

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Howard Goldstein [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 17, 2017 11:22 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting Announcement - LRPC May 18, 7 pm Washington Kirkwood Special GLUP Study Plus  
**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Anthony,

Thank you for continuing to lead this effort. We spoke briefly at the May 1st event - unfortunately, I had to leave early and so was not able to provide my feedback. If it isn't too late to provide feedback and incorporate for tomorrow - the below is how I would respond.

Scenario's:

Least favorable (Dark red) - 3 Bonus

Less favorable (pink) - 2-1 Base, 2-1 Bonus, 2-2 Base, 2-2 Bonus, 3 Base, 5 Bonus

Most favorable (Dark Green) - 5 Base

Visual Preference Survey (using page numbers from what you have posted online)

Page 71 - Lower Left Picture

Page 72 - Upper Right Picture

Page 73 - Lower Right Picture

Page 74 - Lower Left Picture

Page 75 - Water

Page 76 - Lower Left Picture

Page 77 - Lower Left Picture

Transitions - Market Commons

Thanks,  
Howard

On Wed, May 17, 2017 at 3:53 PM, Anthony Fusarelli <[Afusarelli@arlingtonva.us](mailto:Afusarelli@arlingtonva.us)> wrote:

Good afternoon:

A draft meeting agenda and materials (subject to change) have been added to the LRPC web page for the Washington/Kirkwood Special GLUP Study in advance of tomorrow's meeting:

<https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/planning-commission/lrpc/>. Please note that much of the content depicting the GLUP modeling scenarios is the same as was illustrated at the May 1 open house. In this way, the LRPC will have the opportunity to discuss these scenarios as a group, taking into consideration input provided on the same scenarios by the broader community at the May 1 open house.

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Howard Goldstein - [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 18, 2017 11:53 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Feedback from May 18th LRPC Meeting

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Anthony,

Thank you for presenting earlier this evening at the LRPC. I thought it was a helpful and productive meeting. I wanted to reach out and offer some additional comments and thoughts. I'll put the majority of my comments in the below - but in addition to the below, I sent my ranking of scenario's yesterday and I will respond in separate e-mail with a few comments regarding the YMCA & community services.

**Open Park:** The additional open space / park created in the NW corner of the study area in Scenario 5 is a great addition for the community. I would strongly push for this feature to be included in all future modeling. This feature is great as it helps taper down to the single family homes and it creates more usable open space for the existing community and not just for the new housing. Many of the scenario's concentrate the park space towards the center of the study area where I suspect it will feel more like the something primarily for the residents of the new facilities.

For this same reason, I find Scenario 3 Bonus completely untenable as it removes all open space from the NW corner of the study area. Instead all of the open space is in the center of the study area.

**Traffic:** I agree with the sentiment expressed by many of the LRPC members today that if possible there should not be an ability to cut-through from Washington to 13th street. Instead the new roads could be stubbed. I believe a cut-through would encourage more traffic - specifically as a "bail-out" from Quincy.

**Massing:** I am strongly in favor of Scenario 5 and specifically the push to better taper height down to 13th street via townhomes or other similar 3 story buildings. As such I believe it is critical for this to be enshrined in the GLUP rather than entrusted to the owners of the property. I understand the owners desire to have flexibility to move height around the property - but I think this can and should be limited in order to protect the character of 13th street.

I also want to highlight and remind both you and hopefully the LRPC of the fact that putting anything other than R5/R6 on 13th street would make 13th street the single farthest point from the metro that is zoned for anything other than low residential. This is why I strongly believe Scenario 5 should form the baseline for this proposal moving forward.

More broadly, I believe Scenario 5 does a good job of leveraging the topology to place more mass and height at lower points, specifically at Kirkwood and 13th street versus at the higher points along 13th street.

Scenario 3, on the other hand, completely misses the mark on this dimension. It completely underutilizes the topology at the corner of Kirkwood and 13th street, instead opting for more height along 13th street. This is particularly egregious in Scenario 3 Bonus. As such I would reiterate my complete opposition to anything resembling Scenario 3 Bonus.

**YMCA & Community services: I will forward comments in separate e-mail.**

Thanks,  
Howard

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Albert Lewis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 18, 2017 4:50 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** Paul Ashin; niabagley [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 2 Questions for the Special GLUP study

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Anthony:

Very much appreciated the walking tour . . . gave some perspective on what you are looking at and the possibilities . . .  
I do plan on attending tonight and the 24<sup>th</sup> as well . . .

Two items I hope you will be able to answer at some point, as I believe they are critical to legitimize the process you are engaged in:

- 1) Does the Committee consider (ie., weighing and balancing impacts) the proposals against NOT making any changes to the GLUP or zoning? (In order for a planning process to be legitimate, it must consider status quo against change, and whether change is warranted by some benefit that overrides the previous planning process, which made decisions for the long term. If only the "scenarios" are up for consideration, the planning process is entirely false. This is a concern I have heard expressed again and again in conversations with other neighbors who are in the area but unable to come to the meetings, one because of hosting 12 young schoolgirls in their back yard. One neighbor considered the whole process ridiculous because it did not specifically allow "none of the above")
- 2) Has the need for single family dwellings (the prime sought after resource for families with school age children) been calculated, measured, and included in the evaluation of this area?? (The demand for such, especially within walking range of schools is extraordinary, and is undoubtedly the reason for the R-5 zoning all along the corridor of which 13<sup>th</sup> St is a part, and the reason our home values are so high. We all understand that there is a need for more schools, but isn't there a need for family friendly housing as well?? And how do you measure the demand for studio apartments or non-family-friendly townhouses against that?? Maybe you need both, but requiring a family to relocate miles away from a school to get a kid friendly home is NOT good county planning)

Albert Z Lewis Jr.  
3511 North 13th St Arlington VA 22201  
[REDACTED]

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Howard Goldstein [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 19, 2017 12:53 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Feedback from May 18th LRPC Meeting

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Anthony,

Thank you again for presenting at the May 18th LRPC meeting. I wrote you a separate note to outline my general feedback on the proposals. To avoid diminishing the feedback on those other points, I wanted to separately write regarding the YMCA & Community services where I have more extensive views.

I am strongly in favor - and I believe most people in the community are as well - of enshrining in the GLUP that any owner of the property currently owned by the YMCA has to dedicate a certain portion of the property to provide services for the community. (e.g., dedicate at least 100K square feet to providing services to the community). I imagine this could be done by maintaining the semi-public zoning on some portion of the land or by making a specific annotation within the land use plan.

I believe this is the right approach for several reasons:

First and foremost - the YMCA provides many important services to the community, some of which (e.g., after school care, summer camps) are highly constrained and that Arlington County would likely want to supplement in the absence of a provider like the YMCA. Furthermore, there is no other facility or zoned area in the nearby area that would be able to provide these services. As such, the existence of land zoned specifically for this purpose reduces pressure on Arlington county. And so as the county considers changing the zoning from Semi-Public, it seems both reasonable and appropriate for the county to require that the owner of the land continue to dedicate space to providing .

Second - in the absence of any formal enshrinement, it seems unlikely that the services provided by the YMCA will remain. One of the LRPC members (Nancy) suggested that having those services provided is a business decision that may change over time. Yes, this is true. And ironically, by eliminating the semi-public zoning or any requirement on the GLUP, the county would in fact create a business incentive NOT to continue to provide community services at this location. The value from potential other uses could make it untenable to continue as-is. If instead, there is a requirement to dedicate property to community services then the YMCA or any owner can make an informed business tradeoff as to how / if to redevelop the land based on all of the requirements.

Explained another way - rezoning the YMCA land is a massive transfer of wealth from the community to the YMCA. It seems reasonable and appropriate for the community to get something back in return for that transfer of wealth. Today - the market value of the YMCA land is quite low, because it can ONLY be used for certain purposes. As soon as it is rezoned, the market value will skyrocket. If there are some restrictions, it will go up - but not by as much. The YMCA can decide whether it is worth redeveloping or not with those restrictions.

Finally - I understand there is some question about if/how such a requirement could be enforced. I certainly don't know the answer. But it was interesting in the LRPC conversation today, an idea was raised to require the owners of the properties to care for the Ball family cemetery. If it is appropriate to annotate in the GLUP a

requirement that property owners care for the Ball family property, why would it not be appropriate to require property owners to dedicate a certain portion of the property to community services?

I reject the notion that delivering community services on this property can and would enable "bonus" development on this property. Rather, in return for the massive transfer of wealth that the county will provide to the YMCA as part of rezoning, I see delivering community services as an absolute pre-requisite for rezoning. As such, I see it as a critical that this requirement be enshrined in the GLUP.

Thanks,  
Howard Goldstein  
3447 13th Street N



## Arlington Partnership For Affordable Housing

### Board of Directors

**John Milliken**  
APAH Board Chair

**Nina Janopaul**  
APAH President/CEO

**Robert Rozen**  
Vice President

**Kevin Yan**  
Vice Chair

**Richard B. Anderson**  
Treasurer

**Susan Bell**  
Secretary

**Yvonne Alken**

**Matthew Birenbaum**

**Cecilia Cassidy**

**George Covucci**

**Michael Geary**

**Julie Gould**

**Jay Harris**

**Alice Hogan**

**Paul Holland**

**Rich Jordan**

**Erica Khatchadourian**

**Rev. Andrew Merrow**

**Sarah Morales**

**Kathie Panfil**

**Michael Spotts**

June 1, 2017

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

Re: Feedback on the Washington Blvd and Kirkwood Road Special GLUP "Plus" May 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting materials

Dear Anthony:

On behalf of the APAH and the American Legion team, I want to thank you for the productive process that you are conducting to review the General Land Use Plan recommendations for this area outside of the Virginia Square Plan. It has been a robust discussion on all the important elements and has fostered a large amount of community involvement to improve the outcome of the process.

As it relates to the material presented at the last special GLUP meeting on May 18<sup>th</sup>, the APAH /Legion team wanted to reiterate a few of the comments on some of the options being studied by staff for consideration as the final plan recommendation to the County Manager this Summer/Fall:

- From a transportation and circulation perspective, the APAH and Legion team continue to believe that a full, north/south vehicular connection is not necessary and instead would recommend an alley/access point to our building which converts to a pedestrian/bike circulation route to the north and east connecting to the cemetery/open space. The main benefit is that it will reduce the vehicular/traffic impact to the adjoining single-family homes on 12<sup>th</sup> Road. This concern has been raised by the 12<sup>th</sup> Road neighbors at every meeting. This decision also directly affects the development on the Legion site and enables the APAH/Legion redevelopment to maintain the needed building footprint to achieve its redevelopment goals. Consolidation of the properties along Washington Boulevard, which is what the County's modeling generally shows, would be desirable in a perfect world, however, the reality is that this is unlikely to occur any time in the near future with the existence of profitable on-going businesses on these properties. The Legion's site has very limited frontage on Washington Boulevard, therefore, our plans call for a limited dimension two lane roadway/alley on the west of our building to a standard sized sidewalk along the Legion/APAH building and a small landscape buffer to the west between the Legion and Casual Adventure site. Obviously the western sidewalk dimensions could change if and when the development to the west on Washington Boulevard occurs.
- From a massing perspective, the APAH/Legion team supports both options under Scenarios 2 and 5 which allow the site to be redeveloped under C-0-2.5. As I mentioned last week at the GLUP meeting, we believe that from a constructability

—  
4318 N Carlin Springs Road  
Arlington, VA 22203

703.276.7444

www.apah.org

perspective, to make the redevelopment of the Legion Site feasible, a plan that permits a wood-frame/concrete podium is necessary. However, like the 11th Street development, APAH/Legion has not planned on pursuing a 10 story, concrete execution for the development as depicted in the massing depicted in the Scenario 5 Bonus. Therefore, a massing of 7/8 stories that notches down to 5 stories in the western corner, as was shown on Scenario 5 Base, seems like the best way to balance the desire for less height next to the SFHs on 12th Road North while allowing for a level max height (7-8 stories) across the rest of the site especially along the commercial, Washington Boulevard and open space frontages. A building design with dramatically varying heights as depicted in Scenario 5 Base and Scenario 2 adds greatly to cost of construction and thus causes financing related challenges because of cost caps placed on building costs by VHDA.

- Lastly, from a zoning perspective, at the May 18th meeting, the staff also discussed the impact of bonus density scenarios. During the future site plan process, we will work with County Staff to take the guidance from the Special Study to perfect a building footprint and massing that meets the needs of the community and the development. Our initial project concepts envision a building with a 23,000 square footprint and up to 8 stories. However, these are early test fits without the full benefit of the all the plan constraints envisioned. Therefore, APAH/Legion recommend Planning Staff maintain the flexibility on the density bonus to be evaluated in the site plan approval and review process to ensure a feasible plan can be created after all the constraints of the circulation, massing, open space and other guiding principles can be evaluated together.

Thank you again for the deep analysis of the development options and solicitation of community feedback at the Open House and Walking Tour.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carmen Romero', written in a cursive style.

Carmen Romero

Vice- President, Real Estate Development



## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Albert Lewis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 09, 2017 11:57 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** QuincyParkNorth [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FUNDAMENTAL FLAW - GLUP Evaluation Process

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

Mr. Fusarelli:

Upon prolonged reflection, I believe there has been a fundamental mistake in the formation of the Study Group for evaluation of the YMCA / AMERICAN LEGION / 11<sup>th</sup> Street Properties / Ball Family Cemetery properties.

The error appears to be combining the YMCA (R-5 / Public Space) lot and the other lots into the same study. I have not heard any coherent reason for this combination other than proximity, which you could arguably extend all the way down Kirkland. By contract, it seems MUCH more rational to evaluate the Commercial areas separately from the YMCA property which has been, and is, completely integrated with the residential neighborhood, and is directly in the non-commercial corridor contemplated in the long-standing GLUP and zoning plan for the area.

WHY combine?

There is no need to evaluate the combined properties since there is an immediate and obvious physical separation between the properties, both in zoned use, and in the overall character of the two sections, The WASHINGTON BOULEVARD section, and the THIRTEENTH STREET section, neither of which has historically been combined, and serve entirely different county needs, one being the residential / public use consideration, the other being light commercial use.

### NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF COMBINATION:

- **Fundamental Change in Neighborhood:** the portion of 13<sup>th</sup> St near KIRKWOOD will be entirely eliminated as a low density area, now is green and shaded with trees, quiet, and non-dominant in terms of space, light, and activity.
- **Elimination of Greenspace / Open Space:** all of the scenarios eliminate open and green space in a significant way. Please note that there is significant tree cover (other than in that little section "buffer trees" on 13<sup>th</sup> Street) that will be cut down, and the proposed streets will significantly lessen available open space. The Balls Family Cemetery is largely turned into a "green doormat" for high rises, totally inconsistent with preservation of its character and potential public value as open space.
- **Loss of R-5 property area:** Even if the YMCA closes down, the property is better used for single family dwellings, or other public use to maintain the neighborhood, provide needed R-5 housing, or for other public valued use as previously contemplated in approval of the YMCA – Maybe Jumping Joeys & the like??
- **Loss of Separation of Light Commercial and Residential Zones:** Normally the sector plans contemplate a buffer area between commercial and residential. The combined "scenarios" all open the area of the YMCA property to commercial traffic and extension of high density use into the long-standing R-5 buffer area.
- **The natural water runoff drainage system separates the two areas,** making the engineering of a combined use more difficult and unnatural.

### POSITIVE EFFECTS OF SEPARATION


- The study of the commercial corridor area is fundamentally different from residential: Large Apartments or Condos integrate with commercial premises in a positive way, as one can see in all the apartment buildings being built throughout the county.
- Traffic impacts are better managed: The two sections have different needs and considerations better addressed by separate analysis.
- The integration of residential and commercial better suited for the Washington Blvd: If more apartments are needed, they are much better situated on the WASHINGTON BLVD side where public transportation is already in place. If the American Legion needs to destroy its existing green space, it should do so in a way that integrates with the light commercial uses contemplated in the sector plan, and access to the Cemetery, rather than trying to encroach on the R-5 area in a destructive way.
- The YMCA property is better evaluated on its own: The special history of the YMCA property is very much distinct from the other properties, and through the site planning process, the highest and best use can be determined without the need for pass-through traffic or access which is better evaluated in a separate study of the commercial WASHINGTON BLVD side.
- The Balls Family Cemetery is better protected: By evaluating access and impact from each of the two sides, a better result is probable, since it stands as the transition between two fundamentally different uses – low density residential, and light commercial. Each can maximize the approach as a transition area, and preserve its separate nature, rather than simply surround it like an inconvenient stone in the road of development.

I understand that a lot of time and effort has been expended in the combined study of these properties. I think a lot of the difficulty in the scenarios is because of this fundamental flaw of combination, which needs to be acknowledged and addressed in any final evaluation, which perhaps could decide to limit itself to the WASHINGTON BLVD properties most productively, or simply proceed with No Recommendation for change.

I hope you will share this with your GLUP / STUDY GROUP colleagues and, in some way, respond.

Thank you for all your hard work, and hope that this might assist in resolving the substantial conflicts and problems which your work has identified.

Sincerely,

Albert Z Lewis  
3511 13<sup>th</sup> Street North  
Arlington VA 22201  


## **Anthony Fusarelli**

---

**From:** Albert Lewis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 17, 2017 10:54 AM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** QuincyParkNorth [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** WASHINGTON / KIRKWOOD GJUP Study - BALL FAMILY BURIAL GROUND problem

Dear Mr. Fusarelli:

This is a comment directly addressing a particular aspect of the proposed scenarios which has not been adequately presented, and in some ways, speaks directly to the general problem of ALL of the scenarios that have been proposed, and strongly rejecting the proposed GLUP modification.

### **THE SPECIAL NATURE OF A CEMETERY**

Arlington is possibly best known for its hosting of the most famous cemetery in the nation, yet also contains the magnificent Columbia Gardens Cemetery, and diminutive Mt Olivet Cemetery, and is in proximity to another beautiful one, Oakwood Cemetery (Falls Church), and while there are possibly a few other small cemeteries in the County, the BALL FAMILY CEMETERY poses a special problem for development in the study area, having been protected by the low density development of the area, including the American Legion property, and the special public use development of the YMCA. Even though not easily accessible, the protection afforded by this coincidence has kept the cemetery in a state consistent with its somber and historic purpose: quiet, tree bounded, reflective, open and solemn. Such are the qualities that a cemetery brings to a community, especially one such as Arlington which treasures its village nature, and seeks to honor the history that a cemetery represents. The character of a cemetery defines a community, the degree of respect that is paid to those that went before. Like Mt Olivet which has a full cemetery, common to all is a respectful space, preserved with light and air. The manner in which the Ball Family Burial Ground is handled will reflect directly on the quality of the community. It poses a unique opportunity but also a pernicious danger that could damage our community values.

### **LIGHT AND AIR**

The most characteristic feature of all graveyards, from Tombstone to Rock Creek to New Orleans's St Louis is the connection with the sky. These characteristics are in the Study 1A Guiding Principles, both 7 and 10 concerning the cemetery, stating significantly to "... increase public open space ..." and enhancing "... the historic integrity and site conditions of the Ball Family Cemetery ...". Unfortunately, all of the Study scenarios directly violate these principles, turning the Burial Ground into what could best be described as a green doormat for the surrounding massive apartment buildings. Especially when one examines the scenarios in the Base View Looking pages and the shadow studies, the Burial Ground appears closed, contained and segregated from all but the apartments looking down, a smidgen of green amidst the concrete. On page 82 of the May 17 staff presentation, one sees a burial ground in an urban setting with office buildings and a nearby church --- no one apparently thought this visually appealing, preferring the park setting where persons were picnicking on the grass --- does anyone truly think it appropriate to make the Ball Family Burial Ground a place where frisbie players eat lunch and apartment dwellers stretch their legs since there is virtually no other place to do it in the apartment canyon? And no historic church? And who would want to visit this place in a reflective mood amidst the stares and noise of the surrounding high density development?

### **HISTORIC CHARACTER**

By coincidence mostly of neglect, the Ball Family Burial Ground has been blessed with trees on three sides, and more significantly open vistas in all directions thanks to the low height of the surrounding structures, the YMCA big structures

blessed by lower geography, and the Washington Blvd structures single story. The nearest structure is an open hangar suitable for picnics or outdoor meetings, perhaps the sound of children. Access has been cut off by the commercial development, perhaps improperly expropriating the property, but in some ways that has protected the property all these years. This Study could reclaim the property as a public resource, but needs to do so in a way that preserves its nature, not irrevocably destroys it. It must be surrounded with open public space distinct from its use, so that a visit to the cemetery, like to the one at Mt Olivet or Columbia Gardens, is a choice for quiet reflection when passing by on adjacent public right of way, not the only place 700 apartment dwellers could congregate during a fire drill.

### **OPPORTUNITY FOR TRANSITION**

The family burial ground is located at the transition between the commercial area along Washington Blvd and the single/two family R-5 zoning to the north. It is the logical location for the appropriate pass-through from that commercial to low density residential. The YMCA public zoned finger that is aligned next to the cemetery, and the expropriated commercial access Ball property form the logical pedestrian pass-through in transitioning from the light commercial areas to the residential. Appropriately designed, this would both protect and enhance the cemetery and provide access from both sides, consistent with the transition. Unfortunately, the scenarios all envision high density development to the north of the cemetery, destroying any pretense at transition, and creating burdens which a small pedestrian corridor could not accommodate, requiring additional roads to admit the massive increase in necessary access, and destroying the character of the cemetery, and the opportunity for a rational transition.

### **WASHINGTON BLVD LIGHT COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

How the Ball Family Burial Ground property was “taken” by paved commercial driveway is an error that must be corrected in any case. But all the scenarios seem to presume that small commercial enterprises, like the Rocklands, or the heavily used Pham’s auto repair, or other businesses are totally unneeded in the face of the demand for yet-another massive apartment / condo development like every other one that have recently sprung up throughout the county, in Ballston, on 10<sup>th</sup> Street, all along Wilson and Clarendon into Rosslyn, so many all around the county, generally and appropriately right along the Metro corridor. Few of the giant apartment developments so directly downzone an entire R-5 block, as would the YMCA property. Is there no longer a place for small commercial in Arlington county? All the scenarios turn the property in what could be best described as a mini-Ballston, high rise density north of Washington Boulevard where it never was, but for a single apartment building with a substantial parking lot buffer to the R-5 dwellings behind. The family cemetery is consistent with light commercial enterprises on its border, and in fact could enhance the sidewalk character of light commercial development along the Boulevard, if properly done. Massive buildings north of Washington turn our neighborhood village into an urban canyon, needlessly and destructively.

### **SOLUTION**

The only way to preserve the Ball Family Burial Ground in an appropriate and County beneficial way is to reject all the scenarios proposed and preserve the existing zoning and GLUP. Alternatively, it may be appropriate to separate out the YMCA property proposal from the overall study, in recognition that R-5/Public space is not beneficially combined with light commercial when there is no demonstrated or critical need for elimination of R-5 in favor of high rise apartments on a single family residential street.

Albert Z “Chig” Lewis Jr.  
3511 North 13<sup>th</sup> St Arlington VA 22201





**WALSH COLUCCI  
LUBELEY & WALSH PC**

M. Catharine Puskar  
(703) 528-4700 Ext. 5413  
cpuskar@thelandlawyers.com

June 20, 2017

**Via E-Mail Only**

Anthony Fusarelli Jr.  
Arlington County, Planning Division – CPHD  
2100 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22201

Re: Kirkwood Road Special GLUP "Plus" Study

Dear Anthony:

On behalf of Eleventh Street Development, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to participate in an ongoing Kirkwood Special GLUP "Plus" Study. We believe that the GLUP study meetings held to date have been very productive conversations, and we look forward to the conclusion of the study process in the near future. As the study moves into its final phases, we would like to offer some additional feedback on the draft study materials.

- **Road Network:** As currently submitted, our application proposes a new alley connection that would run behind the new building and connect Washington Boulevard and N. Kirkwood Road. After much discussion, we continue to believe that the proposed alley is the most appropriate design solution (as compared to a full road section). The narrower alley width responds to the desires expressed by the community to minimize impervious areas and to discourage cut-through traffic. In addition, implementing a full road section, as shown in some of the GLUP modeling materials, would present significant construction challenges given the extreme changes in grade across the Kirkwood site and surrounding properties. The regrading needed to achieve a full road section around the perimeter of the Kirkwood property would expose structured parking and create other negative impacts on the building's design. Furthermore, a full road section will reduce the buildable area of the development, resulting in an increase in the height of the building in order to maintain the necessary density.
- **Building Massing and Height:** Assuming that the GLUP Study allows for a narrower alley section, as discussed above, 11<sup>th</sup> Street Development anticipates that the proposed density of the new development (including available density bonuses) can be accommodated within a six-story structure. As previously discussed, Staff's modeling assumptions are more conservative than the parameters we have used to design the proposed building. Specifically, Staff's assumptions regarding floor-to-floor heights, corridor width, and average unit sizes result in a taller and bulkier structure. Our own assumptions for average unit size, corridor width, and floor-to-floor heights result in a

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

703 528 4700 • WWW.THELANDLAWYERS.COM  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD. • SUITE 1300 • ARLINGTON, VA 22201-3359

LOUDOUN 703 737 3633 • WOODBRIDGE 703 680 4664

(A0771128.DOCX / 1 Draft Letter re. Kirkwood Rd Special GLUP Study "Plus" (draft 6.20) 008557 000002)

shorter, more compact structure that accommodates the density needed to support the project in a 6-story building that appropriately transitions to adjacent properties. Therefore, while it is important that the building be zoned to the C-O-2.5 Zoning District for purposes of generating the needed density, it will not be necessary to construct the building to the maximum height permitted in the C-O-2.5 Zoning District.

- **GLUP Designation and Density:** We continue to support Staff scenarios #2 and #5, which show the Kirkwood site designated as “Medium” Office-Apartment-Hotel. This designation would support a rezoning to the C-O-2.5 Zoning District. 11<sup>th</sup> Street Development has worked very hard to assemble the parcels needed to support new development near the intersection of Washington Blvd. and Kirkwood St., and is continuing its efforts to incorporate the corner parcel into the site assemblage. The density afforded by the C-O-2.5 Zoning District is essential to creating a viable new development in this location, given the challenges associated with creating the parcel assemblage and addressing existing site constraints. However, because C-O-2.5 is a unit per acre Zoning District, and not an FAR district, the proposed density in our application can be accommodated in an appropriately scaled structure that meets the community’s expectations for massing and height.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to participate in this ongoing planning study. We very much appreciate being included in the process. We note that time is of the essence, as 11<sup>th</sup> Street Development must satisfy its contractual obligations to the owners of the individual parcels in the Kirkwood site assemblage. Therefore, we encourage the County to continue moving through the process efficiently, and we offer any support that we can provide to bring the GLUP study process to conclusion.

Sincerely,

WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY & WALSH, P.C.



M. Catharine Puskar

Cc: Garrett Erdle  
Matt Allman  
Elizabeth Gearin  
Bob Duffy

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Albert Lewis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 03, 2017 12:04 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Cc:** CountyBoard; QuincyParkNorth [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** GLUP - Scenarios / WASHINGTON BLVD - KIRKLAND RD / Proper Evaluation & Review

As we approach the end of the YMCA / 11 St Developers / American Legion review and requests for the big change in the GLUP and neighborhood zoning, a missing piece seems important for an adequate consideration of those changes. All the proposed and evaluated scenarios have presumed some level of change, yet you have always asserted that the planning group will consider those scenarios against no change at all. Yet how are you making that comparison?

**REQUEST:** This is to request modeling (perhaps available as in prior year reviews) of the impact of retaining *the Current GLUP and zoning of the study site*, to properly evaluate the impact of any proposed change. Such modeling would, as in the existing scenarios you have modeled, show the highest and best use of the property, including bonus density, under the current limitations, and with the existing tools, in order to reasonably evaluate the costs, neighborhood character, and income potential for the study area without change, including how one might protect the Balls Family Burial Site consistent with current zoning, and how the Washington Blvd light commercial zone could be continued or enhanced in a site plan process.

Without this modeling, it seems impossible to know whether the costs of any proposed change, and how resulting damage to the existing neighborhood character can really be measured, either subjectively, visually, functionally or financially.

**PROPOSAL FOR COUNTY BOARD REVIEW STANDARD:** It also seems appropriate for the County Board to require such modeling for any proposed change in the GLUP, and should be a minimal financial burden as existing modeling tools are in place for the site, and may be produced from historical models, requiring little additional expenditure, and providing a substantial and critical piece for any legitimate Board review of proposed changes. By copying this email to the Board, I am asking for their adoption of such a rule for all GLUP change proposals.

Hopefully you have that modeling already produced in earlier evaluations, and perhaps you can simply upload such to the website, or otherwise link it to assist in the review process. If you are unable or unwilling to provide such modeling, I would be most appreciative to know the impediments.

Thank you for your service,

Albert Z. Lewis Jr. / Steffanie J. Lewis  
3511 North 13<sup>th</sup> St Arlington VA 22201  
[REDACTED]

McGuireWoods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
Tysons, VA 22102-4215  
Phone: 703.712.5000  
Fax: 703.712.5050  
www.mcguirewoods.com

Richard T. Lunger, III  
Direct: 703.712.5003

McGUIREWOODS

tlunger@mcguirewoods.com  
Fax: 703.712.5247

July 14, 2017

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

**Re: YMCA Considerations-- May 18, 2017 LRPC Meeting Materials and Comments**

Dear Mr. Fusarelli:

On behalf of the YMCA, I would appreciate the opportunity to restate my comments made at the LRPC meeting held on May 18<sup>th</sup> as well as to provide greater detail on my comments. In addition, the YMCA thanks you and your team on your comprehensive planning efforts with regard to a large area affecting individuals and groups with various interests.

First, the YMCA is a unique entity as compared to other interested parties in the Study Area due its community-serving purposes of recreation, youth development and general health and wellness of people of various ages and abilities. It is not a land developer, it is not a home owner, and it is not a business like other interested parties in the Study Area; but the YMCA views itself an established part of the community serving Arlington for over 70 years. Since 2010, the YMCA has provided financial support to 4,025 children and families enrolled in its programs and services. In fact, the YMCA was honored to receive the Arlington Leadership Legacy Award as the 2017 Non Profit of the Year. As such and as briefly touched on in the May 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, I would like to reiterate that the YMCA has no intention whatsoever of relocating to another location as was discussed as a hypothetical at the LRPC meeting. The YMCA affirms that it seeks to continue its community-serving purposes at its current location. In fact, the staff of the YMCA have been working with their consultants for nearly ten years in search of the capacity and partners with which to redevelop their property to expand their services to the community and build on the partnerships and relationships that they share with Arlington and its residents for many years to come.

Second, because the YMCA is in need of modernization and upgrades to continue its community-serving functions, and because it has not yet partnered with a future entity and/or developer, the YMCA needs as much flexibility as possible in this early stage of planning its land area within the broader Study Area. Even though such flexibility is sought, one point to reiterate is that the YMCA is highly aware of the physical mass transition needed at the north of its property, along 13<sup>th</sup> Street N. In this way, the YMCA always has and continues to plan for an



July 14, 2017

Page 2

efficient, low-scaled mass transition along 13<sup>th</sup> Street regardless of the use (residential and/or YMCA) of that particular massing. Such a low-scale mass is in line with an efficient YMCA design or a low-scale residential form compatible with Lynnbrook. The YMCA feels strongly that the low-scaled mass plus the preservation of the stand of trees along 13<sup>th</sup> Street is appropriate in terms of scale, massing, transition and buffer; and also respects the scale of the Lynnbrook community.

Thirdly, because the YMCA seeks the maximum amount of flexibility in the future General Land Use Plan ("GLUP") designation, the YMCA continues to reiterate its support for the singular "Medium" Residential GLUP designation with the ability to seek bonus density (Scenario 2, Bonus). Such a designation would not preclude the YMCA from continuing to plan for low-scale massing along 13<sup>th</sup> Street North in line with Lynnbrook. It would allow for more height and density in the middle of the Study Area (south portion of the YMCA property), which was shown in all of the Scenarios (except for Scenario 3, Base) that Staff showed at the May 18<sup>th</sup> LRPC Meeting. Such height and density allows for a future massing that can take advantage of the topography/slope from the west of the Study Area down/east toward Kirkwood Road. It also allows for density appropriate for land in the R-B Corridor approximately 1/2 of a mile (walking distance) to two Metro Stations. Also, and most significantly, such a designation does not preclude open space areas (including rights-of-way and pedestrian connections, play areas, etc.) within the YMCA property; in fact, allowing for greater height and density allows open space to be more feasible from an economic perspective. As discussed on May 18 by LRPC members, there seems to be support for new rights-of-ways (in whatever form they take), open spaces and other public infrastructure particularly within the YMCA property boundary. The YMCA would like the maximum flexibility to consider such elements, along with the preservation of the stand of trees along 13<sup>th</sup> Street N. All of these elements are more feasible under the requested "Medium" Residential GLUP designation with optional Bonus density than the other Scenarios under study.

Because the YMCA is in the early stages of planning for its modernization at its current location, the more flexibility the Study/future GLUP can allow for, the better. The YMCA is not a land developer. Its main purpose is community-serving and it solely seeks to allow for future options that may include desirable elements from a Planning (and community) perspective, such as roadways and/or pedestrian networks, parks and open space, community facilities, affordable housing, etc.

We hope you will consider our points made above and we look forward to working with you as the Study comes to a close. Please let us know if you have questions or need information from us as you consider Staff's recommendation for the Study Area. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards,



Tad Lunger, Esq.

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Elizabeth Morton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 19, 2017 11:16 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** Comments on Eleventh St. Development project-Washington/Kirkwood GLUP Plus

**Categories:** Email Response Needed

We are writing to express our support for the "Eleventh Street Development" project, which will be directly across the street from our home on 1139 Kirkwood Rd.

We have attended one Washington/Kirkwood Special General Land Use Plan community meeting and reviewed the project documents. In general we are impressed by the potential of the project. We feel that a development of this scale (5 or 6 stories) could provide a nice complement to our group of townhomes, creating a more balanced and urbane gateway to Clarendon/Virginia Square than the low scale undistinguished building that exists now.

Since this will be a substantial new presence on our street, we hope that the developer, designers and County keep in mind the following points in order to maintain and even enhance the overall walkability and pedestrian orientation of Kirkwood Rd.

- \* There must be attention to high quality materials and architectural detail, especially at street level, though in our view the building need not be in a "traditional" architectural style.
- \* There should be minimal curb cuts and loading/entrances from Kirkwood Rd., since the Kirkwood/Washington Blvd. intersection can already get backed up. Traffic patterns of the surrounding intersections should be closely studied; for example right now there is often already a backup on Kirkwood before Washington Blvd. and between Washington Blvd. and Fairfax Dr., in part due to those making right turns and the short distance between the Washington Blvd and Fairfax Dr. stoplights. We'd obviously like to minimize the impact and noise from any loading activities.
- \* Ample street trees and landscaping should match or exceed the street trees on the Bromptons side. Even though Kirkwood is a somewhat busy street right now, it still has a gracious quality largely due to the street trees and green median areas.
- \* Although we understand the main project entrance will be on the Washington Blvd. side, we'd like to see the massing of the Kirkwood Rd. side broken up at least visually so the building does not appear monolithic. To create some sense of transparency it would be appropriate to have multiple entrances, and welcoming places to pause, sit, and look into the ground floor spaces, especially on the Washington Blvd. side.

We were happy to read that new residents are expected to take Metro and were happy that they will not get Zone 6 parking permits, which would be a burden on the neighborhood. We hope residents are strongly encouraged or incentivized to take public transportation.

As others have noted, we hope that the impact of this overall GLUP project is always viewed in the context of the very substantial Red Top cab project, which (during and after construction) will also significantly affect our homes from the other direction. Although we believe the two projects will

probably ultimately improve the neighborhood, their construction will affect the quality of life and congestion in our immediate vicinity for several years, and we hope that appropriate mitigation measures are put into place.

Sincerely,  
Aniruddha Dasgupta  
Elizabeth Morton  
1139 Kirkwood Rd.

## Anthony Fusarelli

---

**From:** Johanna McDonough [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 21, 2017 1:49 PM  
**To:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Subject:** LRPC GLUP Study Meeting on July 25

Dear Mr. Fusarelli,

To our conversation relative to the Washington/Kirkwood Special GLUP Study, I wanted to reiterate my appreciation of your time and patience to speak with me. With the re-scheduling of the meeting to Tuesday, July 25, 2017, my ability to attend is compromised as it coincides with "The Snedden Family Vacation."

In attending, it would be my hope to stay abreast of the direction of discussions relative to future recommendations that will be made to The Planning Commission resulting from the study. Certainly as a small, independent business operating since 1995 in Arlington, I would and do advocate that the future plan be inclusive of existing small businesses. The ability to sustain themselves during possible construction, as well as recapitalizing for possible new buildouts, is a physical and fiscal challenge that will require extensive planning. Language to address the future inclusion of present tenants and to keep a vibrant streetscape are important in reiterating continuity of the existing "hyper-local" community and uniqueness of Arlington.

Thank you for consideration of my thoughts and keeping me abreast of information, meetings, and planning dates for this study. If anything comes up that you feel I should be made immediately aware of, please contact me. We'll be in Sandbridge, VA, so somewhat in the vicinity.

Sincerely,

John Snedden  
Rocklands Barbeque and Grilling Company

(via)

Johanna McDonough  
ROCKLANDS Barbeque and Grilling Company  
2418 Wisconsin Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20007

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[www.rocklands.com](http://www.rocklands.com)

Voted D.C.'s Best BBQ by popular vote by *Washington City Paper* in 2009 – 2015 & 2017!

Voted D.C.'s Best BBQ restaurant in *Washingtonian* 2010, 2012, 2013 & 2015!

Join our [email list](#) for fun and exciting news about ROCKLANDS!



---

**From:** Anthony Fusarelli  
**Sent:** Monday, July 10, 2017 5:59 PM  
**Subject:** Meeting Announcement - LRPC July 25, 7 pm Washington Kirkwood Special GLUP Study Plus