

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
<b>DOCUMENT STRUCTURE / FORMAT / OVERALL</b>						
O.1.	LRPC	PC	6/9	<b>Technical Items</b> Some of the more technical items, such as street cross sections, could be moved to an appendix for better flow.	<i>Staff concurs. Staff will go through the document and identify elements of the plan that may be better positioned in an appendix or the rear of the document.</i>	
O.2	LRPC	AHCA	6/9	<b>Area / Context</b> In Chapter 1, add a map/graphic that shows Crystal City in its broader context from the Potomac River, 395, and Four Mile Run.	<i>Staff concurs. Staff will provide a map that shows the geographic area bound by I-395, Four Mile Run, and the Potomac River. Staff will also consider additional data on growth projections that may be provided for greater detail on local growth.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 1 – EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>						
1.1	LRPC	AHCA	6/9	<b>Fig 1.2.5. / “Restaurant Row”</b> In Figure 1.2.5, revise the diagram to soften the edge between Restaurant Row and the Aurora Highlands neighborhood. This area is an important element integral to Aurora Highlands, so the edge shown on the map should be deleted.	<i>Staff concurs. The diagram will be revised to illustrate the edge differently to show that the 23<sup>rd</sup> St Restaurant Row is an integral part of the adjacent blocks to the west.</i>	
1.2	LRPC	Audience	6/9	<b>Vision Statement – Aerial</b> Please use a current aerial photo of the Crystal City/Aurora Highlands/Arlington Ridge geographic extent.	<i>Staff concurs and will incorporate a more recent aerial photo of this area in the existing conditions section.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 2 – VISION STATEMENT</b>						
2.1	LRPC	Misc.	6/9	<b>Vision Statement – Length</b> The Vision Statement should be more concise and to the point. This could be done in conjunction with a new chapter or section that describes the overall place of Crystal City in the future and what life would be like in the area.	<i>Staff concurs. Staff will work on redrafting the Vision Statement into a 2 or 3 paragraph statement, and will focus on painting an overall vision of the future Crystal City at a high-level. More detailed specifics not included in the Vision Statement will be moved into a new section opening Chapter 3 (see comment 3.1.1).</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
2.2	LRPC	PC	6/9	<p><b><i>Vision Statement – Jefferson Davis Highway</i></b>                      It does not appear that the plan for Jefferson Davis Highway is consistent with the policy directive language adopted by the County Board in December regarding bridging the gap between the east and west sides.</p>	<p><i>Staff does not concur. The record from the Board meeting indicates that the stated reason for adopting the PC recommended language for T13 was to be more flexible in allowing other strategies in addition to an “urban boulevard” concept to help bridge the gap between the east and west sides. Board discussion affirmed that this is essentially a word edit and not a major substantive change. Already incorporated into the plan are strategies such as physical and transit improvements to strengthen connections between the east and west sides, build-to-lines along JDH to better define and frame the street, and intersection or underpass improvements, such as at JDH and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Staff encourages LRPC discussion to focus on identifying additional detailed strategies to help bridge the gap that are consistent with the adopted Policy Framework.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter	Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
<b>CHAPTER 3 – NEW SECTION – Humanizing Crystal City</b>					
3.1.1	LRPC	Misc.	<p>6/9</p> <p><b><i>New Section/Chapter – Describing the “Place and People” of Crystal City</i></b>                      Expanding from the Vision Statement, the Plan should include a new chapter/section that humanizes the Plan, or discusses how life in Crystal City would support daily, civic, and cultural life in a variety of ways. This new section should address comments on the following elements, if not addressed in the Vision Statement itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Emphasize the point about Crystal City, Aurora Highlands, and Arlington Ridge functioning as a single unit;</li> <li>o Stronger reference to bicyclists and bicycle facilities;</li> <li>o Additional descriptions to include lower income and/or physically handicapped persons in Crystal City;</li> <li>o Delete planning jargon (e.g. “urban form”) from Vision Statement;</li> <li>o Expand beneficiaries of Plan to include visitors, neighbors, tourists, etc.;</li> <li>o Clarify that surface transitway system will connect beyond Arlington into Alexandria and also Fairfax;</li> <li>o Stronger emphasis needed for open spaces and parks;</li> <li>o Expand the bullet on “Very high quality public parks...” to include “high quantity” as well;</li> <li>o The Plan should have an order of magnitude estimate for a bracketed range of school children that may be generated by Crystal City in the future assuming the vision of more family households, with children; logical boundaries for impacts need to be considered;</li> </ul>	<p><i>Staff concurs. Staff will work on drafting a new section to open Chapter 3 that will in more detail describe what life is envisioned to be like in the future under the Plan. The new section will address most or all of the bulleted items listed in the column to the left, unless they are addressed directly within the Vision Statement itself.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
	LRPC	Misc.	6/9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Enhancements to the transit system should be its own bullet, and the idea of placing the pedestrian and transit users at the same priority level as vehicles should be made;</li> <li>o Flexibility should be reserved to allow the area to adapt to what the market will allow, within the Plan framework;</li> <li>o Long Bridge Park also needs to be recognized as part of surrounding context;</li> <li>o Additional text is needed on sustainable design and development, urban forestry canopy, and carbon neutrality.</li> <li>o Create a strategy for civic infrastructure elements, such as schools, community centers, and facilities that support and encourage participatory civic life, in addition to child/adult day care, routine and urgent health care facilities, and other facilities/services important to supporting a vibrant urban community.</li> </ul>		
<b>CHAPTER 3 – NEIGHBORHOOD OVERVIEWS (3.3)</b>						
3.3.1	LRPC	PC	6/9	<p><b><i>“Neighborhoods” terminology</i></b>                      Identifying six individual “neighborhoods” seems counterproductive as it could perpetuate existing boundaries rather than breaking down barriers for a more seamless community. Suggests that another term (e.g. “district”, “sub-area”, etc.) could resolve this issue.</p>	<p><i>Staff had used the term “neighborhoods” to describe the various areas that had been identified during the planning process with the Task Force and referenced in the Goals and Objectives. Nevertheless, to preclude the misperception that these sub-areas are meant to be physically and psychologically separated, staff will revised the Plan to use the term “district” instead when presenting the overviews.</i></p>	
3.3.2	LRPC	PRC	6/9	<p><b><i>Open Spaces in Context</i></b>                      Consideration should be given to the open spaces outside but nearby Crystal City.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. Staff will develop a new map that illustrates the planned open space network in Crystal City, as well as the existing and planned open spaces in the surrounding vicinity.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.3.3	LRPC	PC	6/9	<p><b>Earning Density above By-Right</b>                      More clarity is needed around the plan's expectations for site plans up to the base density and site plans that include bonus density, to denote that there will still be certain expectations up to the base density, in addition to beyond.</p>	<p><i>Staff will continue to work on this element to provide greater clarity on community improvement expectations for various levels of development.</i></p>	
3.3.4	LRPC	AHCA	6/9	<p><b>Connections among Neighborhoods</b>                      Consideration should be given to the prevailing east-west flow of people (corridors, e.g. 18<sup>th</sup> Street) into and out of Crystal City, and identify pertinent improvements for pedestrian accommodation as needed.</p>	<p><i>Staff and the Plan support improved transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility improvements to strengthen the connections between the east and west sides of Jefferson Davis Highway.</i></p>	
3.3.5	memo	AHCA	6/9	<p><b>Post Office site</b>                      At the Northwest Gateway there should be a mention of the County's intent to retain the U.S. Post Office and retail at this location.</p>	<p><i>The Plan narrative can be modified to identify that there is community support for this use. However, it will be a business decision by the USPS whether or not to retain a presence at that location. <u>The County's understanding from USPS is that they wish to maintain a retail presence in the vicinity, but do not envision a free standing building.</u> The retail recommendations allow retail in this location, although it would not be required.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.3.6	memo	AHCA	6/9	<b>Neighborhood Oriented Retail</b> Page 40, section 3.3.6. At the West Side on restaurant row there should be a specific mention of the intent to preserve and retain small “neighborhood oriented” retail along this section of 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street. The desire here, as opposed to within Crystal City, to have small neighborhood oriented retail as opposed to the large chain eateries and stores, etc. usually associated with Crystal City should be mentioned.	<i>Staff concurs. New language will be added to specifically mention the importance of existing businesses and intent to preserve and retain small locally owned and neighborhood serving retail along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street between Eads St. and Fern St.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – SUSTAINABLE DESIGN (3.4)</b>						
3.4.1	LRPC	E2C2	6/9	<b>Level of Detail</b> What’s the appropriate level of detail in recommendations for sustainability? Can they be more specific than currently written?	<i>The language in the Plan is written to try to balance the desire for identifying specific strategies within Crystal City while maintaining consistency with County Wide policies and programs over time. It is anticipated that the county’s policies around sustainable development will continue to evolve over time.</i>	
3.4.2	LRPC	PC	6/9	<b>Suggestions vs. Requirements</b> Clarity is needed as to whether these guidelines are requirements or suggestions? Consideration should be given for new construction vs. adaptive re-use projects.	<i>The specific recommendations noted in this section are intended as strong suggestions, but not necessarily requirements. There may be a limitation in the County’s authority to legally require inclusion of certain elements.</i>	
3.4.3	LRPC	PC	6/9	<b>Density Bonuses?</b> In terms of implementation, are density bonuses envisioned for LEED projects in Crystal City, if so at what levels?	<i>Staff is continuing to consider how these elements can be incented through the development process in Crystal City. These strategies will be addressed in the Implementation chapter of the Plan to be reviewed by the LRPC in the fall.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – BLOCK STRUCTURE (3.5)</b>						

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.5.1	LRPC	AHCA	6/9	<b>Figure-Ground</b> The existing figure ground diagram, Figure 3.5.1, should be corrected to accurately convey the Crystal Houses block, Potomac Yard, and the wastewater treatment plant facilities.	<i>Staff concurs. The figure ground diagram will be corrected to accurately convey existing conditions as data availability permits.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – TRANSPORTATION (3.6)</b>						
3.6.1	LRPC	AHCA	7/8	<b>No Additional Streets</b> Page 47, section 3.6.2. Regarding new streets, the map on page 49 correctly shows no new streets between Eads Street and Route 1. It might be useful to mention this in the text of the report as one of the neighborhood protection measures.	<i>Staff concurs. Staff will provide additional detail in the text that emphasizes that no additional streets are planned between Eads and Route 1 between 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> Street. While no additional streets are planned for the connection of Eads and Route 1, the County still adheres to its adopted policy of enhancing the street grid by breaking up large blocks.</i>	
3.6.2	LRPC	PC	7/8	<b>Complete Streets</b> Consider refinements/edits to stated definition of “Complete Streets” in this section of the Plan.	<i>Staff concurs. Staff will further refine the definition to be consistent with the “Complete Street” definition stated in the Master Transportation Plan.</i>	
3.6.3	LRPC	PC	7/8	<b>Inconsistencies Between Street Grid Drawings</b> Figures 3.6.5 and 3.6.6 illustrate a different street grid in certain locations; it does not appear to be consistently drawn.	<i>Staff concurs. Figure 3.6.5 will be revised to be consistent with the street network shown in Figure 3.6.6. However, as Figure 3.6.5 does not illustrate alleys, potential alley locations shown on 3.6.6 will not appear in 3.6.6.</i>	
3.6.4	LRPC	PC	7/8	<b>Geographic Extent</b> Figures 3.6.4 and 3.6.5: To avoid confusion, these figures could use the same geographic extent as shown in Fig. 3.6.6.	<i>Staff concurs and the maps will be modified to ensure that the geographic extent is consistent for these 3 graphics. Additionally Figure 3.6.6 is hard to read in black/white copy.</i>	
3.6.5	LRPC	PC	7/8	<b>MTP versus Crystal City Plan – Street typologies and sections</b> Text should help clarify that the graphic’s typologies are in general reference to the county Master Transportation Plan, but that the vision for the physical character of the streets should follow the cross-section recommendations in the Crystal City Plan (if there is conflict between them).	<i>Staff concurs. The MTP will be the overall vision of the streets and the actual Crystal City Plan will have the street cross sections and a more detailed vision of the physical framework and character for the future streets in Crystal City. However, cross-sections are illustrative recommendations, and exact dimensions and uses may vary when street design and engineering work is undertaken.</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.6.6	LRPC	E2C2	7/8	<p><b>Cross-Sections and Bicycle Lanes</b>                      In some instances there are inconsistencies with the existing and proposed pedestrian and bike routes shown in Figure 3.6.8 and the street cross sections, for instance the section shown for Crystal Drive south of 26<sup>th</sup> Street.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. The street cross sections and bike network are being further refined and will be incorporated in the final plan.</i></p>	
3.6.7	LRPC	CCTF	7/8	<p><b>Pinch Points and Streetcar</b>                      Pinch points shown in Fig. 3.6.9 relate to past concerns we've shared with County about ability to accommodate transit in dedicated lanes on Crystal Drive.</p>	<p><i>Staff does not concur. Studies to date indicate that there is adequate dimension to generally accommodate streetcar (w/ dedicated northbound lane) in existing ROW with other street elements. Staff will consider developing more detail that illustrates how the cross-section would work at pinch points.</i></p>	
3.6.8	email	PRC	6/10	<p><b>Bus Route Correction</b>                      On page 50, in figure 3.6.7, existing transit is shown. Bus line 10E does not go near Crystal City. It comes out of Alexandria on Mt. Vernon Ave. to Arlington Ridge and follows Arlington Ridge to Lynn and down the hill to Army Navy Drive and then into the Pentagon. It only runs during the morning and evening rush hours. So, it should be deleted from the legend in figure 3.6.7.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs that 10E is shown incorrectly in this figure. Staff will correct this figure accordingly.</i></p>	
3.6.9	LRPC	PRC	7/8	<p><b>Transit to Long Bridge Park</b>                      It's concerning that there is no proposed transit shown in the Plan for getting people up to Long Bridge Park.</p>	<p><i>There is a proposed streetcar stop on 12<sup>th</sup> Street at the new 10<sup>th</sup> Street connection. Bus transit facilities (e.g. bus stops) have been incorporated into the design of Long Bridge Park and reconstruction of Old Jefferson Davis Highway, laying the groundwork for accommodating future bus service there. Also, the closest general location for a street car stop is within ¼ mile walking distance from south end of the park.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.6.10	LRPC	PRC	7/8	<p><b><i>New Bus Route Suggestion</i></b>                      Crystal City/Potomac Yard and Shirlington may all benefit from a bus that runs from Shirlington to Potomac Yard and then to Crystal City generally following S. Glebe Road. It could go into some of the neighborhoods to get closer to more residents. Currently, the 23A goes between Crystal City and Shirlington but skips Potomac Yard. It may not be an immediate need but is certainly worth looking at in the total transit package.</p>	<p><i>Staff will further review. Two separate efforts will inform any future action on this item. The MTP-Transit Element identifies priority corridors for improving bus transit service, and the S. Glebe Rd. corridor is identified. Additionally, the County continues to work with WMATA on a regular basis to analyze effectiveness of existing bus service and opportunities for upgraded or streamlined service.</i></p>	
3.6.11	LRPC	PRC	7/8	<p><b><i>Improved Multi-Use Trails</i></b>                      Opportunities to expand bicycle capacity are needed, recognizing National Park Service can pose obstacles to increased trail width. What can staff do to open this dialogue with the NPS? It appears that increasing the width of Mount Vernon trail is a good candidate to advance from bicycle capacity issues. Would like to see this push forward with the CMO to start making progress on this item.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs, but notes that this item is outside the scope of this planning effort. Staff will continue to work with the National Park Service the multi-use trail network at both a regional and local (Crystal City) scale.</i></p>	
3.6.12	LRPC	AHCA	7/8	<p><b><i>Improved Pedestrian and Bike Connections</i></b>                      Fig 3.6.8 should be modified to zoom out and include area extending to the Pentagon Row area – need to illustrate connections to the greater neighborhood to the west.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. While the streets included in 3.6.8 are within the study area, staff will modify the diagrams to include more context, including more of Pentagon City.</i></p>	
3.6.13	LRPC	CCTF	7/8	<p><b><i>Retail Streets and Frontages</i></b>                      Regarding retail oriented mixed use streets, there is too much retail on too many streets; and how does this relate to the Retail Frontages recommendations?</p>	<p><i>The retail-oriented mixed use streets is a reference to the Type A street typology used in the Master Transportation Plan (which includes design guidelines for that type of street), and does not mean that the entire street needs to be lined with retail. The Retail Frontage Map (Fig. 3.9.3) presents the more specific recommendations on retail locations.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.6.14	LRPC	E2C2	7/8	<b>Bike Lane Specifications</b> In street cross sections, 5 foot bike lane next to parking lane seems insufficient.	<i>The Arlington minimum standard is 5 feet for on-street bike lanes and has proven adequate in its many applications across the County. Where additional street space is available, the County will consider wider bike lanes along with the many other potential uses for the space.</i>	
3.6.15	LRPC	PC	7/8	<b>Pedestrian Crossing Distances</b> In street cross sections, some of the pedestrian crossing distances appear to approach 77' – isn't this greater than our maximum width without center refuge?	<i>The street cross sections are in mid-block locations. The actual crossing distance would be at the intersection location and would not include parking making the cross section up to 16 feet shorter.</i>	
3.6.17	LRPC	Audience	6/9	<b>Traffic Impacts on Neighborhood</b> The Plan directs traffic to major arterials, which include 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street, Arlington Ridge Rd., and Glebe Rd.	<i>Staff does not concur. Strengthening the mixed-use makeup of Crystal City has an extremely positive impact on limiting additional vehicular traffic generated by Crystal City. The Plan also significantly enhances transit, bike, pedestrian, and TDM systems which should enable much less per capita automobile usage. Staff has developed 24-hr weekday auto trip calculations per the Plan that show very little increase in traffic, particularly during peak periods. Most of the traffic in Crystal City on Jefferson Davis Highway (existing and projected) is through traffic.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – PUBLIC REALM (3.7)</b>						
3.7.1	LRPC	PC	7/30	<b>Tree Boxes vs. Tree Grates, Pits, etc.</b> The language in second to last sentence in first paragraph under 3.7.2. should be modified to delete the phrase “utilize tree boxes”, as this appears to be unnecessarily specific. This issue needs to be clarified and used consistently throughout (for instance, review page 116-17).	<i>Staff concurs, and the plan language and recommendations will be revised to refer to street tree plantings in sidewalks as either tree pits or continuous planting strips. Any reference to “tree box” will be removed from the plan, consistent with the County's Landscape Standards.</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.2	LRPC	E2C2	7/30	<p><b>Replacing Open Space in Crystal City</b>                      In the second bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, the language should be clarified to make clear that new open space being provided is within Crystal City.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. Although, in this same recommendation the developer can provide park facilities for up grades to existing open spaces. In that case the County should first consider park improvements to for existing open spaces that serve within Crystal City, or then nearby public parks that are likely to be see greater demand and use from residents of Crystal City and surrounding area such as Aurora Virginia Highlands and Eads Parks to help offset higher recreational demands from new Crystal City tenants.</i></p>	
3.7.3	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Clarifying “Public” Open Space</b>                      In the second bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, the word “public” should be added before “open space” for purposes of clarity.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs and will add the word “public”.</i></p>	
3.7.4	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Discussion on Public vs. Private Open Space</b>                      It would be useful to have a little more discussion (or section) that clarifies the distinction between public and private open space.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. The heading on the section at the bottom of p. 69 will be changed to “Public versus Private Open Space” and revised to clarify the roles each play for contributing to the livability of Crystal City.</i></p>	
3.7.5	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Mid-Block pedestrian connections</b>                      The discussion on public open space should include reference to Policy P6 and the desire/need for mid-block pedestrian connections and east-west connectivity in particular. A graphic that illustrates where these connections are most desired would also have value.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs with adding a reference to Policy P6 within Section 3.7 - Public Realm, but does not concur with adding a new graphic showing these connections. Existing text highlighting the goal of achieving these connections should be sufficient.</i></p>	
3.7.6	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Private active recreational facilities</b>                      In the fourth bullet under “Open Space Planning Recommendations”, what exactly is meant by “...within the development” (regarding pools, gyms, rooftop facilities, etc.)?</p>	<p><i>The term is used for either outdoor or indoor facilities on the development property that are built for private use by the tenants and are not accessible to the public. Placing facilities on rooftops, within courtyards or in the building can help to meet the recreational demands of the tenants and reduce the demand on public facilities.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.7	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Precedent Photos</b> There are many local examples of public open spaces in Arlington that can be used, instead of so many photos from abroad.</p>	<p><i>Staff agrees. However, the intention of using photos from other jurisdictions is to inspire new designs for Crystal City, though some more local examples can be also considered.</i></p>	
3.7.8	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>15<sup>th</sup> Street Park and Trail</b> The proposal for a bike-path inside the park is concerning, and further reduces the usability of the proposed space.</p>	<p><i>Staff will clarify in the plan that the multi-use trail is envisioned as a meandering path and not intended for serious bicyclist use; it would be much more passive in character.</i></p>	
3.7.9	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Table 3.7.1</b> References that direct readers to section 3.3.7 to review open space concepts are incorrect.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. The references will be corrected and refer to the page on which the concept is illustrated.</i></p>	
3.7.10	LRPC	E2C2	7/30	<p><b>Water Features in Open Space</b> Consider including reference to rainwater harvesting systems for concepts for public open spaces uses (e.g. irrigation), as feasible.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. A subheading in Section 3.4 can be added to detail examples of rainwater harvesting systems and practices that should be encouraged.</i></p>	
3.7.11	LRPC	E2C2	7/30	<p><b>Sustainability Elements in Open Space</b> p.73, replace “catch basins” with “cisterns”. Consider consistent recommendations for permeable paving in open spaces throughout, where feasible.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. “Cistern” will replace “catch basin”, and permeable paving will be encouraged wherever feasible.</i></p>	
3.7.12	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Façade along 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Plaza</b> p.74, Please clarify what is meant by “building wing to north should be more <u>iconic</u>...”.</p>	<p><i>The intent of the term “iconic” is to encourage a building design that will stand out and is recognizable. The building faces along the plaza should be designed to create a sense of place that will attract people to the site. Staff will revise the description to provide more clarity.</i></p>	
3.7.13	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Underground Connection to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Plaza</b> p.74, Reference to space potentially providing direct entrance to the underground presumes underground would need to be extended to this location. Is this desirable and/or appropriate?</p>	<p><i>It is not necessary to have the concourse entrance directly at the plaza. In lieu of extending the underground to the new plaza, the existing access point at 23<sup>rd</sup> Street could be enhanced as part of a streetscape improvement project that provides a well-designed connection between the access point and the plaza.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.14	LRPC	CCTF/PC	7/30	<p><b>Water Park; Over-Programmed?</b>                      p.76, Graphics and narrative suggest a number of new elements to this park which may crowd or clutter the currently successful park. Rather than having a free-standing structure for bike rentals, perhaps it could be incorporated into the redevelopment structure along the park's southern edge.</p>	<p><i>Staff understands the concern, and emphasizes that the illustration is conceptual. Text on this page will highlight the importance of avoiding too much clutter in the park when considering future improvements or additional uses.</i></p>	
3.7.15	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Expectations for soil depths and plant installations</b>                      It could be useful to have a statement about expectations or standards used to ensure sufficient soil depth and acceptable planting methods for plant quality, <u>especially where locations have been identified for large canopy trees in parks or plazas.</u></p>	<p><del>Staff does not concur.</del> <i>The Arlington County Landscape Standards provide detailed information for developers to use for their plans. All future projects will be expected to meet these standards. However, staff will research examples of preferred minimum depths in cases where large canopy trees are built on top of underground structures or parking.</i></p>	
3.7.16	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Long Bridge Park Esplanade</b>                      p.77, How will the plans for the esplanade and for future park space at Gateway Park be coordinated? The Esplanade character should be carried until Crystal Drive for consistency in design; widths should be consistent.</p>	<p><i>The connection between the esplanade and Crystal Drive is planned to be built as part of the Long Bridge Park project. When improvements are made to Gateway Park its design will include plans to integrate the esplanade into the park in a coordinated manner.</i></p>	
3.7.17	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Crystal Park, playground</b>                      p.79, What is the intended use and accessibility of this space as it relates to an existing child day care center facility? Is the playground envisioned as private, public, or one of each?</p>	<p><i>A public park is envisioned for the site. Also, child care remains important to the County, and as long as there is a care center at this location there will need to be a playground of some sort, which may or may not be part of the public park.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.18	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Community Canine Areas</b>                      What are the Plan's proposals or recommendations on future community canine areas?</p>	<p><i>The Plan will be modified to include a more general recommendation about Community Canine Areas, without specifying specific potential locations for them. The open space recommendations table will be modified to delete specific references to Community Canine Areas.</i></p> <p><i>To meet the growing demand for places for dogs to play and exercise, a CCA should be built either in or near Crystal City. Decisions on future specific locations for a CCA will be part of a future planning exercise.</i></p>	
3.7.19	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Public Art</b>                      This section needs clarity on the goals for public art. The county has history of defining public art pretty broadly, not just referring to plop art. In actuality, county has shied away from targeting gateways as place for public art. A few specifics about particular public art initiatives in the area could make some sense. Clarify level of consistency with Public Art Master Plan.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. The section will be revised to add more detail on these points.</i></p>	
3.7.20	LRPC	HC	7/30	<p><b>Public Art</b>                      Text could use cross-reference to "performing arts" narrative that occurs later on page 98.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs. The section will be revised to include a cross-reference.</i></p>	
3.7.21	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Underground Wayfinding</b>                      p.81, Suggest adding note to ensure clear and frequent wayfinding signage throughout the underground.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs and will add a bullet emphasizing the need for continued effective and clear wayfinding.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.22	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Underground - Continuity</b> p.81, Does the continuous underground network need to be fully underground, or can there be instances where street crossings occur at grade if space is short.</p>	<p><i>The Plan encourages the maintenance of the underground, its adaptation to well-designed future redevelopment, and an increased interplay between the interior concourse and streetscape areas, which would allow instances of street level crossings. In such instances, safe pedestrian crossing facilities would need to be provided.</i></p>	
3.7.23	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Underground – Public Access</b> p.81, What tools will be used to ensure that the underground is open to the public, if not through easements?</p>	<p><i>The underground is currently open to the public 24/7 with private security patrols. If it is agreed that public access needs to be protected in the future, this would be addressed at the site plan level, and may include conditions dictating hours of access.</i></p>	
3.7.24	email	Property Owner representative – JM Zell (E. Wilcox)	6/3	<p><b>Open Space #20</b> The “Community Canine Area” noted on page 70 at Fern and 22<sup>nd</sup> Street is a new concept that was not discussed with the Ownership or at any of the task force meetings. Further, it contradicts the text on page 40, which describes the area as a “relaxed park setting.’ It seems premature to program the open space as a dog park, and locating dog parks involve a greater level of community input. We note that there are no dog parks identified on the eastern side of Jefferson Davis Highway or elsewhere in the plan area.</p> <p>We recommend that the text on page 70- be consistent with that on page 40, as this is in keeping with the discussions throughout the task force meetings.</p>	<p><del><i>This park is within walking distance of both multi-family and single family residences. A park which includes space for active recreational facilities will benefit the community. Open space #713 and #26 have been identified as additional potential sites where a CCA could be located.</i></del></p> <p><i>A Canine Community Area (CCA) is one of many options that could be considered when this space is planned in the future. Park planning will occur when a site plan is submitted for this block and at that time the community will have an opportunity to participate in the process. A group to sponsor the CCA will also have to commit to providing supervision and upkeep before a new CCA will be planned.</i></p> <p><u><i>Please see response to comment 3.7.18 above.</i></u></p>	<p><del><i>There is LRPC concern that this level of detail is too specific</i></del></p> <p><del><i>Maybe approach it in more of a policy level approach or descriptive fashion, by saying:</i></del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del><i>✓ Encourage a balance of active and passive spaces</i></del></li> <li><del><i>✓ Balance between plaza hardscape and softscape;</i></del></li> <li><del><i>✓ Balance user needs and variety of elements within the park network</i></del></li> </ul> <p><del><i>...and thus eliminate the more specific park design recommendations</i></del></p>

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.7.25	Phone call	Property Owner representative – JM Zell (E. Wilcox)	8/13	<b>Community Canine Areas</b> - Specific locations for a CCA should not be included in the plan - Have a general recommendation that a CCA be built either within or just outside the Crystal City study area.	<i>Staff does not concur. The open space concepts provide guidance on the future development of the open spaces to ensure that a balance of active and passive recreational facilities is built in Crystal City. No final decisions are being made, and each park will undergo a planning and design process in the future. Please see response to comment 3.7.18 above.</i>	
3.7.26	LRPC	Audience	6/8	<b>Green Space</b> Attention to green spaces is very important; this was also conveyed in comment from LRPC member; Pocket Parks are key assets.	<i>Staff agrees that a well designed open space system is essential to the quality of life in Crystal City.</i>	
3.7.27	memo	AHCA	6/7	<b>Existing Pocket Park</b> Page 70, table 3.7.1. The table does not show the existing pocket park on the northwest corner of 23 <sup>rd</sup> St. and Eads St., nor is it included in the public open space section.	<i>Table 3.7.1 presents proposed open spaces and their approximate sizes and design concepts. The Plan does not call for the retention of the existing 2,000 sf park.</i>	
3.7.28	memo	AHCA	6/7	<b>Open Spaces on Maps</b> Maps on pages 85, 87, 89, 91, 95, 97 & 101 need to be corrected. These figures should show the intended “green” open spaces between Eads and Route 1 south of 26 <sup>th</sup> Street for pedestrian and open space use as called for shown on Figure 3.7.2 (page 71 open spaces# 25 & #26 ) and correctly shown on other maps ( pages 72, 74, 76, & 78).	<i>Figure 3.7.2 shows all the proposed open spaces. The maps on p.85 and beyond show the open spaces that are within the “built-to-lines.” These maps do not show all the parks because they focus on other features of the Crystal City Plan, and the exact location of the parks not within built-to-lines are subject to change to some extent.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – DENSITY &amp; BUILT FORM (3.8)</b>						
3.8.1	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<b>Tapers and Setbacks</b> p.86, sentence beginning “However, the massing...” needs clarification – what does this mean?	<i>Staff will revise text to clarify. The purpose of the statement is to introduce other tools and strategies, beyond maximum building heights, that can also help shape tapers and setbacks.</i>	

Comment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.8.2	LRPC	CCTF	7/30	<p><b>Gaps between Podiums</b> p.86, Is the 40' guideline for podiums only or for breaks for garage or loading dock entrances into buildings as well?</p>	<p><i>The 40' guideline is intended for breaks between podiums where they may occur along the street walls. For garage or loading dock entrances into facades, design guideline #7 on page 105 qualifies that breaks in the façade (including entrances) for vehicular ways should typically be 25 feet.</i></p>	
3.8.3	LRPC	PC	7/30	<p><b>Ensuring Tapers and Interesting Skyline</b> Tools may be a little weak to ensure tapering in building forms, especially if there is no numerical cap on density. Thought needs to be given to how the code ensures the desired tapering.</p>	<p><i>The Plan is intended to describe what we want to achieve. Future tasks, such as Zoning Ordinance amendments, will be undertaken to ensure codification of elements that ensure that desired building tapering is achieved.</i></p>	
3.8.4	LRPC	Audience	6/8	<p><b>Building Heights</b> The Plan's maximum heights and stepbacks for the Holiday Inn site preclude future redevelopment of a new hotel on the property. Request that LRPC work with staff to look at this issue.</p>	<p><i>The maximum heights for this site were adopted as part of the Policy Directives. Also, form and massing studies by staff indicate that a similar GFA that exists on the site today could be achieved within the Plan heights, under certain configurations and/or with modest relaxing of stepbacks.</i></p>	
3.8.5	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Tower Coverage terminology</b> p. 90, Text should use "tower coverage" consistently rather than also using the alternative term "block occupancy". Also, use "greater and lesser" as descriptors instead of lower and larger".</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs and will use "tower coverage" only, and will also use "greater and lesser" in this section.</i></p>	
3.8.6	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Approach to Penthouses</b> p. 92, Is the treatment of penthouses addressed in the Plan or in future zoning? The goal should be for more interesting building tops that incorporate penthouse / screening more creatively (e.g EPA buildings in Crystal City).</p>	<p><i>The Plan doesn't focus on the discussion of penthouses. The treatment of penthouses <del>vis-a-vis</del> relating to building height will be addressed in zoning, but the Plan makes clear the maximum heights recommended in the plan are for the limit of tenable space. However, staff can will consider including Plan language, perhaps within the Design Guidelines, that addresses the design of penthouses and their heights.</i></p>	
<p><b>CHAPTER 3 – LAND USE AND USE MIX (3.9)</b></p>						

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.9.1	LRPC	CCTF	9/21	<b>Existing vs. Proposed GFA / Percentages</b> p. 94, Question raised regarding the 70%+/- increase in residential discussed on page 94 versus the 100-110% increase understood from previous materials. Please explain.	<i>The 70%+/- refers to increase in residential GFA, while the projected increase in resident population is estimated at almost 100%. <u>The text in the plan can be expanded to note the anticipated doubling of residential population through plan build out.</u> A table detailing these figures are on the project website, 9/21 meeting: <a href="http://www.plancrystalcity.com">www.plancrystalcity.com</a></i>	
3.9.2	LRPC	E2C2	9/21	<b>Affordable Housing</b> p. 94, In new text provided, narrative should be revised to state “achieving <u>an additional</u> 550-1,200 committed affordable housing units...” to be consistent with the Policy H5.	<i>Staff concurs and will make this correction.</i>	
3.9.3	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Affordable Housing</b> p. 94, In new text provided, should delete “Ideally” in 3 <sup>rd</sup> Paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence. Also, in 2 <sup>nd</sup> Paragraph, for consistency “multi-unit <u>flats</u> ” should be changed to “multi-family <u>units</u> ”.	<i>Staff concurs and will make these revisions.</i>	
3.9.4	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Affordable Housing</b> p. 94, Discussion of diversifying housing types should be expanded to include diversity not only of types (high-rise vs. low-rise) but also sizes in terms of bedrooms, price points, and general locations, etc.	<i>Staff concurs and will revise the text accordingly.</i>	
3.9.5	LRPC	Audience	6/8	<b>Affordable Housing</b> The Plan suggests affordable housing could be within Crystal City or nearby. Does this include Aurora Highlands and Arlington Ridge? What is the thinking?	<i>The goal is to achieve affordable housing in Crystal City. When this is not feasible, the idea would be to try to locate such housing nearby in Pentagon City.</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.9.6	LRPC	PRC	9/21	<p><b>Retail Uses and Park Spaces</b>                      p. 97, How much of the open space will be consumed or accommodated with spillover activity from retail uses – it looks like a lot. How might the kiosk policy impact plazas as well?</p>	<p>Basically five <del>(+/-)</del> <u>(or about 20%)</u> of the public open spaces are envisioned to be mostly lined by retail uses. Retail liners are one way to help attract human activity and interest to urban spaces, and successful Arlington examples include Courthouse Plaza, Wellburn Square, Pentagon Row, etc. Per the Zoning Ordinance, in certain districts kiosks would be permitted in publicly accessible open spaces or plazas <u>that are</u> greater than 5,000 square feet in area and contiguous to public sidewalk.</p>	
3.9.7	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Retail Uses – What is the Vision</b>                      p. 96, The Plan should include more information on the future types of retail envisioned. What types will be needed to support a self-sustaining, complete community? Any supporting information of relevance prepared in the Task Force process should be included in summary in the Plan. Also, a sense of the current thinking in the EDC's Retail Task Force could inform plan thinking – should be consistent.</p>	<p>Staff concurs, and will draw upon the highlights of the supporting retail analysis and include a brief discussion on them in the plan. Retail is not expected to be "destination", but more of a mix that supports local employee and resident populations. The vision is for Class A ground level retail fronting public sidewalks and open spaces, while service retailers would continue to occur primarily in the internal (Underground) spaces. The Plan will also be reviewed for consistency with the Retail Task Force paper, and adjusted as necessary.</p>	
3.9.8	email	CCTF	6/7	<p><b>Retail Locations</b>                      Page 97, section 3.9.3. The report indicates where retail locations are to be required, i.e. are mandatory. However, it might be helpful if the report would also indicate where such street level retail would be desirable such as along Eads St. just north and south of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as well as other locations within Crystal City as might be appropriate. This would provide greater negotiating leverage when specific site plans come in for consideration.</p>	<p>The Plan states that any area in Crystal City where retail is not required would in fact permit retail if it were proposed. These recommendations were also part of the adopted Policy Framework. <u>The Plan will also be reviewed for consistency with the Retail Task Force paper, and adjusted as necessary.</u></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
	Meeting	Commenter				
3.9.9	email	PRC	6/10	<b>Cultural Resources</b> On p.98 (3.9.4) you include a discussion of 2 black box theaters and a rectangular proscenium theater. Is the square footage shown sufficient for each of those venues. The rectangular proscenium theater may need more space than shown if the two black box theaters together require 20,000 square feet. May be worth taking a look at the numbers.	<i>Staff agrees that the square footage for the theaters are the minimum required and that the space requirements shown in the Plan should be revised to show a size range for each theater.</i>	
3.9.10	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Cultural Facilities – Estimated Space for Theaters</b> p. 98, Is the space recommended in the Plan sufficient? Is it envisioned to replace any of the existing spaces nearby, or is it envisioned to complement existing spaces? There may be an opportunity for something greater than is being proposed.	<i>See response to comment 3.9.9 above. Generally these new spaces are envisioned to complement existing spaces, but their ultimate construction will depend upon future market and/or community demand for such spaces.</i>	
3.9.11	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Cultural Facilities/Community Services, Document Format</b> p. 98-99, With the drafting of the new section to begin Chapter 3, will these 2 sections remain in the current location or will they be folded into the new section, or will these items be discussed in both places? Maybe cultural resources remains in this spot but community services gets folded into the new section.	<i>As the new section comes together as a draft, staff will consider the appropriate locations for these topics and how they may be best addressed.</i>	
3.9.12	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Cultural Facilities/Community Services</b> p. 99, Discussion should be expanded to address schools in this context, as well as including recognition of child day care, urgent care medical facilities, and other community oriented service and infrastructure identified in adopted policies. Consideration should be given to how retailers such as CVS/Walgreens may evolve to provide medic care services to support the community.	<i>Staff will review the language in this section and expand upon the discussion where needed to address these items. These elements also may be discussed as part of the new sections being developed for Chapter 3.</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.9.13	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Community Services - Fire</b>                      p. 99, Given the ability to co-locate fire stations as part of high-rise residential projects, the words “away from residential use” should be deleted from the paragraph’s last sentence describing potential location criteria for siting a future station if needed.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs, and will revise text accordingly.</i></p>	
3.9.14	LRPC	CCTF	9/21	<p><b>Above Grade Parking</b>                      p. 100, The language outlining the expectations to be explored before being allowed to build above grade parking (which would be lined or screened) is a little unclear on the intent; suggest revising “strong market conditions” to “market demands” or “market requirements”.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs, and will revise the text to clarify that the Plan strongly discourages above grade parking, but would permit it as a last resort if needed to meet parking requirements, so long as it is lined or screened appropriately.</i></p>	
3.9.15	email	CCTF	6/7	<p><b>Loading along Eads St.</b>                      Page 101, figure 3.9.4. All the retail loading is indicated to be placed on Eads St. in the neighborhood, however, if Route 1 is to be made into a “boulevard” it would seem natural that some of the loading be placed on Route 1 allowing more of Eads St. to be pedestrian friendly and not a service corridor.</p>	<p><i>Loading access from Jefferson Davis Highway is not an option, given significant safety and traffic management concerns (and VDOT control). Where possible, the idea is to encourage the use of common service driveways with loading courts from Eads St. to minimize curb cuts. <u>The challenge to achieving this in all cases is the coordination between planned open spaces and space needed for service courts.</u> Also, there will be a focus on attractive design and screening of service areas.</i></p>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – WATER, SANITARY, and STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE (3.10)</b>						
3.10.1	LRPC	E2C2	9/21	<p><b>Policies</b>                      p. 102-03, Policies, or broader goals, are needed in each of the areas in this section. The goals provided for stormwater infrastructure should be complemented with goals for sanitary sewer and water service goals. Policies S1, S2, and S3 should be co-located on the page along with this new text.</p>	<p><i>The overarching policies on sustainability are S1, S2, and S3 in the Policy Framework of the Plan. There are opportunities for identifying supporting goals on these topics tailored to Crystal City, and staff will consider additional feedback from E2C2 and others in this area.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.10.2	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Water Conservation</b> p. 102-03, Water conservation is expected to be an issue of only increasing importance; there should be some language in the plan that discusses the clear direction moving forward.	<i>As a large element of sustainability, water conservation is a key element of this plan. The text can be revised to note that as older buildings are demolished and replaced with new buildings, current standards for water conservation and building performance take effect that have significant positive impacts on water conservation.</i>	
3.10.3	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Water Conservation</b> p. 102-03, Is the proper terminology "Stormwater Detention Ordinance" or "Stormwater Retention Ordinance".	<i>Chapter 60 of the Arlington County Code is known as the "Stormwater Detention Ordinance."</i>	
3.10.4	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Existing versus Proposed</b> p. 102-03, The text in this section may be formatted in a way to separate the discussion of existing versus proposed future; this could be done by splitting the discussion of each topic into two paragraphs.	<i>Staff concurs, and will revise accordingly.</i>	
3.10.5	LRPC	PC	9/21	<b>Solid Waste Strategies</b> p. 102-03, This section could be expanded to include discussion around solid waste recommendations appropriate for the Plan, if needed.	<i>Staff will confer with county staff in charge of solid waste to explore potential opportunities for establishing recommendations.</i>	
<b>CHAPTER 3 – DESIGN GUIDELINES (3.11)</b>						
3.11.1	LRPC	CCTF	9/21	<b>Figure Cross References</b> p. 104, references to figure 3.7.4 should be changed to 3.8.5.	<i>Staff concurs, and will revise accordingly.</i>	
3.11.2	LRPC	CCTF	9/21	<b>List of Questions on Guidelines</b> M. Bonanno will follow up with staff on questions looking for clarification on design guidelines and how they apply to specific scenarios.	<i>Staff received a list of comments on October 16, 2009. After staff completes their review, responses will be provided and discussed at the next LRPC meeting.</i>	
3.11.3	LRPC	CCTF	9/21	<b>Figure Cross References</b> p. 108, references to figure 3.12.2 should be changed to 3.11.2.	<i>Staff concurs, and will revise accordingly.</i>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.11.4	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>References to Compliance with ADA Guidelines</b>                      p. 110, language should be revised to state: "Principal entrances for all new retail should be located on a street frontage <u>and be designed to be compliant with the ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG).</u>"</p>	<p><i>All site plan projects are subject to standard site plan condition language requiring compliance with all federal, state, and local laws, including the Americans with Disabilities Act.</i></p>	
3.11.5	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Exemptions to Clear Zone Requirements and Minimum Clear Heights</b>                      p. 110, There is an apparent discrepancy regarding features above the sidewalk being a required minimum of eight feet (#3) versus ten feet (#5) above the sidewalk. Please clarify.</p>	<p><i>Both specifications should refer to 10 feet above finished grade as the minimum, or the condition needed to be exempt from clear zone width requirements, to be consistent with the Sign Placement requirements of the Zoning Regulations.</i></p>	
3.11.6	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>How Do Marquees Impact Clear Zone</b>                      p. 110, Clarity is needed around the language in #3, and how marquees impact the width of the clear zone if they are an overhead feature.</p>	<p><i>Staff will clarify the language to distinguish between horizontal and vertical dimensions and indicate that such elements "should not narrow width of Clear Zone by more than 2 feet"</i></p>	
3.11.7	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Impact of Building Frontage Elements (Residential) on Clear Zone Widths</b>                      p. 111, While supporting potential for landscaping areas and frontage elements, a key priority is maintaining adequate clear zone width for all sidewalks.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs and supports achieving at maintaining at least the minimum clear zone widths specified in the Plan.</i></p>	
3.11.8	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Lobby Entrance Accessibility</b>                      p. 111, Text in #2 should be expanded to note that entrances should be fully accessible design consistent with ADAAG.</p>	<p><i>Please see response to 3.1.4 above</i></p>	
3.11.9	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Location of Café Zones</b>                      p. 112-114, While noted in the text on page 114, the graphics with café zones should include a note on them saying such zones could also be located in the landscape zone, and/or an alternative diagram should be used to illustrate that condition.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs and will add clarifying notes to the relevant graphics.</i></p>	
3.11.10	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Tree Box</b>                      Entire Document, All references to "Tree Boxes" should be replaced with "Tree Pits" throughout the document text and in all pertinent graphics or figures.</p>	<p><i>Staff concurs, and will revise accordingly.</i></p>	

Com-ment #	Meeting/Commenter		Date	Question/Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Changes to Plan
3.11.1 1	LRPC	E2C2	9/21	<p><b>Street Lighting</b> While the Carlyle light type is specified, the text should clearly state the need for Dark Sky compliant fixtures.</p>	<p><i>Staff is focused on improving the overall performance of County and Dominion owned street lights with an emphasis on improving energy efficiency and reducing maintenance and life cycle costs. This strategy can be included in the Plan discussion.</i></p>	
3.11.1 2	LRPC	PC	9/21	<p><b>Materiality of Landscape Furnishings</b> p. 117, There is language recommending against the use of plastic tables and chairs. Is this appropriate, or does this limit the use of recycled materials?</p>	<p><i>The intent was to discourage cheap and flimsy plastic furnishings. The language will be revised to encourage the use well-designed and durable furnishings made from recycled plastics.</i></p>	
3.11.1 3	LRPC	PRC	9/21	<p><b>Street Tree Recommendations</b> p. 188, What are the qualities of the Ginkgo that make it a suitable street tree, given it's challenges in achieving significant canopies? Also, the scientific name of Platanus Occidentalis is not matched correctly with the Common Name (it should be American Sycamore). Please clarify which one is intended and make consistent.</p>	<p><i>Ginkgo trees are nearly pest-free and resistant to storm damage. They are a durable street tree where there is enough overhead space to accommodate the large size, even in confined soil spaces. Ginkgos tolerate most soil, including compacted, and alkaline, and grow slowly up to 75 feet. The tree is easily transplanted and has a vivid yellow fall color.</i></p> <p><i>Platanus Occidentalis is the scientific name for the American Sycamore. London Plane Tree is a hybrid between American Sycamore and possibly the Oriental Plane Tree, and it is known as Platanus acerifolia (sometimes Platanus x acerifolia or P. x hybrida). London Plane Tree is proven to be a better tree for the urban environment (street tree), and the Plan will be clarified to reflect that.</i></p>	