

Park and Recreation Commission Meeting Sept 23, 2008

7:00pm (Crystal City Policy Directives)
DHS building, 7th Floor, 3033 Wilson Blvd.

Topic: Crystal City Planning Process; Policy Directives

Neal Sigmon provided some background on the Crystal City Planning Process to date. Anthony Fusarelli gave a staff presentation on the process to date, highlighting key elements of the Plan and Policy Directives, focusing on open space elements.

Questions and comments that arose by PRC members during the meeting included the following:

- ✓ The goal of trying to increase the residential balance is an important one for the future of Crystal City.
- ✓ Policy B7, regarding the protection of daylight to open spaces, is a creative new tool that may be the first application of this in a County plan.
- ✓ Have specific implementation strategies been developed with achieving parks, in particular with regard to the Crystal Drive courts?
- ✓ Has FAA signed off on the proposed building heights? Are there existing buildings that create issues with FAA?
- ✓ Is the County considering incentives to get people to live in Crystal City in order to increase the residential population?
- ✓ How was Long Bridge Park factored into the planning for open space in Crystal City, if at all?
- ✓ The plan proposes that a building be removed to create open space #7; how is this to be achieved?
- ✓ How would additional open spaces impact the plan? If spaces other than those proposed in the plan were created, would it change the proposed open space network?
- ✓ How does the projected residential population or density increase compare with the projected increase in open space?
- ✓ Is the existing zoning maxed out in Crystal City?
- ✓ The removal of the building on 20th Street would help open up the park in terms of visibility and access
- ✓ What thought has been given to active versus passive recreation programming of open space?
- ✓ Is open space #3 essentially a median?
- ✓ It would be beneficial that regards to plantings in the parks, that they included actual shade trees rather than just low growing decorative plantings
- ✓ Timing and phasing aspects are important to the current residents; promises for improved quality are important, but it appears that spaces #3 cannot meet those promises.
- ✓ The question has been raised as to whether the Center Park proposal is a case of putting too many eggs in one basket. For this reason residents question the need for a large park.
- ✓ Many of the existing open spaces today are underutilized, and raise the question as to whether or not the existing open space is more than adequate to meet current needs, and if an increase in open space should track with an increase in development?
- ✓ It's observed that the plan falls short of providing new open space opportunities on the west side of Jeff Davis Hwy