. Malis		CB can not increase unit count within existing buildings (density may change with smaller site area applicable to existing buildings)
25	208C3	Under what circumstance would the CB need to modify lots widths and lot area requirements?	1	I. Malis		If a partial infill project is proposed, it would alter the existing lot size and could change the density of the existing buildings to remain relative to the remaining lot area. This provision would allow the CB to evaluate a proposal and modify the lot width or lot area requirements for the area remaining.
26	208C4	Is this intended to say that within a Conservation Area existing parking cannot be lost or does it say if the project is currently underparked it needs to be brought up to code?	1	I. Malis		Currently drafted to say that parking can not be lost. However, it is still under review whether parking relief can be/should be permitted during interim phases of redevelopment in order to achieve Code-required elements such as new streets.
27	209A4	Can the developer choose not to take bonus density on his site and thereby eliminate an Open Space shown on the Regulating Plan?	1	I. Malis		No; open space on Reg Plan is required; Revise text to clarify
28	209B1Ai	Reference to Section 903. Don't see this section. 901 is Definitions.	1	I. Malis		Error; should have referenced Section 803

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
29	209B2	Are the site improvements listed requirements?	1	I. Malis		Site improvements are listed in a. - e. of that section
30	209C	The following are questions because it is not clear to me how the HALRB review process is intended to be executed.	1	I. Malis		This section may require further refinements
31	209C	When do the meetings w/HALRB take place - before or after the project is accepted by the County? Is HALRB's recommendation available and reviewed by the community before the hearings?	1	I. Malis		Revised
32	209C	Can the applicant proceed to the CB with a project if they have not agreed to HALRB's recommendations?	1	I. Malis		Yes.
33	209C	"shall be consistent with the guidelines" - is that open to clear interpretation?	1	I. Malis		Revised
34	209C	"meets the intent of the Architectural Standards" - aren't the standards a regulation that must be adhere to?	1	I. Malis		Revised
35	209C1	Is it a minimum of two meetings w/HALRB plus "at least on additional" in 209C2?	1	I. Malis		Yes.
36		Draft allowance for infill development: Where should this language reside in ZO? Are rules in RA districts needed?		I. Malis		Additional revisions may be needed.
Part 3: Regulating Plans						
1	B.3	in what scenarios would street construction be delayed?; need to determine bond funding details (how/what/when/circumstances)		all		
2	C.1	Street shift up to 50': is this to the advantage of Developer #1? Does Dev #2 have to build in alignment with the shifted road? Or can the new streets be off-set (which seems problematic to help alleviate circulation away from Col Pike)? Need to explain what scenarios - or criteria will be used - to allow shift? Is it based on a hardship?		all		
3	11&12	What is the "alternative street" referenced in the Western regulating plan?	1	Chris Slatt		See separate attachment regarding changes to Streets/Alternative Streets
4		Need to be clear that when a street (centerline?) shifts, the RBLs shift also		IM		
5	301.B.2/ others	Overall intent of when/how street alignments, locations can change and process needs to be clearer		all		
6	301.C.1.b	indicate a specific slope/criteria for when/why street locations can change		T. Karantonis		
7	301.C.1.f	Process for how streets will be added?Why would we allow a street to be removed/deleted? In what process?		TK/IM		
8	301.C.1.d.	Why are "stub outs" needed? Can they be studied further and shown as a full street or alternative street?		TK/IM		
9	301.C.1.(ii)	is 100' a county standards; is something more (i.e. 150' more accurate for County)?		T. Karantonis		
10	C1 Streets	How does this work with the new street in Barcroft?		N. Iacomini		No change. New streets in Conservation Area will follow proposed cross sections; except that new streets and,
11	C2	again, how does this work with Barcroft frontage along Columbia pike?		N. Iacomini		
12	Reg Plans	Need to see heights as a thru picture – because I just can't visualize it.		N. Iacomini		See Transition study graphics
13	Center Reg Plan	Slicing 2 Conservation Buildings - not confident this is a good solution. Would be better to preserve all or less/none				To be discussed as part of review Transition Study for Conservation Areas
14	Center Reg Plan	Quebec apts: intro of road south of future 11th creates too small buildable area. Unnecessarily creating streets and dividing property		B. Mowbray		Revised
15	Center Reg Plan	east edge of Oakland Apts are not accurately included in Reg Plan (too much is shaded as existing SRD)		B. Mowbray		Revised
16	Legend	Natural Area is fully shaded green, rather than outline				Revised
17	East Red Plan	unclear how large open space will be achieved		B. Mowbray		Dedication, and in combination with TDR
18	All Reg Plans	unclear if Buildable Area's are viable? How will 25' parking set back allow or constrain common parking layout (120')? Are there narrow/insufficient areas?		B. Mowbray		Parking Setback Line adjusted to 30'; consistent with depth of residential units
19	West Reg Plan	western-most properties: Lot Building Limit line shown in 2 different places for same condition - needs to be adjusted to match (at edge of alley or set back?). What is distance indicated, 50' per NM regs?		staff		Revised
20	Foxcroft Reg Plan	why does alley jog at Orme St? does it encroach on SFD lot?		staff		To be revised
21		West End Regulating plan appears to include vehicular connection not included in Final Neighborhood Plan and not included in MTP map	3	Chris Slatt		Proposed MTP will be updated; based on further analysis some additional refinements have been made to the planned streets
22		FBC District appears to have been extended south of the 10th Place cul-de-sac (farther than shown in Urban Form Vision map)	3	Chris Slatt		Will evaluate for Final Draft
23		Source of additional bike paths show on Western Regulating Plan? Don't appear to be from Neighborhoods Plan	1	Chris Slatt		Proposed MTP will be updated; based on further analysis some additional refinements have been made to the planned streets
24		Should the "Bike Paths" on the regulating plans be better described as Shared Use Paths? Presumably pedestrians will also be encouraged to use them.	1	Chris Slatt		Shared Use Trail/Path will be incorporated into the FBC
25		Looking at the Urban Form Vision Map from the Neighborhoods Plan, at the block between Wakefield and Buchanan north of new 10th St, I expect their to be Townhouses on the east end and west end, with building potential rising to a higher level in the middle. Looking at the regulating plan, because there is no frontage on the north side there it is unclear to me if this is what would actually occur and if it did, how far back the lower town house height would extend into the block.	1	Chris Slatt		Neighborhood Manners would apply in that area
26		New Street connection appears to be missing from Central Regulating Plan between new 11th St and 12 Rd in the vicinity of Taylor	3	Chris Slatt		Revised
27		Additional Street connection appears on Central Regulating Plan that is not on MTP map or Final Neighborhood Plan (between Pike and new 11th St in vicinity of Oakland)	3	Chris Slatt		Proposed MTP will be updated; based on further analysis some additional refinements have been made to the planned streets
28		Eastern Regulating plan has additional segment of 9th St east of Courthouse Rd that does not appear on MTP Map or Final neighborhood plan	3	Chris Slatt		Proposed MTP will be updated; based on further analysis some additional refinements have been made to the planned streets
29		Row of parcels on Eastern Regulating plan appears outside of FBC District, but in Neighborhoods plan Urban Vision Map it is inside (north of 9th St between Scott and Rolfe)	3	Chris Slatt		UFVM was an error; area is currently parkland (Penrose) and not planned for redevelopment
30		New section of 12 Street west of Rolfe does not step down to Townhouse/Small Apartment as it does on the Neighborhoods Plan Urban Vision Map	3	Chris Slatt		To be Revised; Reg Plan should indicate Small Apt/TH along new 12th street leading into Arl View neighborhood

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
31		Source of bike path show on Eastern Regulating Plan crossing Washington Blvd? Don't appear to be from Neighborhoods Plan. Is that the Foxcroft Penrose Connector from the bike element of the MTP?	1	Chris Slatt		Reg Plan may be incorrect; NAP shows trail following north up Washington Blvd, rather than across Wash Blvd; since this would be a County connection, staff will assess whether this should be shown on the Reg Plan.
32	Street Type Key:	Perhaps add a unit of measure (feet) to the numbers shown so it is immediately clear what the numbers reference (street width)		K. Grigor		503.B.2. text describes labels
33	Reg Plan	The plan lists Carver site as townhouse only. I was glad to see the plan conforms to that compromise the community reached with the board and planners last summer.		K. Grigor		No change (Max density note has been added to Legend)
34		Arlington View Terrace is listed as "Urban Residential 4". What does that "4" mean? Four story maximum as decided by community/board/planners during summer 2012? If that is what the "4" indicates, perhaps this max height as it applies to that site should be more clearly stated in the FBC document.		K. Grigor		
35		OR if the "4" is not a reference to max height: Arlington View Terrace is listed as BES Urban Residential. In the documents, that allows up to 8 stories. That is not what was agreed to last summer by the community county board and county planners. Our agreement stated 3 stories at AVT with 4 stories allowed along the south side facing the golf course. The max height should be clearly stated in the FBC document.		K. Grigor		Label indicates special condition that limits buiding height to 4 stories; (Will provide additional notes in Legend to clarify
36	15	What doesthe note "Urban Residential 4" mean?	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		see above
37		Additionally, Arlington View Terrace currently has a small playground and the FBC document does not indicate a mini-park or any green space. It would be nice to have some green space/park space on that site		K. Grigor		A new public open space was not designated for this area; this playground is private; with any redevelopment, a Private Open Area is required which could contain play equipment
38	9-301.C.3.d	What conditions are included in deeming a site ALLEY not feasible. Please specify what conditions would allow for an exclusion; existing topography or adjacent buildings or structures?	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		to be evaluated further with Final Draft
39	11-302.B	In the existing FBC, the stretch of Columbia Pike from S. Greenbrier Street to S. Columbus has 2 designated RBL's, 112'-8" and 102'-0". The new FBC proposes widening the central stretch to 130'-0". This proposal is dramatically different that the already/or proposed constructed projects at Greenbrier (119'-4")and Dinwiddie (98'-4") as well as with the existing retaining wall at the bus stop and topography on the north side of Columbia Pike. For example, down Columbia Pike at the new Giant grocery building the new construction uses an RBL of 92'-0". The Magnolia Garden charrette exercise last year by Arlington County specifically showed street frontage construction at the new Arbor Heights property. If the road were widened, a standard double loaded apartment building would not be possible due to vastly increase street and yardage requirement. Is keeping the existing street layouts being considered for some areas?	3	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Wider streetscapes are part of the vision established in the NAP. Dooryards along Columbia Pike will allow additional landscaping and give Neighborhoods a greener condition. See Cross Sections in adopted NAP. Property owner shall build according to the BES frontage type shown within their property. If a change in frontage type occurs within the property, the property owner has the option of shifting where one frontage starts, up to 50' in either direction on their property.
40	15	Is appears that regulating plan types change designations outside of existing property lines. How does an Owner address this change within their existing street frontage? Refer to S. Rolfe Street and S. 14th Road.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		
41	p. 15, p. 23 k	To achieve the County's goal of 400 affordable housing units per year, existing properties owned by nonprofit housing organizations should have a bonus height option. See 1400 block of S. Rolfe at Arlington View Terrace Apts.	3	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Areas for Bonus Height were established during the planning process; the adopted NAP indicates those areas.
42	9, 3d alley	Plan needs to consider site grade; greater than 8%-10%, as not practical to provide an alley. Allow garage access from street. If alley is not 'practical' to build, why would the land need to be dedicated? The 13'-0" of green space set back would seem adequate.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Garage acces is permitted from street, through an opening in the wall.
43	p7 301.A.3	"additional regulations (and bonuses)" should be "potential bonuses" to be consistent with Regulating Plan key and to underscore that they are not automatically available.	1	Carrie Johnson		Additional formatting will be evaluated as part of Final Draft
44	p9 302.	Last sentence: clarify where larger-scale Regulating Plans can be obtained or found online.	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
45	p11ff 302	Regulating Plans even at 11x17 size need street names for clarity and ease of use.	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
46	p10ff 302.Bff	Regulating Plan key should explain jagged green lines and areas marked "preserve".	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
47	Center Reg Plan	Regarding the height of development shown at the corner of George Mason and Columbia Pike immediately adjacent to Barcroft, bonus height is indicated. How does this fit with the set back described in Section K (Bonus Height), p. 123 of the Form Based Code document? From which side is the set back determined? Given the lower buildings of Barcroft and the proposed apartment development, does set back from the lower buildings of Barcroft or the street make more sense? Could a lower height at that corner be considered?		J. Lawrence		See Transition study graphics
48	C.2.c.	What is basis for 1,500 linear feet perimeter block size?		staff		Dimension has been revised to 1,300 linear feet. It is a subjective dimension based on evaluation of other locations and a preferred limit for overall block size
49	301.A.1	indicate "four" subareas		T. Karantonis		Revised
50		Alleys - perhaps add more flexibility for alleys, and promote ped/bike connections through them as well; can be 'safer' environments with added lighting, sidewalks; perhaps consider alternative commercial uses also		TK		No change; alleys can accommodate a variety of users
51	Center Reg Plan	Extend required Shopfront (Red) down GM Drive to 11th Street intersection		T. Karantonis		No change; Prefer to allow Retail as option rather than as a requirement, depending on market conditions
52	All Reg Plans	All Reg Plans should be oriented the same way; prefer N is up		staff		This is in progress; orientation will be addressed with Final Draft
53	All Reg Plans	For the Color and Symbol Key I think the heights need to be conveyed through colors as was done in the NP (p. 4.22-23). The standards to which Alleys must be built are minimal and only address the roadway without consideration for pedestrians, and where the developer is not building the alley there is only a minimal requirement for a 13 foot wide linear space for the future construction of an alley (pg. 21). Alleys are not required where a BES site is on a perimeter common to non-developable or conservation lands. This eliminates the opportunity for access to an accessible at-grade rear entrance.		L. Dye		No change
	301(C)(2) Alleys			R. Sigel/K. Guernsey		Alleys are primarily intended to provide access to back-of-house services and parking, and entrances shall be

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
54	301(c)(3) Alleys	As the draft Code is currently structured, the practical impact of inadequately addressing the needs of pedestrians in alleyways, is to restrict and in some cases to practically eliminate visitability. Additionally, when safe and accessible paths of travel and sidewalks are not provided in the alleys, it places those individuals for whom the back entrance is their primary means of entrance (or their only means of accessible entrance), in the unsafe and hazardous position of having to walk and dodge amongst the cars and traffic utilizing the alleys.		B. Siegen/K. Guemsey		located on the front sides of buildings along the RBL. However, access to buildings may occur from alleys, and where required by Building Code, entrances will be accessible. The dimensions for alleys are minimum widths and can be wider. The draft FBC has been revised to allow at-grade entrances for Townhouse units on streets 80' wide, which may be used for access and rear access adjacent to a conservation area may not be required where physical space may be limited.
55	301 B 3	"post bond funding" - "county agreed-upon construction cost estimate" -- county estimates I have seen for NCAC projects have been excessive. Recent sidewalk project in my neighborhood concreted around a telephone pole so that the sidewalk was no longer ADA compliant. Response was "it's not much money to fix it". county should have done it correct in first place and stop wasting my tax dollar. Super Stop fees approximately \$900k per stop -- county staff determined this reasonable until slammed in the national news. Alternative, arbitration, or mediation option needed.		S. Pryor		Revised/removed
56	301 C 1 a I	3 cheers for not allowing dead end streets. Will this override Douglas Park constant battle to not support connective grid streets through area?		S. Pryor		No change. Some connections are not feasible due to topo or other existing site constraints; Alternative Streets may allow ped/bike connection only
57	301 c 1 d	does this mean existing driveways / cut outs get second shrift to new development?		S. Pryor		No change. Existing conditions will not change until a property owner chooses to pursue development following FBC, or changes conditions with by-right development which is not required to follow FBC
58	301 c 1 g	does this allow stove pipe access? Narrow driveway and then property is bigger in back?		S. Pryor		No change. See proposed street locations per Regulating Plans
59	301 c 2 b	does this contradict 301 c 1 d?		S. Pryor		Will evaluate for final draft
60	301 c 3 d	we will have problems with this. Who will control and deem something as parked? Can the police ticket if loading area?		S. Pryor		need more clarity on the concern
61	East Reg Plan	First, AHC's primary concern is that both the Plan and Code indicate that A VT is limited to three stories and is eligible for four stories through bonus provisions. This height designation is confounding given the County's goal to develop 400 affordable housing units per year and AVT is dedicated affordable and can be more intensely developed. Additionally, please note the existing RA8-18 Zoning of AVT would permit 6 stories/60' of height through the special exception/site plan provisions. If there is a means to modify this designation to six or more stories, which is consistent with the special exception provisions of the existing RA8-18 Zoning District and GLUP designation, I recommend this be done to help further the County's affordable housing goals and to help low-income families to live near where they work. AHC had previously advocated for 8 or more stories on two occasions before the plan was adopted in summer 2012.		AHC		No Change. Four stories on the southern portion of the site is permitted (does not require Bonus), per the Neighborhoods Area Plan.
62	East Reg Plan	Second, the County should not recommend the continuation of South 14th Road west of South Rolfe Street. This is our parking lot and tot lot for AVT. The proposed continuation of S. 14th Road, which is a relatively short distance, does not further connectivity, as it dead-ends into Army Navy County Club property.		AHC		A portion of County ROW exists in this area; This is still under discussion
63	East Reg Plan	Third, the County should not require building frontage for South Rolfe Street south of South 14th Road, which also dead-ends into Army Navy Country Club property. This portion of the road does not provide vehicular connectivity. Thus, AHC asks the County to consider vacating this portion of S. Rolfe Street for redevelopment purposes.		AHC		This is still under discussion
64	East Reg Plan	Lastly, it appears the portion of S. Rolfe Street south of S. 14th Road is to provide a connection to the proposed bike trail shown in the vicinity of South 15th Street, also known as Outlot A and Outlot B, which ultimately connects to the Army Navy Country Club bike trail. This property should not be used for a bike path, as it passes through private property, including A VT. It seems difficult to achieve a bike path as shown in this area. AHC supports a bike path in this neighborhood, but it is better done by connecting the path through Army Navy County Club, northbound on South Queen Street, west on South 13th Road, and north on South Rolfe Street, or remaining on South Queen to Columbia Pike. The benefit of the proposed alternative is the path on South Queen would be located on or near Hoffman-Boston Elementary School, which may be a destination in itself and is a public facility, which seems more appropriate. The location of the proposed bike path as shown on the MTP is not necessary alternatives exist that seem more feasible-and limits development options. As such, we ask the County to study an alternative bike path route in this area.		AHC		Future trail connection will be updated to use existing ROW instead of private property through AVT (i.e. following 14th Street and/or Queen St) (would be tracked through separate process since trail is not applicable to FBC development)
Part 4: Building Envelope Standards						
1	402.B.1	Complete & Discrete Vertical Façade Composition - wording revisions; unclear language; relates to Definition also		B. Mowbray		Revised
2	402.B	Restate to indicate a range (i.e. 60-75') or state as 75' or less; as written expect that everyone will always design at 75'		C. Gordon		Revised
3	402.B.3.C	Material color should be a sufficient way to create a different composition		all		Revised
4	402B	Should materials be part of façade composition?		N. Iacomini		No change. Material changes are a method to achieve CDVFC. Should also expand to allow for different colors (i.e. brick masonry) to also be a distinguishing element.
5	402.B.3.e	add "e" - indicating that bay height/roof line variation can be an element to distinguish bays		C. Gordon		Revised
6	p19 402.B.1 and B.2	75-foot average façade compositions: clarify whether the average must be achieved within each project or along the block face as a whole. And how is the average calculated when a project is exempted under B.2 as <100 ft. wide?	1	Carrie Johnson		CDVFC is controlled per project. A project with less than 100' of frontage is exempt; Adjacent property with more than 100' of frontage, if applicable, would be required to comply with CDVFC reg
7	402.C	15K floor plate is too small for UMU and UR BES, possibly Small Apartment.		all		
8		perhaps this provision is not needed; focus on the street edge, max length of building along RBL (~350')				
9		15K would be too small for GROUND STORY as well		all		

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
10		Confirm intent - what are we trying to control?		all		
11	20-C.	What is the reason for the 15,000 SF maximum? If you have 300 or more feet of developable frontage this makes for a very narrow building depth. The code already requires the façade to be broken down visually into small segments.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		See separate handout
12	402.D.1.B	30' height limit is tight with taller GROUND STORY -		all		Height is limited to provide compatibility with adjacent single-family development; 2 stories to top of wall plate would be generally consistent with height of SFD in R zoning (35' to mid-point of pitch)
13	402.D.1.C	50' no build zone may be too large; perhaps need to consider allowing some building, but with lower height		C. Gordon		
14		50' set back - would this preclude any ancillary structures? (i.e. venting for parking garages; mechanical/transformer enclosures; amenity structures - pool house; etc)?		C. Gordon		Revised; See NM
15	402.D.1. exhibits	3 diagrams relate to SFD and 1 is for abutting FBC BES; diagrams are confusing to review/understand due to different scales; yellow shading for 402.D.2 should be changed/confuses reader to think it applies to SFD; can all SFD exhibits be combined into one?		all		NM diagrams refined.
16	402.D.3 Garden Wall	material (masonry) is too limiting. Should at least allow for wood, wrought iron.. Full masonry may create too much enclosure - making SFD too boxed in. No other options permitted		B. Mowbray		Revised
17	402.D.3	remove STREET WALL; it would not be used on Common Lot Line.				Revised
18	402.E	Are roof decks/terraces permitted in any BES?		C. Gordon		Revised
19	402.H.2	could be more clear that: 1) upper story windows will be elevated 6' above each floor; ground story windows will be elevated 6' above floor unless garden wall provided		staff		Revised
20		Also need to clarify the upper story window provision also applies when adjacent to SFD when garden wall is required		staff		Revised
21	BES	Elevated Ground Story: accessibility challenges; long lengths of ramps (and drwgs do not accurately represent realistic lengths & platform reqs)		all		Revised
22		limiting of Support Functions to 50% of RBL - may be too limiting; working at odds with elevating Ground Story		B. Mowbray		No change. Regulation maintains balance of units and other uses along RBL; keeps eyes on street/activity along street
23	Garage & Parking	Height clearance of 16' - need to confirm if this is also covering loading docks. Which need 18' clearance per County std		all		to be further evaluated
24	Fenestration	Blank lengths of wall - how can this be handled? Other than with windows		C. Gordon		Revised
25	p. 25	Isn't the Wooster project just all residential lofts? But it is being shown to illustrate urban mixed-use frontage.	1	staff		No change. UMU allows all Residential uses; Retail only required with Shopfront is specified
26	Neighborhood manners:	How does this apply to areas where there is currently a tall building backing residential that does not comply to the 60 degree plane from the common lot line? For example, along Rolfe St. the Lancaster is 6 stories but the FBC code allows 8 stories plus 2 bonus. Since the current building does not adhere to the neighborhood manners (60 degree line) would new building have to comply?		K. Grigor		No change. This regulation is only required for new construction following FBC. Existing construction and new by-right construction would not be required to comply with this provision.
27	20, E1 height	Due to site slopes, average elevation should be measured from around the entire site, not just the front.	2	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		No change. FBC measures from adjacent sidewalk elevation; average along each frontage
28	20, E1 & E3 height	Please explain the difference between 'Story Heights' and "Ultimate Building Height."	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		See Revised Definitions
29		How do the window proportions work contiguous to preservation areas?		N. Iacomini		No change. New construction adjacent to Conservation Areas (Barcroft) will have HALRB review. Fenestration range specified in BES is compatible with fenestration conditions in Conservation Areas
30	402D	There needs to be neighborhood manners to preservation areas. The garden apts are no taller than most single family houses. While the density is different (apts vs single family) the size is the same and so the transition needs to be made.		N. Iacomini		To be discussed; See Transition Study exhibits
31	402H 7.	Do we know that doors have to be at this length? Does it always make sense or does it cause too much of a regularization of façade?		N. Iacomini		intent is to provide a main street environment with multiple shopfronts, rather than entice large scale retail tenants
32	402K4	needs to be written for preservation area since garden apts are short and in some cases are even of less height than a single family house depending upon its age and roof configuration		N. Iacomini		To be discussed; See Transition Study exhibits
33	403	we need more Arlington possible photos		N. Iacomini		To be revised with Final Draft
34	Pg. 27	need to make upper story #3 as in residential		N. Iacomini		To be revised with Final Draft
35	404	more Arlington like pictures. Why is the fenestration the same for residential as for urban mixed use?		N. Iacomini		No change. This is a permissive range; UMU and UR are similar building forms
36	405 - small apt building	How will this work in Barcroft? And its transition to existing buildings?		N. Iacomini		To be discussed; See Transition Study exhibits
37		And the fenestration the same range as others?		N. Iacomini		No change. This is a permissive range; UMU and UR are similar building forms
38	406	again with needing more apropos pix		N. Iacomini		To be revised with Final Draft
39	Page 38	what is the height to the ridge? Is it as 35 feet midpoint roof in R neighborhoods?		N. Iacomini		FBC regulates height different from main ZO. Height to ridge would depend on individual story height and slope of roof pitch
40	401(F)(5) Siting	As all buildings facades must be built up to the absolute RBL, with only a 30 inch offset area permitted, the inclusion of a ramp to any building entrance would be precluded. Set the permissible offset area to be a minimum of 96", or the width of a ramp compliant with the 2010 ADA Standards of Accessible Design, or put in an exception for a deeper offset area to create a pedestrian-friendly ramped entrance		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Draft FBC has been revised; ramps permitted forward of RBL between clear sidewalk and main entrance. Also, only a min. amount of building has to be placed on the RBL (75%), which allows for additional portions of the buildings to be set back.
41	401(F)(7) Siting, 401	The current FBC draft utilizes references to "handicapped ramps." Terminology such as "handicapped" is increasingly considered derogatory by many in the disability community. Remove the term "handicapped ramp," and replace with "accessible ramps compliant with the current Federal ADA Standards of Accessible Design." Allow for the incorporation into the building design of an accessible ramp without requiring approval of the Zoning Administrator.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Revised

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
42	401(F)(9) Siting	13 feet for future alley construction is not wide enough. Practical Impact: Places pedestrians and those getting in and out of vehicles in danger, and threatens their safety. May even be so limited that individuals with mobility disabilities can't navigate or use the alley (also see comments above - Pg. 9, 301(C)(3) Alleys). 13 feet for future alley construction is not wide enough. Practical Impact: Places pedestrians and those getting in and out of vehicles in danger, and threatens their safety. May even be so limited that individuals with mobility disabilities can't navigate or use the alley (also see comments above - Pg. 9, 301(C)(3) Alleys). Include standards that require, and alley widths that allow, alleys to have sidewalks to enhance navigability and safety for pedestrians using those to get in and out of their residences. Require clear, unimpeded widths that allow for vehicles such as private cars and taxis with side operating wheelchair lifts, and Metro Access, to safely load and unload passengers.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Alley requirements and conditions are still under review
43	403 Height	Prohibits residential units that can be reached by the occupant(s) without intervention of extensive ramping or mechanical intervention such as a lift or elevator. Practical impact: For individuals with a variety of mobility impairments distance, sloping and steps are a significant barrier. Mechanical intervention is always subject to failure of the mechanics and power, thus potentially trapping residents in their home with no way out except to climb steps/stairs which they may or may not be able to do. Being trapped in one's home, especially during any type of emergency situation, has significant life, health and safety ramifications. Make this requirement for a 3 foot raised ground floor optional or remove it. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be considered for the FBC as a mechanism to promote both the principles of visitability of housing and privacy.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Draft FBC is revised. Main entrances for larger buildings must be at grade, and will meet Building Code requirements. Options are included in draft FBC. At grade units are permitted for TH units on certain width streets. Continuing to look at at grade units for small apartment buildings in certain circumstances.
44	403	To ramp up 36" requires, under the 2010 ADA Standards for accessible Design, three 5' level landing areas (bottom, every 30', and top), with a no greater than a 1:12" slope. Any interior ramping will take at least 45 feet to get residents up 36 inches (or 3 feet). For many people with mobility impairments the daily impact on their physical health due to unnecessary barriers contributes to a decrease in physical health and quality of life. Elevators or lifts are another option, however, these add significant costs to construction. In additions see comments in previous bulleted section regarding potential health and safety ramifications of having to completely rely on mechanical devices to facilitate access. Make this requirement for a 3 foot raised ground floor optional or remove it. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be considered for the FBC as a mechanism to promote both the principles of visitability of housing and privacy.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		
45	404 Urban Residential Frontage, 404 (1) RBL length.	See comments and practical implications above under the section that addresses Pg. 21, 401(F)(5) Siting		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Draft FBC has been revised; ramps permitted forward of RBL between clear sidewalk and main entrance. Also, only a min. amount of building has to be placed on the RBL (75%), which allows for additional portions of the buildings to be set back.
46	404 Urban Residential Frontage, 404 (1) Ground Story Height	See comments and practical implications above under the section that addresses Pg. 26, 403 Height. Make this requirement for a 3 foot raised ground floor optional or remove it. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be considered for the FBC as a mechanism to promote both the principles of visitability of housing and privacy.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		
47	404 Use	As the ground floor must be a minimum of 36" in elevation it may actually prohibit any such use as retail space or shop front as it would be an inaccessible place of public accommodation. Practical implications: Potential customers of the retail space created on the 36" high ground floor would not be able to access nor benefit from the goods and services provided therein. This would reduce the number of customers able to enter the retail space and make purchases or take advantage of the services being offered and could be a violation of federal law, thus making the location far less desirable to a retailer or for commercial use.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Ground Story commerce or Retail space will be at grade; no elevated finished floor required
48	405(1) Ground Story height	See comments and practical implications above under the section that addresses Pg. 26, 403 Height . This would prohibit a private citizen from pursuing their own construction using the FBC to build a townhouse with an accessible front door even if they wanted to do so, since the construction of a ramp 45 feet long (with level landing areas) or an elevator in a private townhouse would be prohibitive. It would also be a significant inhibitor and disincentive for a developer to do so. For individuals on fixed and limited incomes with mobility impairments, or older adults who are frail or in failing health, or families with such members, who need affordable but accessible housing, their ability to purchase, rent or live in this housing type along Columbia Pike would effectively be eliminated, by this condition. Make this requirement for a 3 foot raised ground floor optional or remove it. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Revised; TH BES permits at grade entrance on 80' wide streets

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
49	Pg. 34, Façade... shall be built-to the RBL for at least 65% of the RB length	This condition, combined with the 36" elevated ground floor, prohibits visitability using the front entrance, and would prohibit a new resident, or an existing resident/owner who acquires or has a family member who acquires a mobility disability, from retrofitting their home with a ramp or lift to the front entrance. Make this requirement optional or eliminate it.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Draft FBC has been revised; ramps permitted forward of RBL between clear sidewalk and main entrance. Also, only a min. amount of building has to be placed on the RBL (lower percentage in west end subareas accounts for additional topography), which allows for additional portions of the buildings to be set back.
50	Buildable Area	Leaves little, if any opportunity to install a ramp, accessible entrance, or provide for visitability. Make this requirement optional or eliminate it.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		No change. Other regulations permit ramps to be forward of RBL if needed.
51	Building projections ... may include a stoop	Does not provide for front door/front entrance visitability. Permits the intrusion of steps/stairs/hand railings thus narrowing and protruding into the public path of travel on the sidewalk. The mandatory portion of this requirement should be optional or removed, as it eliminates visitability through the front of a residence		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Revised; TH BES permits at grade entrance on 80' wide streets
52	406 Detached Frontage 406(1) Ground Story Height	See comments and practical implications above under the section that addresses Pg. 26, 403 Height. This would prohibit a private citizen from using the FBC to build a detached private home with an at-grade or accessible front door even if they wanted or needed to do so. It would also be a significant inhibitor and disincentive for a developer to do so. Making raised ground floors a requirement means that individuals or families who have children, parents or grandparents with disabilities, failing health or acquired disabilities, could not live in nor have the opportunity to benefit from building, purchasing or renting in this housing type along Columbia Pike. This prohibits visitability using the front entrance, would prohibit a new resident or an existing resident/owner who acquires or has a family member who acquires a mobility disability, from retrofitting their home with a ramp or lift to the front entrance, or at the side. Make this requirement for a 3 foot raised ground floor optional or remove it. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Under further evaluation
53	p19 402.B.2 and p.33	How do the "complete and discrete" composition rules apply to townhouses? The illustrations p.33 (top left, middle right, middle bottom) show repeating facades of considerable length. Clarify?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
54	p20 402.D.1	"Single-family detached residential lot" (or "parcel", on the illustrations) needs definition. Is it any lot used for a single-family detached house? Any lot so zoned, even if otherwise used? Are there any in the District?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
55	p20 402.E.2	Why no maximum roof height? Especially for sites subject to Neighborhood Manners?	1	Carrie Johnson		Roof heights are controlled by roof pitch; to achieve authentic roof pitch this provision is controlling element rather than height
56	p23 402.K.4.3	For bonus stories, presumably residential, a maximum story height of 12 ft seems generous.	1	Carrie Johnson		Story Height includes structural elements
57	p23 402.K.4.4	Bonus height setback plane of 60 degrees next to a single-family lot may be fine for a 5-story building but inadequate for 10 stories. This needs refinement based on actual situations where it may occur.	1	Carrie Johnson		To be discussed; See Transition Study exhibits
58	p25 403.	Be sure all illustrations, especially larger buildings, meet the façade composition criteria.	1	Carrie Johnson		Photos for illustrative purposes only; Note indicates that not all elements are Code compliant; may be helpful to provide a caption indicating the relevant element in the picture
59	p26 Buildable area+Defin.	To count toward private open area, balconies should have minimum dimensions that make them functional, i.e. large enough for someone to sit there.	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
60	p26 Buildable area+Defin.	Clarify whether a rooftop private open area may include furniture, lighting, and/or any structures required by code to accompany a pool.	1	Carrie Johnson		to be further evaluated with Final Draft; Insert language to allow structure associated with roof-top amenities (i.e. enclosure for common bathrooms) which does not count as Story
61	p30	A maximum upper story height of 14 feet for a residential building is very generous.	1	Carrie Johnson		No change. Story Height includes structural elements
62	p30 Buildable area	See comments re p.26 re private open areas (balconies and rooftops).	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
64	p31 Use	Does "neighborhood-serving retail" include professional and medical offices? If so, is 1000 sq.ft. enough?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised. See Section 8 Building Use Tables
65	p34 Buildable area 2.b	What is a "deck" (undefined)? How far above ground may it be? May it protrude into setback areas?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
66	p38 Lot size	How do the dimensions and setbacks for newly subdivided lots here relate to those by-right in the relevant zoning districts? Why offer different options here?	1	Carrie Johnson		to be evaluated
67	402.B.3.C	are veneers possible/allowed?		T. Karantonis		to be evaluated
68	402.D.3. Garden wall	Do garden walls have to extend completely to the RBL? There may be benefits for stopping within property and allowing 'openness' at RBL from one property to another		T. Karantonis		Revised
69	402.F.2	Need a graphic to explain		staff		Graphic will be provided w/ Final Draft
70	402.F.2	Prefer chamfered corners, or other special treatments. Does this provision prohibit? May want to allow for more than only Shopfront condition (i.e. to UMU and UR BES)		T. Karantonis		Chamfered corners permitted for shopfront conditions.
71	402.F.4	Can we have some flexibility? Do we need Street Wall for 100% unbuilt frontage?		T. Karantonis		Further evaluation as part of Final Draft
72	402.F.5	What about adding/allowing for some bays to step back from RBL to allow for more outdoor seating? Other relief? (i.e. for some portion of min. RBL requirement, allow flexibility for some bays to have additional 30"-36" setback		T. Karantonis		This can be accommodated within the 25% allowance for buildings to be off RBL
73	402.H.6	Allow for solar shades to project from Façade (ditto for Building Projections in BES)		staff		Revised
74	402.H.8	need illustration		staff		
75	402.H.9	Does this duplicate H.5?		staff		Revised
76	402.H.10	Do we need to regulate that bays project at 90 degrees?		staff		Revised
77	UMU BES	Does the NAP indicate that Retail is optional in Foxcroft?		TK/IM		NAP indicated that containing retail to existing nodes is encouraged
78	UR Retail BES	Are the greater than 1/4 mile locations viable for retail? Why only 1,000 sq ft? What is methodology for this size limitation? Need to be able to map these locations/make it clear in Code where these locations apply - i.e. 1/4mile radius ??		staff		Dimension is taken from NAP. Can be further evaluated; intent is for use to be provided if market demands; space is local, neighborhood-serving and size is therefore smaller more in keeping with proposed building forms further from Pike frontage
79	UR, UMU, Street Walls	Not clear why different scale walls and gate openings are needed. Would prefer to use same rules. Street wall height for UR seems more conducive, less overwhelming.		staff		Revised; different scales due to different building forms

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
80	UMU BES	Shopfront Regs: 1. should reference 402.F.2		staff		Revised
81	UMU BES	Upper Story uses should reference Section 8		staff		Revised
82	UR BES	Why are different RBL % set for east vs. west of GM Drive?		staff		Due to different topographical conditions; additional flexibility and opportunity for more green
83	Attic story	Make regulation clear that space does not count against Stories. May need to look at Definition and pull wording from there into Regulation		staff		Revised
84	Lot Building Limit Line	New Concept: Should be emphasized and highlighted to community about what it is/why needed		staff		No change.
85	402 A	I'm not understanding this paragraph. Can you provide example? If option to shift by 50', what happens if that 50' hits the end of the block?		S. Pryor		No change. Extending BES frontage type can occur around / wrap around a corner
86	402 B 1	allows no wall of glass, allows no reflection of other buildings in area (e.g. the architectural school example victor provided); doesn't allow big shop windows; doesn't allow stain glass. I do not agree with these restrictions.		S. Pryor		Fenestration %s have not changed
87	401 D 3	what if single family neighbor would rather kep the sunlight? Garden wall definition shows masonry only. Why not steel / iron or other option which allows sense of privacy but doesn't kill the plants? If homeowner doesn't want the area restricted? why not green wall option?		S. Pryor		No change. Masonry wall still specified to provide more protection for ex single-family detached to new construction. Plantings could be provided in addition to garden wall.
88	401 F 4	why?? We should allow steel, iron, green or other options if 2 parties agree		S. Pryor		No change. Street wall intended to anchor the back of sidewalk and frame the street edge/public realm
89	401 F 9	any requirements for turn around area? Or assuming because an alley connects to street, then turn around is not needed?		S. Pryor		Alleys may terminate into a parking garage. In some instances if an alley creates a dead end, a turn around may be required to meet fire department standards
90	401 G	disagree. What about townhomes in the new areas under these restrictions?		S. Pryor		No change. FBC does not permit parking in front yards, or within 30' of RBL, except for corner lot TH units. Garage entrances for townhouse development would generally occur from an alley at rear of lot
91	401 H 2	there are multiple townhome / duplex arrangements along Col Pike in Penrose at Westhampton Mews and the development next to it which has multiple windows. 2b contradicts and does not allow the ground floor residents to have windows even though they have garden wall. Disagree with 2b in particular.		S. Pryor		Revised for clarity
92	401 H 3	concept for stoops was to have them IN the common area. I'm not understanding this restriction		S. Pryor		No change. If a stoop is provided on the side of a building, it shall be at least 5 feet from the property line
93	401 H 4	why not allow glass enclosure to create bay window type variance? See Crystal City and Pentagon Row buildings. Allowed for Halstead, too. So why isn't it allowed? The variance allows interest.		S. Pryor		No change. Bay Windows are permitted. Envisioned look for balconies is open to air/sky
94	401 H 8	why are the privacy fences required to be opaque? Why not allow steel, iron, green, etc other options		S. Pryor		No change. To provide more privacy between adjacent uses
95	401 H 9	duplicate of #5?		S. Pryor		Revised
96	401 I	Civic Buildings should NOT be exempt from standards		S. Pryor		Civic Buildings with public uses will go through a different type of review process than typical FBC projects. These buildings would require a different level of community review and would require a different architectural character to suit the civic use, and therefore are intended to have relief from these standards.
97	403 intro	everything is historic for presentation, where are current structures? The Woost in lower left is bland		S. Pryor		Additional photos will be added with Final Draft
98	403 details	9' is not standard stud height		S. Pryor		Revised; 8'-10"
99	403 details 2	street wall height of 12'?!? Too tall, completely opaque structure; disagree with concept of opaque street walls, should allow steel, iron, green, other options		S. Pryor		Revised heights
100	3 details 3 upper stor	Why are religious institutions not allowed? You've just restricted the baptist church on Scott Street by the restriction to commercial or residential only.		S. Pryor		See Building Use Table
101	404 intro	again with historic view only. Multiple comments from residents beyond me that we don't want to keep repeating Filmore Gardens		S. Pryor		Revised
102	404 height	9' is not standard stud height		S. Pryor		Revised heights
103	404 elements	Street wall restrictions contradicts the blank wall lengths in fenestration section. Street wall along Westhampton Mews allows for sound to travel up and not directly into the homes. It's old technique from stone walls in New England to deflect the street noise. With restrictions as designed, Westhampton Mews if redeveloped should be turned around and face Col Pike?		S. Pryor		Correct, if this property were to redevelop following FBC, the front of the building would face Columbia Pike and/or other RBLs.
104	404 use	Penrose east end is completely Urban Residential, but we have a church at corner of Scott and Col Pike. Restriction only allows Residential - which precludes religious institutions		S. Pryor		See Building Use Table
105	405 Height	A completely opaque street wall is not desired in all cases, should allow steel, iron, green or other options. 8' is a prison wall type environment in a small townhome setting. More typically neighborhood fences are 3' with option to encourage neighbors to speak -- opaque fence does NOT encourage this..		S. Pryor		No change to materials; Revised heights
106	405 Siting	"gap of 10 to 20 feet is required between EACH building" doesn't permit use of duplexes, which is traditional Arlington structure. Remove this restriction or put in caveat for the more dense. Why not allow homeowner to park on their own property if it does not block the sidewalk? We have mix of townhomes, a few single family, religious institution -- this section doesn't allow any of it. Is parking access allowed from alley? Picture shows it on page 35, but not clear from text		S. Pryor		Multiple Townhouse buildings, min. 18' wide, can be grouped, with a maximum length of 120 feet. For example, a grouping of 2 townhouse buildings could be separated by a 10-20 feet open area from an adjacent grouping of 2 townhouse buildings. Alternatively, a grouping of 6 townhouse buildings, 20' wide, could be built without exceeding the 120' regulation.
107	405 Use	this is the existing structure for some of east end in Penrose with townhomes next to Westhampton Mews and few single family homes with max 2-3 stories. Is goal / purpose to destroy the single family townhomes on Col Pike? If yes, then I do not agree. Keep home ownership as option, not just rental properties along the pike.		S. Pryor		The FBC is consistent with the policies set forth in the NAP. If redevelopment were to occur following FBC, a different form of development is envisioned from what exists today calling for larger, multi-family buildings. The FBC would not regulate rental versus condominium ownership. The NAP envisioned a more appropriate building form for Columbia Pike frontage than rear-facing townhomes as currently exists.
108	405 use	residential use only - so owners cannot work from home? E.g. web designer who does not have traditional store front		S. Pryor		See Building Use Table

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
109	Neighborhood manners:	Carver Homes and Arlington View Terrace sit deep in a single-family home neighborhood, with many homes of the 1-story rambler style/small 1 ½ story Capes, with building heights no greater than 20 feet to roof peaks. Special thought must be given to prevent towering structures among low height homes. For example, the townhouse style feasibly could result in a building height (whether commercially feasible or not) to the top plate of the 3 rd floor of 50-feet, and to the peak of over 60-feet. This outcome cannot be permitted by the code, regardless of whether or not it might not be considered commercially feasible. A rethinking of neighborhoods manners, in particular as it relates to building heights, must be undertaken for Arlington View and special rules developed to be applied to preserve/integrate the Neighborhood Manners of Arlington View. Note: under the draft code, the <i>minimum height</i> a townhouse could be built would be approximately 40-45 feet to the peak.		T. Barlow		Ultimate Height and Story Height for Townhouse/Small Apartment BES has been revised. By-Right zoning regs remain intact, which allows height of single-family detached 35' to mid-point of pitched roof
110	Height	See Comment on Neighborhood Manners with regard to building height. In addition, street space entrances should not be of any less frequency than 18-feet, regardless of impact of such a rule on number building units that can be placed on the Carver site (e.g., resulting in less than 60 townhouse units/80 household units). Townhouse units less than 18 feet in width have been established to be poor outcomes for established single family neighborhoods, and also lead to poor utilization of space among other negative results.		T. Barlow		No change.
111	English Basement Units	Although currently prohibited from use in the Arlington View community, English Basements must be permitted for the Carver Property, otherwise the objective of permitting "piggy-back" units for some of the townhouse units will be difficult to achieve in attractive, efficient manner. The draft code appears to drive all inhabitants of a "piggy-backed"/"stacked" unit into a single entry-door at a single elevation, with all of the attendant negative economic and social consequences for the units and inhabitants. The County and consultants are encouraged to reconsider banning the English Basement model from the Carver Property as permitting them could result in attractive styles, uses and afford owners/occupants with enhanced privacy and ease of access.		T. Barlow		Revised; English Basement units would be permitted on 14th Street, where street width would be 80' with wider Dooryard.
112	ELEMENTS 3. Each townhouse and/or small apartment building shall include a functioning street-space entry	See comment above. The code should permit up to two street-space entries to accommodate the English Basement model, whether used as a single family home, or as a two-unit dwelling, or single family home with option for future accessory unit.		T. Barlow		Revised
113	USE	It is not clear if an English Basement can be a stand-alone single family dwelling unit, or is only considered as an "accessory" to a single family dwelling unit. Other parts of the zoning code permit accessory units for existing single family homes. These provisions in the Residential Form based code must be harmonized so it is clear what is intended. The preferable outcome would be to NOT classify an English Basement as only an accessory unit, but should mean a stand-alone single family unit (see note about commitment to permit "piggy-back" units for Carver Homes.		T. Barlow		Revised for clarity
114	BES / finished floor elevation and alley access	Multiple issues		B. Siegel/K Guernsey		See separate handout (to be posted separately)
Part 5: Street-Space & Open Space Standards						
1		Dover Kohl, Ferrell Madden and County staff have done excellent work making trees an integral part of the streetscape, as well as including tree planting specifications in the FBC draft.		Steve Campbell (UFC)		No change.
2	pg 52, 504.f.4	No requirement for visitor bike racks to meet Arlington Class II/III standards (from MTP)? Just "u racks recommended"?	1	Chris Slatt		Revised
3	pg. 49/2.a.i	Hopefully language will be added to allow the 110 sq ft of soil surface area for isolated trees to have additional, contiguous, uncompacted soil volume provided for tree roots through the use of cantilevered or bridged pavement. Ideally soil volume for each tree would be 600-1000 sq ft.		S. Campbell		No change. Soil area shown for Isolated tree condition is a minimum.
4	pg. 43	Regarding the 130/72 street cross-section, would it be possible to include a 'typical' dimension for the mid-block tree lawn (it appears to be approx. 10').		S. Campbell		Doc Formatting will continue with Final Draft. Center median is a shared turn lane, 10' wide.
5	p41/502/C.3	3. contribute to ultimate sustainability. Trees planted with significant soil volume will improve tree health, survivability, appearance, and size. Native trees and plants create a walkable, comfortable environment; they contribute to privacy, the reduction of noise and air pollution, shade, maintenance of the natural habitat, conservation of water, and rainwater management.)(suggested additions in red)		S. Campbell		may require further review to confirm suggested edits
6	p54-5/D,E,F	1. Is it a change to have a developer select the park amenities? Is community input appropriate?		S. Campbell		Review process will continue to be refined. Process would include reps from PRC and UF, DPR staff. Part of analysis by staff would be to assess need for particular amenities in immediate area
7	page 49/ 504. A.3	"In addition to his property, the owner must maintain the following areas: Should examples of 'maintain' be given so the property owner knows what is to be expected? Is it simply to sweep and pick up litter, or, for example, in terms of street trees, is the owner responsible for watering the tree(s) when needed?		S. Campbell		Details are still in progress
8	p41 502.C.1	Change to "pedestrian activity, with walkable streets ..." for better grammar. Don't put "walkable" in quotes unless streets are in fact not safe	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
9	p42 503.Bff	Uninformed question: how do these specifications relate to specs for these or comparable streets in the MTP? Will existing MTP parameters continue to apply to existing streets within the District?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised. Shared Use Trail is terminology used in MTP with similar meaning here for both ped and bike shared access.
10	p51 504.E.1	Are the 2012 Traffic and Street Lighting Specifications the right ones to reference? Do they cover the county's transition to LEDs?	1	Carrie Johnson		Correct

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
11	p53 505.C.1	Does "surrounded by street trees" mean that urban public spaces must have street trees even along the edges that are not along streets or pedestrian ways?	1	Carrie Johnson		Correct. Regulating Plan shows public open spaces abutting streets in most cases; some will be adjacent to a building with only a public sidewalk. In those locations, public sidewalk with street trees will be required to frame with space and continue walkways. Text revised.
12	p54-5 505.D,E,F	Re "programmed" vs. "open and unprogrammed" parts of urban spaces: both the terms and the distinctions need more thought. "Programmed" suggests managed or scheduled activities, not just the placement of objects such as tables. "Furnished" might work better. Also, the language suggests that the "open and unprogrammed area" is to be used for nothing -- not organized gatherings, not landscaping with seating walls, not shaded respite areas, and not outdoor eating space. Is that what's intended?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
13	p55 Table 1	Providing a menu of amenities is a creative approach. Re specifics: (a) Food trucks are seldom fixed though vending kiosks could be. (b) Why no mention of benches or other general-purpose seating? C) water features are high-maintenance, seasonal, and often less durable than other art forms. (d) One feature from each category won't be enough for most of these areas.	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
14	p56 506	Several frontage type illustrations and street-space specifications suggest that most dooryards should be green. However, if there are any planting standards or requirements for dooryards, I missed them. Perhaps they should be added here?	1	Carrie Johnson		Dooryards will have more flexibility for the type of landscaping than street trees. However, evergreen trees will be prohibited to avoid creating a barrier at the back of the clear sidewalk.
15	P. 46 ST 54/36	Reducing the sidewalk width from 6' to 5' is still giving me heartburn as I commented on the draft NP last year. I understand the intent is to be very thoughtful about where this should be allowed and the "street type key" handout we received 3-5-13 shows these spots in all 4 areas. I'd like more info about the rationale and the chance for the group to discuss at one of our upcoming meetings.		Linda Dye		Revised. ST 54' is revised to ST 58' to account for wider sidewalk and adjusted parking/gutter space at 8'
16	P. 49	Street Trees: For the original FBC nodes areas we are using an area of 60 sq feet (12X5) per tree. This shows 90 sq feet. Can we get the rationale for the difference.		Linda Dye		Neighborhoods Area Plan envisions "greener" conditions. Larger soil areas are due to larger tree pits, and desire to have more underground soil volume for overall tree health
17	P. 52 E.5.	Street Furniture: Are there any requirements for particular styles, quantity, spacing. Does this include bike racks.		Linda Dye		Revised
18	P. 56 A.	Preserved Natural Areas: Item 2.d. requires trash cans for these areas. P.54 D. Plazas and E. Mini-Parks and P. 55 F. Neighborhood Parks do not mention such a requirement - and should. Living next to a one-acre corner park I know how important and helpful they are.		Linda Dye		Revised
19	506.A	How will limits of Natural Areas be defined? Is a "limits of land disturbance" needed? Check to confirm limits are accurate with aerial photos (i.e. area around Col Grove is NOT shown in NAP, but included in Reg Plan)		TK/IM		Revised
20	506.A	Unclear what the actual regulations are; what a developer must do		IM		Revised
21		Should allow for/promote Shade coverings and vegetation to make more aesthetic pleasing and control heat islands particularly during summer months and maintain usability of plazas/parks				Revised
22	504.B	Continuous tree lawns: discourage turf (high water requirements); prefer ground cover instead; drought tolerant		staff		No change. Options provided. Ground cover is another option.
23	504.B.2.c	"climbing vines": not good under Street Trees; should remove		staff		Revised
24	504.E.	confirm reference to County standard also includes new policies for LED lighting		staff		County lighting policies include standards for LED lighting
25	505.D, E. F.	soil profile below "pervious paving"		staff		options for structured soil or other techniques are permitted; further review would occur at the time of project review
26	506.A.2.d	should also mention "recycle" containers		staff		Revised
27	46 ST 54/36 p. 52 E	I would really like to see 6' rather than 5' sidewalks		L. Dye		Revised
28	p. 52 E.5. Street Furniture	I think we need to spell out details of what we wa		L. Dye		Revised
29	p. 55 F.4. Table 1 Urban Public Space Amenities	At the April 11th meeting we discussed how much should be spelled out in terms of planning amenities. After much thought, I think we should do so as shown in Table 1		L. Dye		Revised
30	F.3	indicates the developer should consult with the county. We need to be clear that would include an opportunity for the surrounding community to provide input before county approval.				Review process will continue to be refined for Mini-Parks which would remain Developer responsibility. Process would include reps from PRC and UF, DPR staff. Part of analysis by staff would be to assess need for particular amenities in immediate area. Process for NP and Plazas would be different and follow typical DPR master planning processes which involve broad groups.
31	503 b	street style does not allow buses through neighborhoods, which are 10.5' wide mirror to mirror. Penrose has multiple bus lines running through our existing neighborhood		S. Pryor		No change. Street cross sections are appropriate for bus routes and consistent with County policies
32	503	need to clarify on the drawings the actual widths expected for parking and driving, just as is done for sidewalk and dooryard; assuming only 7' for parking		S. Pryor		Doc Formatting will continue with Final Draft.
33	504 a	groundcovers instead of grass - thank you!		S. Pryor		No change.
34	504 b	does structural soil actually work for trees		S. Pryor		Yes. No change.
35	504 d	add options for smaller/shorter trees for under the power lines instead of having to cut larger trees severely back		S. Pryor		FBC projects are required to place utilities underground. Evaluating whether requirement should stand for SFD Detached frontage or offer relief.
36	505 d	Penrose residents generally not in favor of more paving with Urban Plaza at corner of Courthouse and col Pike. Need option to allow for green space.		S. Pryor		Revised. Plazas (2) have Columbia Pike frontage and are envisioned to be heavily used for public gatherings and pedestrian traffic. As such, these spaces would have a higher percentage of paved surfaces than other park categories. However, plazas will be required to include a certain amount of unpaved pervious surface and a subset of space for vegetated space. Plazas are proposed for County responsibility to design, construct, and maintain. Public participation process for these would follow typical DPR master planning process.
37	505 f	parking SHOULD be required for parks and other destinations. Consider single parent trying to have picnic in destination park outside of very short walk. Would you want to carry a cooler, push stroller and have hand free to 2 small additional children?		S. Pryor		No change. Off-street surface parking is not envisioned for new public open spaces. However, most new open spaces would b adjacent to or near new on-street parking spaces.

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
38	505 f 4	not fully correct list and should not be restricted. Need flexibility for community tastes to change over time.		S. Pryor		No change. Amenity list is provided to give developers and community members some degree of predictability on what can be achieved within the proposed public spaces. If the list needs to be amended in the future, a zoning ordinance amendment can occur. This is a standard applied Countywide.
39	505 f 5	if public easement, then developer has to take the liability and county is exempt from tort -- this is awful!		S. Pryor		
40	506 a	yes preserved natural areas should be 4th category. Do not just preserve existing, but attempt to expand		S. Pryor		
41	506 b	how much community involvement is needed? Consider NCAC program for established program with structure and process instead of setting up yet another process/hoops		S. Pryor		
42	506 other	where is acknowledgement to purchase property when fits with county needs? E.g. the homeless shelter in Clarendon?		S. Pryor		Natural Areas would not be public spaces; may offer public access where trails bisect spaces Review process will continue to be refined for Mini-Parks which would remain Developer responsibility. Process would include reps from PRC and UF, DPR staff. Part of analysis by staff would be to assess need for particular amenities in immediate area. Process for NP and Plazas would be different and follow typical DPR master planning processes which involve broad groups.
43	502 Intent C(1) The Urban Space Standards: 1. Establish an environment that encourages and facilitates pedestrian activity. "Walkable" streets that are comfortable, efficient, safe, and interesting	It is clearly in the vision and regulating plan that all pedestrian areas be navigable and usable by all manner of pedestrian – on foot, using scooters or wheelchairs, pushing children in strollers, etc. Walkable in (C)(1) should not be in quotes. A walkable street should be defined as navigable, usable and functional for ALL pedestrians so as to ensure opportunity, equity of use and benefit to ALL.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Revised
44	Pg. 46, 54 ft. Street S width	This does not accurately reflect the Street-Space Task force and neighborhood requirements that sidewalks never be any less than 6 feet wide. Practical implications: less comfort and more inconvenience for pedestrians. Reinstate the 6 feet minimum		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Revised
45	Pg. 47, Alley	This does not accurately reflect the Street-Space Task force and neighborhood requirements that sidewalks never be any less than 6 feet wide. Practical implications: less comfort and more inconvenience for pedestrians. See comments and practical implications above under the section that addresses Pg. 9, 301(C)(3) Alleys. Additionally, as proposed, the alleys have no allocation for pedestrian space or use. As the Code is currently presented there is either extremely limited or no accessible front entrance into certain residential building types. Thus, the Alley's become a crucial, vital and integral part of the accessible pedestrian pathways, as anyone who cannot go up or down a 36" stoop, steps or porch must use the alley's as their primary means of getting in and out of the building. Also, since nothing, including trashcans can be kept in the front of a building, people will haul their trashcans by means of the alleys to the front for pick up.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Alley requiremens and conditions are still under review
46	Pg. 53, 505 Urban Public Space	Practical implications: Accessible features must be designed in from the beginning and not applied as an afterthought. There is no reason why accessibility for persons with disabilities should be viewed as ruining public space or imposing some onerous burden. Public space must be preserved for the public, and that means all of the public not just a privileged few. The intent statement should clearly articulate that the intent is for all public space – urban plazas, mini-parks, neighborhood parks, be designed used universal design principles so that they are usable by ALL people along Columbia Pike.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		
47	Pg. 55, Neighborhood Parks	This section provides a useful placeholder for reminding developers of the need to ensure utilization of universal design in these public spaces. The FBC should note that amenities must be accessible to all by complying with principles of universal design and applicable federal standards.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Neighborhood Parks are recommended to be space dedicated by property owner to County. County would take responsibility to master plan space with community, detail design, construct, and maintain park.
Part 6: General Architecture Standards						
1	overall	photos indicate elements that conflict with regs; and may not be issues, so why restrict?		all		
2		All photo examples are older buildings; should incorporate some buildings constructed sine 2008; to indicate some contemporary designs are feasible; avoid sending a signal that only possible designs match older traditions		staff		More photos will be provided with Final Draft
3		Do not want an outcome that only results in traditional architecture; not all urban contemporay styles are bad, result in poor outcomes		staff		
4	overall	FAR TOO STRICT		S. Pryor		
5		overall limiting and restrictive; recreating look of Old Town, Georgetown		all		
6	overall	Gen Arch Stds surpass existing Code Arch Stds, this may be unnecessary and too restrictive		all		
7	602	Building wall materials - very limited; too limited		all		
8	602.A.3	Brick uniformity - limiting (photos show brick coloring that is not always uniform)		C. Gordon		See separate response handout on Arch Stds
9	604	Pitched roofs - not confident the aesthetic outweighs the disadvantages (on taller, larger building forms)		all		
10		- pitched roofs preclude mechanical equipment on roof and requires surface area		all		
11		- precludes access for residents		all		
12		- can pitch be provided at Façade, but terminate so as to create a flat roof for roof access/equipment (mansard with dormers on frontage with flat away from RBL)		all		
13		- scale of building footprints for MF buildings will be large; pitched roofs will look very large/massive; reconsider for taller buildings		C. Gordon		
14		-Need to see real examples of pitched roofs for taller buildings, higher than 4-5 stories		all		
15		- Explain the aesthetic trying to achieve		all		

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
16		- perhaps incentive to create pitched roof is by allowing Attic Story; although still does not negate other issues		C. Gordon		
17	62-604.A.	If a building is designated Urban Residential or Townhouse/Small Apartment within the Special Neighborhoods why is there not an option for a flat roof? Your examples for Urban Residential all have flat roofs, page 29. The Townhomes photos show row houses with flat roof, page 33.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		See separate response handout on Arch Stds/Roof style to be further evaluated
18	609.A. 2	brackets - not needed (photos show examples without brackets and balcony design is fine)		C. Gordon		
19	610.A.6	railing color - why? Do not need to regulate color / finish to match; may be a reason to allow for deviation; could include a finish standard to avoid rusting or unfinished paint which would mildew or weather		C. Gordon		Revised
20	613	Column regs - too much; unnecessary		all		Columns are not required elements; if columns used, stds apply
21	614.4	12' wide doors are common/standards for access into MF building garages		C. Gordon		Revised
22	615.A.1	6" mullion - 4" would also be sufficient; should be permitted		C. Gordon		Revised
23	615.A.2	Fixed windows would be likely for some portion of all residential windows		all		No change
24	615.A.4	Not sure needed; Shutter brackets or clips instead of shutter dogs		staff		Revised; if used, brackets should be used
25	615.A.5	will be hard to regulate and/or achieve 40% of glazing when meeting building code and green building stds; why not say another way more simply? And, remove 2nd sentence - unnecessary		C. Gordon		Revised
26	615.A.6	"non-reflective": conflicts with green building stds which have some level of reflective glass; with high performance windows		C. Gordon		Revised
27	615.A.8	should consider allowing fiberglass, and also ___ for window material		C. Gordon		Revised
28	618	mechanical equipment can be screened by landscaping; what view would be critical to screen with wall/fence if landscaping allowed?		all		Revised indicating wall/fence required when otherwise visible from a street/sidewalk
29	601.A.1	"Bldg construction draw its ornament and variety from the arch traditions of NoVa and surrounding region" - confusing. Are we trying to emulate something from the past? If this will be weighed during project review, then there isn't as much flexibility in applying the other arch regulations. Coupled with the narrow arch stds, perception is this will create colonial, classic revival style buildings only.		all		Revised
30	58-602.B.1	There appears to be no accommodation for additional materials; metal, metal panels, ceramic tile, glass, cast in place concrete, or decorative concrete masonry units.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Revised
31	60-603.B.2	The only functioning load bearing lintel type allowed is shown in picture #1, the steel lintel. In reality, it is only supporting the brick veneer. Any new construction will use a loose lintel or steel beam to support the veneer brick detailing. The restrictions defined here do not allow for any Modern or contemporary detailing. For example, this would eliminate any of the corner windows so typical in Arlington garden style apartment complexes.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Revised
32	60-603.D.2	Is the use of metal, aluminum, copper, etc. not allowed for parapet copings and flashings?	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		to be further evaluated
33	74-615A.1	This requirement appears to eliminate all horizontal, square, or mixed operable and fixed groupings? Is this the intent?	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		Intent is for vertical proportioned windows
34	602	Do we need to make material areas and/or percentages? Is an all frame building at the pike desirable again?		N. Iacomini		FBC won't dictate a particular construction type (i.e. concrete vs. frame)
35	602B	Is 602B limiting to those materials?		N. Iacomini		Revised to allow additional materials
36	p57 601.A	Why "architectural traditions of Northern Virginia and the surrounding region" instead of "Arlington and ..."?	1	Carrie Johnson		Revised
37	p74 615	Are there any specifications for window screens?	1	Carrie Johnson		No
38	p78 618.A.2	"Visible from an adjacent street or sidewalk" is not a very clear standard for screening.	1	Carrie Johnson		to be further evaluated
39	p 62	Roof materials: should allow light colored roof materials to meet Solar Reflective Index; should permit solar shingles; also allow recycled rubber shingles that look like slate				Flat roofs may be light colored; pitched roof materials have not changed
40	p 62	Should allow for solar panels; need to confirm if permitted to be on roof facing a street		staff		Revised
41	p78	is solar OK without screening?		staff		to be further evaluated
42	p. 57 Part 6.	At the April 11th meeting we discussed how prescriptive these should be. In each section, I was hoping we could just describe what is prohibited rather than long lists of what is acceptable but then repeatedly found myself thinking - no, we better spell this out. I would find it acceptable to describe only what is prohibited if we can figure out how to keep from getting results we don't want.		L. Dye		
43	602 a	materials list far too restrictive, consider current technology; pictures and examples still bland; doesn't allow for green wall masonry completely traditional, why not showing modern options? Headers for the 3 block doesn't make sense to not allow,		S. Pryor		Revised
44	603 b	not showing curved arch option which is traditional		S. Pryor		to be further evaluated
45	604 a	symmetrical requirement is ridiculous for roof, there are many interesting options; why are you pushing cookie cutter??		S. Pryor		No change. For predicatability and quality outcomes/construction
46	604 d	does this allow for roof deck?		S. Pryor		Revised
47	605 a	all pictures are traditional again		S. Pryor		More photos will be added with Final Draft
48	606 a	allow full windows on corners, current structure / requirements doesn't allow it; req doesn't allow frosted or staining -- do not agree		S. Pryor		to be further evaluated
49	607 a	restrictions prevent green / solar architecture to allow for awnings above 1st floor 2. minimum underside clearance of 10' -- 10 sq feet? 5 - restriction to fabric doesn't make sense, should allow hard surface; 6. doesn't make sense - shiny allows for metal		S. Pryor		Revised to allow solar shades (canopies) affixed to buildings; canopies are by definition part of the architecture and have broader materials
50	608 a	stone not allowed? Frosted, stained or other interesting treatments not allowed; tile not allowed -- allow myriad of products, NOT just wood or metal		S. Pryor		NO change.
51	611	remember that single family houses exist, townhomes exist, duplexes exist and are all part of the fabric of Col Pike - 7' is too deep for smaller living structures; again all pictures are traditional, nothing current or modern		S. Pryor		No change.
52	613	should allow for flush install of columns, otherwise rot out wood or material on the lip extending past roof/structure; again ALL traditional pictures		S. Pryor		No change.

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
53	614	should allow for frosted, stained or other interesting treatments in the door		S. Pryor		These are not prohibited
54	615 a	wood only for shutters is ridiculous; should allow stained or frosted glass or other modern technology treatments; where are the bird safety restrictions?; again ALL traditional pictures		S. Pryor		No change.
55	617	definitions declare garden and street walls as opaque in other sections; should allow for green walls or other building materials		S. Pryor		NO change. Intent is to provide more privacy for adjacent sfd dwellings.
56	Building Wall Materials	All materials should be permitted unless on a "prohibited" list, with fully articulated, transparent reasons for not permitting the material. For example, it is not explained why EIFS, Styrofoam and similar materials are prohibited. ICFs (Insulated Concrete Forms) are a very efficient (architecturally, energy, etc) product and there is no reason to prohibit their use. An internal assessment that a product might not be commercially feasible, and therefore should be prohibited, must not be left to the County or consultants; let the market dictate such outcomes. In addition, whether applied manually, or sprayed on, products have matured to the point where both are ideal outcomes, and none should be discriminated against.		T. Barlow		EIFS has not been proven in the past to be a durable, permanent building wall material.
57	Building Wall Materials C. Townhouses & Detached Single-Family Houses	See comment above. Optional: I would recommend that "pastel" colors of HardiPlank and similar materials be prohibited, in particular in Arlington View. They clearly do not mesh with any historical past and any future vision for Arlington View. The historic Gray house in Arlington View should set the tone/standard for future construction in Arlington View.		T. Barlow		No change. Regulations would not reach that level of prescriptivity.
58	Roofs	Flat roofs must be permitted. Banning flat roofs severely limits application of modern green-roof technologies and is contrary to the vision established by the County Board for Arlington to lead the way through greater commitment to a sustainable community. Again, prejudging feasibility of technologies must be avoided and such outcomes must be decided by builders/developers based on the needs of the current market. Flat roofs can be not only attractive, but can provide other advantages to the builder/developer/homeowner and community.		T. Barlow		Revised
59	Windows	Lists for materials should be based on materials clearly not desirable/prohibited, not approved lists. For example, what materials would the County and consultants prohibit as a finish materials for windows? A fiberglass technology is out there with very good technical and "green" attributes and should not be excluded. If an "approved" model list is used at all, seeking a variance to use of such materials must be expedient and with minimal cost. In any case, reasons for prohibiting a product must be clearly articulated and otherwise transparent to the builder/developer/owner/citizenry.		T. Barlow		No change. Intent of Code is to provide a set of standards that can be applied administratively, and to provide some degree of predictability.
60	Pg. 70, 611 Porches and 612 Stoops	This directly contradicts the meaning, intent and spirit behind the concept of Visitability in the regulating plan. Practical implications: it subverts the intent of the Columbia Pike neighbors to create a community that is livable, walkable, and universally accessible to all. It turns a class of Arlington residents, their family members, and their friends and visitors into second class citizens by ensuring that they cannot enter through one's private home by the front door. Remove this requirement. Consider that many persons with disabilities and older persons would appreciate the option of a ground floor level residence that is automatically accessible without the need for further intervention to ensure accessibility of access and egress. Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be considered for the FBC as a mechanism to promote both the principles of visitability of housing and privacy.		B. Siegel/K Guernsey		Draft FBC has been revised to allow TH units without stoops and elevated ground stories on 80' wide streets. See separate response handout on finished floor elevation. NAP indicated dual goals for visitability and privacy. FBC will not conflict with ADA requirements, which allows for ramps and elevators to make grade transitions. All entrances to large buildings will be Building Code compliant.
61	Pg. 76, 616 Accessibility	A five inch front entry would have to be ramped out five feet, as any change in level over ¼ of an inch is considered to be inaccessible. Many of the accessibility methods prescribed in the draft FBC make assumptions about homeowners and visitors with disabilities that may not be valid. For example, it is not accurate to say that all persons with disabilities: Will necessarily own or have access to a car to serve their transportation needs. Modified vehicles can be prohibitively expensive, and not everyone can necessarily drive even a modified vehicle. Many persons with disabilities, be they homeowners or visitors, rely exclusively upon public transport. ; Will necessarily be able to independently navigate the distance from the rear of their building to the front. This may be particularly true if the residence in question is towards the middle of the block and there are no alleys close to the residence, and especially if the alley is not pedestrian-friendly. The NAP envisages increased use of public transportation by all persons, and thus it will be important to ensure that all residents, regardless of age, disability, etc can have easy access to public transportation. Providing front-door accessibility to the street for all residents is thus important in encouraging a cultural shift of the neighbourhood away from a car-centred culture.		B. Siegel/K Guernsey		Revised accessibility design options in draft FBC

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
62		Flush should be defined as "no greater change in level than ¼ of an inch from the adjacent sidewalk/fronting walkway elevation. Practical implications: Compliance with current federal accessibility design standards. Improved livability and visitability for all members of the community, whether they ambulate on their feet, with wheels, with mobility devices such as crutches, braces, canes, walkers, scooters, wheelchairs, etc., and regardless of physical capacity or ability. The requirement that the ground floor be no less than 36" from the at-grade level of the sidewalk should be removed so as to allow for a simple, convenient, readily and easily accessible front entry into all manner and type of housing type. In addition, there should be a minimum requirement that 75% of all units on the ground floor and 25% of all other units, or at least one, be accessible in any new construction. Practical implications: Improves on walkability, pedestrian access, reduced dependence on cars, by creating housing stock that is accessible to public transportation. Improved livability and visitability, more diversity, housing stock that meets the needs of young, old, disabled, non-disabled, and that adapts to the needs and changes in the lives of the residents, encourages inter-generational families to stay together, keeps residents in their homes longer, reduces the number of people who are forced to give up their homes as they age and life circumstances change/evolve. Eliminates the creation of a physical, social and civil society that relegates a portion of its population to second class citizenry.		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		All required buildings will be ADA/Building Code Compliant. Larger buildings under this code will have entrances at grade.
63		Eliminate the favoritism and higher priority for "privacy" in section 616(b) over the value expressed by citizens and the regulating plan for visitability and diversity of housing stock. The visions expressed in the regulating plan do not prioritize visitability as a lesser value. Practical implications: Execution of the regulating plan as intended, and as clearly desired by the community and neighbors		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		See reponse above and separate response handout.
64		Where privacy is sought, consider that the NAP indicates that dooryards accompanying ground floor level finished first floors can provide an alternate means of promoting privacy. Such an option should be considered for the FBC as a mechanism to promote both the principles of visitability of housing and privacy		B. Siegel/K. Guernsey		Townhouse units on 80' wide streets, with 10' Dooryard, are permitted to have units / entrances at grade. Design for Small Apts in this circumstance is under evaluation. Larger buildings will have entrances at grade, but shall elevate units facing RBL side of building where more pedestreian and vehicular traffic occurs.
Part 7 - Conservation Area Standards						
1	Chap 7	References to and text of the Secretary of the Interior guidelines in the Conservation Area Architectural Standards are appreciated		J. Lawrence		No change
2	Chap 7	Section C, Role of HALRB: Change "will review" to "shall review" for consistency with other FBC documents		J. Lawrence		Revised
3	Chap 7	Clearer definition of "immediately adjacent" to areas identified to contain important historical features needed. Diagram 1 shows areas contiguous to Barcroft. Does "immediately adjacent" mean only contiguous to or could it also mean across a street or other area? There is no corresponding area defined around Fillmore, which is a conservation area and, by definition, contains important historical features. Fillmore also is bounded by streets. What is "immediately adjacent" to Fillmore?		J. Lawrence		Regulating Plan now includes areas subject to Conservation Area Standards. New construction areas that are subject to these specific standards are where existing buildings of the Barcroft complex will be removed and do not apply to other new construction on other private property. Foxcroft Heights was not an adopted Conservation Area within the Neighborhoods Area Plan. Areas adjacent to Fillmore Gardens are not subject to this Neighborhoods FBC.
Part 9: Building Use Standards						
1		confirm retail uses/commerce will allow for child care and school uses		staff		See Building Use Table
2	803A	With the new units scenario, how would the 20-30% net new figure work with regard to a tear-down situation? Like if it had been a building with CAFs, would it still be 20-30% of ALL units, or would there be a separate requirement for replacement of old CAF units?		A. Hogan		Aff Hsg requirements is tied to the amount of net new units created on site, whether additional units by infill, or removal and redevelopment.
3		I guess the same question would go for 803B where it discusses existing buildings/units.		A. Hogan		If renovated units are used to meet aff housing requirements, a higher percentage of aff hsg units are required (5% more)
4	803B:	So glad we are doing the East/West options. Also, with the term only 30 years, will there be any right of first refusal for the Co. to purchase or transfer those units to a non-profit at the end of that 30 year period, or would they just go to market rate with that developer?		A. Hogan		further review of draft language is needed for Right of First Refusal
5	803D:	Love the monthly meeting clause! (Is it clear whom they'd meet with - tenants, Relocation staff, etc?)		A. Hogan		to be determined
6	803E:	What if units have been updated fairly recently, is there flexibility? We may not want to spend AHIF funds on that if, for example, appliances still have 5-10 years of life in them. Would the Co. want it to be based on inspection or delayed til needed?		A. Hogan		to be determined
7	209	This section discussing the provision of bonus stories seems vague. Will there be a range or suggestion on how many additional units need to be provided to achieve additional stories? Or is it purposefully vague to leave room for negotiations with the Board? I am concerned a very few could be provided for stories in an early development proposal and then that will look like precedent for later plans also seeking additional stories. Do you have thoughts on how/why this is open-ended?		A. Hogan		it will be an evaluation of the value requested and how that translates to aff hsg units provided
8		Plan assumes everything is commercial or residential. Why are you discriminating against our churches? E.g. baptist church on Scott St. Trinity on Wayne St is covered by FBC.		S. Pryor		See Building Use table for additional clarity on how other uses can be accommodated
Part 10: Definitions						
1		Equal of Better - unclear what discretion is given to ZA; what criteria to evaluate new materials?		all		Revisions are still under discussion
2		Needed: Shared Parking; Reserved Parking stds		staff		Parking stds are still under review
3	Complete & Discrete	"scalar break down" ?? - text could be replaced with text in BES		staff		Revised
4	Fenestration	where/how is this measured? Is Fenestration in this Code measured for the CLEAR HEIGHT? STORY HEIGHT?		staff		Revised
5	Ground Story	"...habitable..." - should we use "occupiable" instead? Not all ground story space will be living space.		staff		Revise

Comment Number	Page & Regulation #	Comments (FBC AWG, ZOCO, Other)	1. Clarifying Question / 2. Error / 3. Inconsistent regulation with Neighborhoods Plan (Please indicate the # that best represents your comment.)	Group / Individual (Please include your Name)	Green Color: Action taken; White: No Change taken	Response as of 6.28.13
6	Private Open Area	"shall not be built upon": but can be either landscape or hardscape or combination; intent is to limit primary buildings, correct? What about shelter/pavilion, trellis feature? What is provided on the roof and a bathroom is required by Building Code - would the enclosure be excluded from area allocated as Private Open Area?		staff		Revised
7	Ultimate Building Height	need to say more simply		staff		Revised
8		stoop is out of order for the definitions		S. Pryor		Revised
General Land Use Plan Amendments						
1		Does the GLUP inform the FBC/BES in terms of density on specific sites? I.e. the GLUP defines areas by number of units allowed per acre. Does this guide the maximum unit density under the FBC? If not, what are the density parameters within the FBC?		K. Grigor		The GLUP continues to indicate a vision for multi-family residential uses around the mixed-use nodes. The residential land use designations will not change, and would be used to guide any future development. However, a new boundary line and GLUP Note is proposed in order to indicate on the GLUP that special recommendations apply and "bonus density" above the GLUP designations (and the corresponding zoning districts) is possible through the use of the FBC. All projects that choose to use the FBC would be required to meet the FBC regulations. The FBC does not however regulate density and instead its regulations are form driven. Therefore the bonus density shown or indicated on the GLUP would not be expressed as a particular number of units/acre, and instead would be described in connection to the form regulations which are mostly controlled by the Building Envelope Standards.
Master Transportation Plan Amendments						
1		Additional vehicle connections appear to have been added to the west end that are not in the plan (between 7th Rd, 8th Rd and Florida)	3	Chris Slatt		Further assessment of properties and site conditions have occurred through this process. As part of the Code preparation, further refinement to street alignment, and additional streets, alleys, trails, have been contemplated to help meet the NAP.
2		Regarding the Master Transportation Plan, there are several places where an asterisk (*) appears after the street name but I cannot find the footnote indicating what this asterisk means. What does the asterisk mean/indicate?		K. Grigor		this will be addressed/clarified
3		What accommodations need to be made by developers in addressing the proposed bicycle paths? The bicycle path that travels down S. Rolfe Street should turn at S. 14th Road, connect to S. Queen Street and then reach the County Club. The present path is shown going through private property and areas where there are no roads.	1	Thomas Wallinga, AIA AHC Inc.		After further examination, the proposed trail connection could follow existing rights-of-way and would not require easements from private property at Arlington View Terrace.