

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
CHAPTER 4 – IMPLEMENTATION						
4.1	LRPC	CCTF	12/9	<p>Parameters for PDSPs The recommendation for full-block, joint PDSP applications is problematic, particularly where ownership is highly fragmented; the County may need to be proactively involved in bringing owners together, and flexibility for less than full-block PDSPs is needed in certain instances.</p>	<p>Staff will further explore this and recognizes potential challenges in achieving complete ownership involvement to develop some full block PDSPs. In these instances the Plan should give consideration to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developers should meet with staff early in their design process to refine the appropriate boundaries for a PDSP on a case by case basis; the applicant will be obligated to demonstrate how a less than full-block PDSP would not preclude planned improvements, if not guarantee them. 2) County involvement in facilitating all involved parties to initiate conversations for a joint PDSP process; 3) Acknowledgement that lower priority may be placed on full block PDSPs for blocks without any new/relocated streets, public open spaces, or relocated segments of the Underground. 	
4.2	LRPC	PC	12/9	<p>Open Space Symbol on GLUP Regarding the open space triangle symbol on the GLUP, other options should be considered for how to clearly convey that all open spaces in the Plan are equally important to achieve. Having just one triangle symbol on the GLUP without any clarifying text seems inadequate.</p>	<p>Staff will consider additional options for how to address the triangle symbol issue, which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Show one triangle on the GLUP within the CCCRD (at Center Park), show 26 triangles on the GLUP for all open spaces, or show triangles on the GLUP for public open spaces above a certain size (the triangles may possibly be shown on the J-D Corridor callout map on the back of the GLUP); 2) If only one triangle is used, in the GLUP booklet discussion on Crystal City, on page 11, revise text to explain the role of the triangle representing all 26 public open spaces proposed in the Plan. 3) On the back of the GLUP Map, update the J-D Corridor discussion to note the total of 26 public open spaces recommended in the Plan and embodied in the single triangle symbol. 	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
4.3	LRPC	PC	12/9	<p>Affordability by Design and Accessibility Guidelines More information is needed on “affordability by design” and “accessibility guidelines.” Examples of how affordability by design could be achieved would be helpful.</p>	<p>After further review, and after consideration of the developers’ comments at the LRPC meeting, staff concurs that “affordability by design” does not seem likely to be achieved within the sites in the Crystal City Coordinated Revitalization District due to land costs, cost of taking down operating assets and construction costs. Affordability by Design would likely be more successful in areas with smaller projects and less expensive construction types, in combination with other incentives (like reduced parking requirements, increased density, etc). Staff has eliminated this implementation action.</p> <p>Accessibility: The original language describes “exploring the use of accessibility guidelines,” but the subtitle for #12 states, “use accessibility guidelines,” which makes it seem like they already exist. What already exist are various regulations for accessibility depending on new construction/rehab, etc source of funding, etc. The intention for this implementation action is essentially to encourage accessible, affordable units. The action has been revised to make this clearer.</p>	
4.4	LRPC	PC	12/9	<p>Using the County’s Then Current Standards Consider adding a caveat to this section, (and perhaps others) that says “Use the County’s most current practice. As of 2010, the standard is...”</p>	<p>Staff will consider whether identifying the current requirements in #5 is appropriate since they exist in the Zoning Ordinance, and if ever revised the Plan’s language would then be outdated.</p>	
4.5	LRPC	CCTF	12/9	<p>On-Site vs. Off-Site Units Text should clarify that units may be provided off-site, as stated in the Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Staff concurs and will revise accordingly, while stating a preference for on-site whenever possible.</p>	
4.6	LRPC	CCTF	12/9	<p>Using Other Tools for Affordable Housing Consider additional language to explain the tools listed in #9, and consider whether other tools may be added to this list.</p>	<p>Staff concurs and will consider additional text to clarify the discussion in this section.</p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
4.7	LRPC	PC	12/9	<p>Target Goal for Affordable Housing Units in Crystal City In the context of all of the Plan’s goals, we should reexamine the number of affordable units we actually believe can be achieved through the Plan.</p>	<p>Policy Directive H3 establishes a goal of achieving between 550 and 1,200 more committed affordable housing units in the Crystal City Planning Area through Plan build out. The range is based on varying assumptions of how the Affordable Housing Ordinance could be applied to future development in conjunction with future development in Crystal City. 1,200 units could be achieved if every portion of affordable housing contributions generated by the Ordinance and negotiated through bonus density were met through provision of units in Crystal City. Provision of 550 units in Crystal City would be supplemented with an amount of cash that combined would roughly equal the value of the 1,200 units without any cash reserve. In this context, this aspirational goal, presented as range, is still relevant as a general target.</p>	
4.8	LRPC	PC	12/9	<p>Parking Requirements and Family-Sized Units With regard to parking requirements, flexibility should be considered for residential building parking ratio maximums when a project has many larger, family-sized units.</p>	<p>As the Plan does not include a maximum parking ratio for residential development it already provides the flexibility if needed to provide more spaces in such circumstances. The County Master Transportation Plan will continue to guide such decisions. Also, current research shows 20% of households in Arlington’s Metro corridors do not own an automobile.</p>	
4.9	LRPC	E2C2	12/9	<p>Bicycle Lane Couplets and Sharrows Sharrows could be explored where one-way bicycle lane couplets are proposed in order to provide bi-direction bicycle facilities on the same street.</p>	<p>A bicycle lane couplet approach for portions of Crystal Drive and Clark Bell is recommended given the limited available dimension and competing facilities, and the overall goal of creating a “complete street” environment on both streets. However, in future design efforts, sharrows could be explored as a potential option if adequate dimension exists.</p>	
4.10	LRPC	PRC	12/9	<p>Four Mile Run Trail Connections Connection to Four Mile Run trail should be added to the language in #17.</p>	<p>Staff concurs and will revise accordingly.</p>	
4.11	LRPC	PRC	12/9	<p>Tree Canopy Coverage The Implementation actions do not include mention of tree canopy coverage.</p>	<p>Staff recognizes this and will consider a new action item that speaks to recommendations to: 1) pursue street tree planting in the near term in areas where near- or mid-term redevelopment is not envisioned and 2) maximize opportunities to increase the number of trees planted in streetscape and public open space locations with each redevelopment project.</p>	
4.12	LRPC	PRC	12/9	<p>Long Bridge Park – Phase I How is the County ensuring the construction of the 1st piece of Long Bridge Park (Esplanade) continues through to Crystal Drive?</p>	<p>As part of Phase 1, the Esplanade connection to Crystal City at 12th Street and Crystal Drive is included in the project construction documents, is funded, and will use existing County easements for access.</p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
4.13	LRPC	PRC	12/9	Surrounding Parks- Types of Potential Improvements Language about improvements to parks should not pre-judge “larger scale” facilities.	Staff concurs and will revise accordingly, stating that those facilities should undergo examination to determine if and/or what improvements should be pursued.	
4.14	LRPC	PRC	12/9	Linkage between Center Park and 2121 Crystal Dr. phasing For #21; should mention the Policy Framework linkage between open space at 2121 Crystal Dr and the Center Park.	Staff concurs and will revise accordingly as an example.	
4.15	LRPC	PC	12/9	Access to Private Building Facilities For #23; regarding public accessibility to private building amenities, this should be re-framed as something to explore, rather than a stated preference or expectation.	Staff concurs and will revise accordingly; clarifying that public access to those facilities should be explored on a project by project basis.	
4.16	LRPC	AHCA	12/9	Achieving Center Park A more specific strategy is needed for how Center Park will be achieved.	☐ Staff will consider adding an implementation action item that directs staff to study this issue further after Plan adoption to develop a strategy or number of potential strategies, potentially in the context of broader open space policy, practice, and tools.	
4.17	LRPC	CCTF	12/9	“No Net Loss” Idea Reference to no net loss of open space at any point conflicts with what was discussed among the Task Force and built into the Policy Framework.	Staff concurs and will revise accordingly.	
4.18	LRPC	PC	12/9	Community Infrastructure Section is missing mention of civic infrastructure, urgent care facilities, polling places, schools, and the commercial needs of Crystal City as a complete neighborhood.	Staff concurs and will incorporate language in this section discussing these elements. The Community Services section of Chapter 3 will also be expanded to more fully describe these community elements.	
4.19	LRPC	PC	12/9	Schools A new item should be considered that discusses monitoring school populations, developing baseline for number of students, and being proactive in planning for future needs.	Staff concurs and will include an action item that discusses continued monitoring of evolving school populations, and planning proactively for facilities into the future etc.	
4.20	LRPC	CCTF	12/9	Crystal City BID In the discussion of the BID, there is some ambiguity about what tasks are being envisioned for the BID (or other parties) to take on in the future; please clarify.	Staff will revisit the language to remove ambiguity or confusion regarding the BID’s current tasks, and will speak more generally in nature about continuing their efforts into the future.	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
4.21	LRPC	E2C2	12/9	<p>Sustainability Actions Chapter 4 is lacking any actions specifically relating to the sustainability or water, stormwater, sewer recommendations earlier in the Plan.</p>	<p>As with other topics in Chapter 4, the goal is not to repeat all the recommendations from the earlier chapters but to present more action oriented items or items that may warrant greater emphasis. On this topic, recommendations elsewhere in the plan speak to the direction the County will be moving towards as a matter of policy/practice relating to this plan and other areas more generally.</p>	
4.22	LRPC	CCTF	12/17	<p>Timing of Infrastructure The text should describe how the Plan will ensure the County will follow through with necessary infrastructure when needed to facilitate individual redevelopment projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chapter should clarify the County and private sector partnership aspect to fund infrastructure elements collaboratively. • PDSPs could include financing work plans as part of approvals, to add a level of certainty on timing of infrastructure. • Joint County-Developer Agreements are a potential tool to consider, where a developer builds infrastructure w/ redevelopment and the County reimburses them over time. 	<p>Staff concurs and will include additional text describing these points. Creating a special section of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for projects in Crystal City should help. Text can be added to describe the public-private partnership nature of the infrastructure improvements. The County could also possibly explore Joint County-Developer Agreements and other tools not in the plan.</p>	
4.23	LRPC	PC	12/17	<p>Site Level and Plan Level Improvements The text should have more clarity in using a categorical approach to distinguish between expectations for projects earning up to the maximum base densities versus density above and beyond the base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On affordable housing, clarity is needed to distinguish between requirements per the ordinance versus negotiations for density above the base density. • Major utility relocations in street rights of way, should be given consideration as off-site improvements. 	<p>Staff concurs and will revise the text to clarify. The intent was to indicate that “site-level improvements” are typical expectations for achieving site plan base densities based on the GLUP, while “plan-level improvements” are generally above and beyond that; however “plan-level improvements” could be achieved in part through provision of community benefits to earn above the base densities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text will clarify that affordable housing requirements will be based on: 1) the Zoning Ordinance; and 2) negotiations for density above the base. • Treatment of utility relocations will depend on specific site plan filings, since in some cases there will be utility relocations costs standard as part of constructing site plans, while in other cases relocations would be part of base county infrastructure costs. 	

Com- ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
4.24	LRPC	PC	12/17	Implementation How does the plan ensure consistent focus w/ following up on recommended public improvements, such as the achievement of Center Park (are there trigger mechanisms)?	The recommendation to create a special section of the CIP for Crystal City for a 6-year period, to be updated every 2 years, will maintain priority and focus. As suggested, text can be added to suggest major property owners in Crystal City are included in related discussions to ensure planned improvements reflected in the CIP are timed accurately with specific private redevelopment projects. Also, an item can be included in the implementation chapter that recommends a follow up task of developing a more detailed strategy to achieve Center Park in a timely fashion.	
4.25	LRPC	PC	12/17	Clarifying Open Space Improvements Text should better distinguish between land area reserved for open space and the costs associated with build-out of such spaces.	Staff concurs and will add language that clarifies the distinction between these elements.	
4.26	LRPC	PC	12/17	Economic Analysis Information Request for information for future Planning Commission meetings to include economic analyses illustrating estimated rates of return and a breakdown between real estate and all other taxes.	Staff will provide the outputs and summary presentations of the economic analysis prepared in tandem with the planning process. These documents are available online at www.plancrystalcity.com , posted under the Oct. 7, 2007 Task Force meeting.	
4.27	LRPC	PC	12/17	Density Exemptions For item #32, confirm whether density exemptions or exclusions will still be used by the County.	There are no issues with using density exemptions.	
4.28	LRPC	PC	12/17	Interim Illustrative Plan at 2030 A snapshot of the illustrative plan in 2030 would help show the improvements factored into the economic analyses in Chapter 4.	Although staff understands the visual aid such a graphic would provide, such a phasing graphic may suggest a false sense of exact certainty regarding the gradual build out of the Plan. Even though the economic analysis included assumptions about the individual projects taken on in the first several phases, the goal was to understand the anticipated costs in order of magnitude, not to lock-in specific projects for a given timeframe, as they will depend upon the timing of private redevelopment.	
4.29	LRPC	CCTF	12/17	Tear-Down Credit Any reference to using a Tear-Down Credit is missing from the text in Chapter 4.	The tear-down credit is included in Policy Directive D3 in Section 2.3 of the Plan, and is still a relevant potential tool to encourage redevelopment consistent with the Plan. Reference to prospective use of tear-down credit will be added in the discussion of item #4, regarding Zoning Ordinance Amendments.	