

	TABLE 1	TABLE 2	TABLE 3	TABLE 4	TABLE 5	TABLE 6	
Concept A	Strengths	Neighborhood retail; limited number of north/south crossings; access to Backlick	Focus mixed use at metro	Straightening Backlick Run; like residential (1)	Pocket parks	Mixed use nodes within neighborhoods; straightening Backlick Run; school west of multimodal bridge should be west of Van Dorn to be walkable to most potential students	Concentration of density at metro; residential neighborhoods large enough to be defined and distinct; multiple (small) retail centers
	Weaknesses	Defeating the purpose of West End being multi-use area; not enough new green space; doesn't keep natural flow of Backlick; school should be well-located for the whole catchment area of the school	Too much residential, need more tax base; lack of connectivity/strategic connectivity (need to know what they are connecting to); lack of balance; not much office	Too much residential (majority); wants to make sure there is enough parking	Straightening of Backlick Run; too much residential; retail seems too suburban (look at failure of retail at Cameron Station)	Residential; not enough green space especially within neighborhoods	Not enough retail/restaurants for so much residential; too much residential versus retail (already lots of residential and much more to be at metro, hi-rises); too much traffic; green connections weaker; no industrial at all
Concept B	Strengths	Green space; ok with density around metro; ok with industrial	Focus mixed use at the metro; need some TDR to grow the green space in the plan area; not a lot of industrial near the residential	Makes good use of park land; school should go near residential, wherever that is, discussion that west makes more sense; like more density near the metro	Finger parks good for stormwater	Lots of walkable connections across tracks/Backlick Run; mixed use on Van Dorn/BRT corridor; incorporate green nodes in Concept B into eventual plans	More extensive green/trails network; more concentrated density near metro; more industrial; retail and existing businesses can retain their existing locations (avoid hostile process); multiple crossings/connections/bridges; saves large areas for residential without being too much residential
	Weaknesses	Too many north/south connections; lacks the stormwater pond of Concept C (VA paving site); too much development, instead of green, north of the metro (by Pickett/Van Dorn and west of Armisted Booth Park); fear of gridlock	May have too many pedestrian connections; probably not going to have a large office contingent; probably the least well liked among the group	Too much residential on Eisenhower; too many connections	Too much residential = cost for City, not taking advantage of Clermont Connector; South Pickett is better for retail over residential; not enough mix of uses- how are we going to pay for all of this?; more residential around metro	Lack of mixed use at Clermont Connector; lack of small mixed use neighborhood nodes	Move office closer to metro (or vertical mixed use to achieve same)
Concept C	Strengths	Stormwater pond; mixed use by Clermont; residential abutting Clermont Natural Area; mixed use on the 495 side	Focus mixed use at the metro; entice green space by transfer of development rights; well-liked concept of the Great Street; not a lot of industrial near the existing	Like desintation street- mixed use	Office around Victory Center; long corridor along Eisenhower is an interesting opportunity; retention pond; Eisenhower Connector mixed use and residential there	Grand economic engine for Eisenhower Valley = connect east and west; good use of beltway interchange at Clermont	Bigger area at west for park or school site (combined) (water?)
	Weaknesses	Mixed use by Clermont is greater than residential; residential should only abut Clermont Natural Area; keep some neighborhood retail on Pickett; potentially, office west of metro could be industrial	Not enough retail in the trade center (need a combination of C and D)	Must have parking!; Don't like green space with stormwater- want mixed use; back industrial off of Van Dorn	Narrow mixed use strip doesn't seem practical along Eisenhower for development; too much retail along Eisenhower; needs treelined boulevard with a "grand boulevard" feel	Needs more of bike/ped connections to the north; not enough retail at Trade Center; Needs rec/civic center on Pickett	One large office area is too mono-use ("deadly"); turning Eisenhower/Van Dorn into "Route 1"; less connectivity (not enough); retail too concentrated away from office
Concept D	Strengths	Mixed use by Clermont; residential abutting Clermont Natural Area; mixed use on the 495 side	Focus on mixed use at metro; provides the best option for the Victory Center; light industrial ok (neighborhood-serving businesses); add "Institutional" to title	Like heavy mixed use around metro intersection	Office/retail near metro; incorporates industrial/flex space; large retail block	Good concentrations of mixed use at metro; good concentration at Clermont; good retail at Trade Center; good addition of rec center/civic center (like Charles Houston Rec Center)	Big box at Eisenhower/I-495 ramp (not used area now)
	Weaknesses	Keep some neighborhood retail on Pickett; mixed use by Clermont is greater than residential; residential should only abut Clermont Natural Area; offices would have to be at scale where Cameron Station homeowners wouldn't have conflict with the lights; too much industrial; would prefer stormwater use of Concept C	Large amount of industrial in the long term is not desirable (heavy industry); would like less industrial east of Van Dorn; probably too much retail in the Trade Center (need a combination of C and D)	Way too much industrial; locate industrial away from residential	Not enough green space; proximity of school to industrial (civic)	Needs mixed use along Van Dorn; needs mixed use with industrial; needs bike/ped connection from north to south	Incubator requires huge leadership and incentives to work

Strongest Elements	Overall Concept	C with modifications: w/residential abutting Clermont Natural Area; keep some neighborhood retail on Pickett; office buildings only if not light nuisance for Cameron Station; perhaps move office from mid-Eisenhower block to West of Van Dorn; office west of metro could be industrial; civic north of the stormwater pond instead of residential; like recreation center/indoor pool for civic use	Elements of all are good: focus on use around metro (mixed); Great Street concept well liked, especially along Eisenhower Avenue; need strategic connectivity- Concept B has too much connectivity built in; consider realignment of City offices and services in the plan area?	C if adequate parking; mixed use, light on industrial; commercial along Eisenhower	Concept D: uses existing infrastructure well near metro, good locations of mixed use	C- see strengths of C; good residential in northern section with Trade Center	Economic impact study-needed; "A" is non starter (Frank)- too much residential- likes "D"; "C" has "boulevard" or "avenue" vision for Eisenhower Ave = nicer; "B" = strongest (metro-centric uses); but combine strength of "C" = nodes
	Nodes	Clermont; metro, density ok	Maximize the FAR and mixed uses at the ends of Eisenhower (metro and Clermont connector)	Metro, Van Dorn interchange mixed use	C and D: high density mixed use at the metro, Eisenhower Avenue connector	Metro, Clermont; mixed use in neighborhoods	Connect nodes at metro and east end of Eisenhower = "B" and "C" combination (strong points of each); connectivity and crossings (between nodes and neighborhoods), along with mixed use at each end
	Green Spaces	Stormwater pond/park	Two connective areas; continuity of green space is important- connectivity of the green space is important	Concept A, fewer pedestrian bridges, straighten Backlick Run	Concept C: retention pond location and need, would prefer to add fingers of Concept B	Concept B with "fingers" north/south connectivity; Concept A w/ straighter Backlick Run	Best bike/trails with "B" and connections/crossings; straighten out creek (but remediation, if necessary); more north/south connections; most plans can accommodate a school site with green or park & water
	Land Uses	Industrial at west, west end only (west of Van Dorn, south of tracks)	Mixed use along Eisenhower with residential behind; mix of the residential and retail; don't pre-suppose a school site (what kind of school are you going to need)?	Like C mix of uses; suggest interim plan- phased uses over time	C and D: mixed use locations, good ratio of residential, retention pond and green spaces	C with a little more industrial and keeping Home Depot/retail at Trade Center; "No" to Concept A (too much residential)	"B" around and north of Metro to Van Dorn corridor to landmark; add avenue/boulevard and east node of "C" along Eisenhower
	School Location	Think of servicing whole catchment area, so maybe not in small area plan	The one where land value is the cheapest; should not decide now on a school location- need flexibility in location; need a willing seller for the school site	West of Van Dorn- closer to residential	Depends on overall land use	West of Van Dorn to make it most walkable to most potential students	Most of plans can accommodate a school site with green or park and water; urban pedestrian-oriented school versus suburban land-hungry model

Report Out Notes	Overall Concept C as base; change to residential at Clermont, like neighborhood retail at Pickett; keep isolated area west of Van Dorn for industrial; like stormwater management pond; locate school in the Landmark-Van Dorn Plan area	Overall Concept C + D hybrid; nodes with high FAR at metro and Clermont; connectivity of B is too much- focus on doing a few well, be strategic; maximize green space by properly connecting what is existing; balance the residential and retail uses of the 2 plans; discussed differences and needs for heavy/light/neighborhood-serving industry; locate the school on the most affordable land- do we even know what type of school it will be?	Overall Concept C as base; concerned about the parking needs in spite of the metro; locate school in the West for walkability; need to know what Fairfax County is planning in adjacent areas; would like to see interim vs. long-term plans	Overall Concept D; like heavy mixed use at Metro, Clermont node is too isolated from transit; like stormwater management pond and green fingers, concerned by the straightened Backlick Run; attract flexible industrial uses/space for future growth	Overall Concept C as base; good for economic base in Eisenhower, connects east and west; maintains retail at the Trade Center, need for neighborhood nodes; integrate civic use (reference Charles Houston Rec Ctr); include more bike/ped connections; school needs to be located in an area walkable to its catchment area	Overall Concept C as base; like 2 connected nodes with big box at Clermont, integrate civic/school site at green space, keep retail and green space at Trade Center- important to maintain the existing retailers in overall plan area; Concept A is too much residential and the area needs retail; would like to see EIS
------------------	--	--	--	---	--	--