

Crystal City Vision Plan, Draft 1.1

Long Range Planning Committee, Meeting Summary

10-22-2009

Discussion/Remarks on LRPC Comment/Response Matrix

Staff walked through the staff responses to the comments raised from LRPC at the last meeting.

- Item 3.7.15; suggestion that mature tree conditions in Crystal City (CC) should be researched;
- Item 3.9.14; text should be revised to explain under what conditions would above grade parking be permitted;
- Item 3.11.11; the plan should consider the option open if the BID and property owners are interested in installing and maintaining lights other than Carlyle in CC.

Discussion/Remarks on Building Heights Errata and “Sector Plan” vs. “Vision Plan” titles

- LRPC request clearer information on the building height parameters adopted by the County Board in the Dec. 2008 Policy Framework, currently recommended by staff, and how they differ.
- In its current form, the draft document seems to be a “Sector Plan” type of document. There is general LRPC agreement that the document should be referred to as a Sector Plan.

Discussion/Remarks on Updated Multimodal Transportation Study (MTS), October 2009

- CC could greatly benefit from high-speed rail; potential to consider station at National Airport, providing a great synergy with CC.
- The MTS should be revised to explain what the 1.5 Alternative Plan represents.
- The table on p.36 is silent about bike lanes on Clark-Bell, conflicting with street cross-section.
- Transitway study graphics should lose the arrow on 12th Street.
- The cycle track condition is better with the physical barrier as opposed to a striped buffer.
- Transitway and Pedestrians: Consider adding design speed for each street in a new column; cannot lose sight of pedestrian experience within complete streets.
- Text should describe the new connection between 10th Street and 12th Street and its justification.
- Questions raised on some of the changes to Phases 1 and 2; staff will report back to LRPC.
- Need to consider impacts of expanding on-street bicycle parking.
- Please provide comparative figures for existing parking spaces and anticipated parking spaces provided through plan build out.
- There should be language in the plan that identifies the PDSP and Site Plan processes to ensure that development over time and its required parking tracks with supply. The idea of “shared parking” needs close scrutiny as it could potentially be considered over multiple blocks.
- Is it realistic to assume Metro will go to 8 car trains on blue and yellow lines in CC, and if so is it possible to quantify the cost of this expanded service?
- On page 41, the third paragraph should begin with “great”, not “good” sidewalks.
- Please provide list of graphics that illustrate proposed network of pedestrian and bicycle connections between Crystal City and neighborhoods to the west.

Discussion/Remarks on Revised Vision Statement and New Sections, 3.2. and 3.3, CHAPTER 3

Revised Vision Statement

Comments on the revised vision statement varied widely. Several comments noted the loss of any mention of economics, BRAC, or that CC is a desirable place for business tenants, while another comment suggested BRAC doesn't need to be called out. Generally, more is needed on what will drive and create change in CC. Several comments agreed that the revised statement is now too short or efficient, and should be lengthened and better organized. Consideration should be given to going back to what the County Board approved in December of 2008, and building from that. Active voice should be used instead of passive, and should talk in the present.

New Sections 3.2 and 3.3: Initial Comments

- More text is needed about the economics and overall vitality of CC; CC is Arlington’s largest business district today and will continue to be; it’s missing the point that visitors and people come to CC because it’s a great place; the CCBID could contribute to the discussions.
- The sections need more describing how the Plan protects the neighborhoods, and how CC integrates with the surrounding areas.
- Need to recognize long history of established neighborhoods, and ensure that they will still be safe to live, work, and play.
- Jargon should be removed from these sections.
- Sections need to balance residential with what it’s like to visit and work in Crystal City as well.
- Focus needs to be more about Crystal City as part of an integrated whole with ARCA and AHCA; plan needs to make clear that neighborhoods will be protected from expansion.
- Different expectations for what the new sections would discuss; would like more specificity about community infrastructure; demographics; impacts on infrastructure/schools, libraries, etc.; and more discussion on what it means to be a complete community.
- Expecting much more specific and concrete discussion on how we would ensure building the community infrastructure needed for the Plan.

LRPC Participant Attendees

Terry Savela	Planning Commission
Nancy Hunt	Planning Commission
Steve Cole	Planning Commission
Inta Malis	Planning Commission
Neal Sigmon	Park and Recreation Commission
Aaron Lien	E2C2
Larry Whithers	Housing Commission
Mitch Bonanno	Property/Land Owner
Bruce Cameron	Aurora Highlands CA
Patty Joyce	Arlington Ridge CA
Ted Saks	former Crystal City Task Force
Harmar Thompson	Property/Land Owner
Jim Whittaker	Crystal City Resident
Christer Ahl	Crystal City Resident

(Bold = Planning Commissioner)