Chapter 1 (pgs 1-18): Vision Plan

1. Recommendation 1.3: Mount Jefferson Park Enhancement: “accessibility and improved safety with eyes on the park. It is unclear what this means, but it seems to
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Chapter 1 does not mention the planned extension of the TransitWay north to run in the median of Route One and then turn south towards Potomac Avenue.

Under Implementation, it would definitely help with the surrounding neighborhood relationship, pedestrian friendliness and place making to do the “Ruby Tucker Park Expansion” sooner: Why the long wait after the Jefferson park upgrades?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Response - Reassessed into Plan</th>
<th>Response - Not Incorporated into Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4      | 15   | Recommendation 1.6: I am not understanding the improvement offered by an additional traffic light at Montrose and Route 1. I have spoken to the
|        |      |         |        |        | Improvement is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended is a new traffic light at Montrose | traffic light on Montrose. |
|         |      |         |        |        | Traffic calming on Montrose      |                                     |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.11: I do not understand the improvement offered by an additional traffic light at Montrose and Route 1. I have spoken to
|        |      |         |        |        | Traffic calming on Montrose      |                                     |
|         |      |         |        |        | Traffic calming on Montrose      |                                     |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.14: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.6: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.11: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.12: "If this really needed?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
| 5      | 15   | Recommendation 1.6: I would like to see a requirement that before the traffic light at Montrose and Route 1 is installed that a plan for fixing the
|        |      |         |        |        | intersection of Montrose and Route 1 is established. That plan should include a plan for
|        |      |         |        |        | traffic calming on Montrose       |                                     |
|         |      |         |        |        | Traffic calming on Montrose       |                                     |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.12: "If this really needed?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
| 6      | 15   | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
|         |      | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                      |
| 7      | 16   | Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?" | Advisory | Non-substantive edit | Addressed |                                          |
Page 17 – Section 1: The City anticipates that a portion of the value increase…will come back to the City in the form of developer contributions to fund…not typically required as part of the design process...not typical...What makes the developer change tactics? Is there no precedent? How can the City force this?

Your proposal also introduces “a new real estate tax increment plan”. Is this the same real estate tax plan discussed by City Council a few years ago when Potomac Yard was being developed? Is this the plan that would have residents of Potomac Yard paying a higher tax rate than those of an area fringe the 610 year old homes? Will there be available tax rates all over the City of Alexandria according to the area where we live? Will the residents have a voice in this matter?

Page 18 - Proposed benefits plan: “The Ruby Tucker Park expansion should be moved upfront to the Phasing and Funds should be allocated initially to the Ruby Tucker Park in light of the long-term nature of the Plan, the high cost of the Park’s expansion and the future economic development that will benefit from the expansion of Ruby Tucker Park rather than relying on future tax revenue.”

The Plan states: “For a 20-30 year vision...What happened to the vision that was created for Potomac Yard in 2000?” A lot of citizens attended meetings concerning the original design of Potomac Yard. Will the 20-30 year vision be effective in 5 years, 10 years, etc.?

Page 19: What could the 50 years plan be? Every year, citizens review new products and/or manufacturers, and various state of construction become the “in” thing.

The Plan states: “For a 20-30 year vision...” What happened to the vision that was created for Potomac Yard in 2000? A lot of citizens attended meetings concerning the original design of Potomac Yard. Will the 20-30 year vision be effective in 5 years, 10 years, etc.?

Page 20: The Plan states: “For a 20-30 year vision...” What happened to the vision that was created for Potomac Yard in 2000? A lot of citizens attended meetings concerning the original design of Potomac Yard. Will the 20-30 year vision be effective in 5 years, 10 years, etc.?
I'd put more emphasis on how the ground floor spaces should be used. Maker spaces and retail are not always the same thing. Maker spaces can include bakeries, clothing makers, arts, light industrial and similar uses. There should be an explicit expectation that ground floor uses are either maker, educational training, light industrial or retail and the use of the recommendation should be for the city to create retail/maker space design guidelines that ensure the spaces are designed to accommodate a wide range of these creative uses and also that the upper story residential uses will be designed to mitigate and prevent conflicts with noise, odors, etc.

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

The compatibility with existing neighborhoods is mentioned several times throughout the proposal. However, before the creation of Potomac Yard, Preston section of the proposal at a time.

We would like to see only one section of the proposal explained thoroughly in each future meeting. Thus, all future meetings will deal with only one section of the proposal at a time.
Chapter 2

21. Title: Overview

Title: Design Standards

2.4 What is meant by “Provide building height adjacent to transit stops.” - Taller than average building height?

2.2 I found this confusing as District 1 does not have any of Mt. Jefferson Park in it. Maybe these park graphics should move to District 2.

2.1 Advisory Group

2.3 Advisory Group

2.4 Advisory Group

2.5 Advisory Group

2.6 Advisory Group

2.7 Advisory Group

2.8 Advisory Group

2.9 Advisory Group

2.10 Advisory Group

2.11 Advisory Group

2.12 Advisory Group

2.13 Advisory Group

2.14 Advisory Group

2.15 Advisory Group

2.16 Advisory Group

2.17 Advisory Group

2.18 Advisory Group

2.19 Advisory Group

2.20 Advisory Group

2.21 Advisory Group

2.22 Advisory Group

2.23 Advisory Group

2.24 Advisory Group

2.25 Advisory Group

2.26 Advisory Group

2.27 Advisory Group

2.28 Advisory Group

2.29 Advisory Group

2.30 Advisory Group

2.31 Advisory Group

2.32 Advisory Group

2.33 Advisory Group

2.34 Advisory Group

2.35 Advisory Group

2.36 Advisory Group

2.37 Advisory Group

2.38 Advisory Group

2.39 Advisory Group

2.40 Advisory Group

2.41 Advisory Group

2.42 Advisory Group

2.43 Advisory Group

2.44 Advisory Group

2.45 Advisory Group

2.46 Advisory Group

2.47 Advisory Group

2.48 Advisory Group

2.49 Advisory Group

2.50 Advisory Group

2.51 Advisory Group

2.52 Advisory Group

2.53 Advisory Group

2.54 Advisory Group

2.55 Advisory Group

2.56 Advisory Group

2.57 Advisory Group

2.58 Advisory Group

2.59 Advisory Group

2.60 Advisory Group

2.61 Advisory Group

2.62 Advisory Group

2.63 Advisory Group

2.64 Advisory Group

2.65 Advisory Group

2.66 Advisory Group

2.67 Advisory Group

2.68 Advisory Group

2.69 Advisory Group

2.70 Advisory Group

2.71 Advisory Group

2.72 Advisory Group

2.73 Advisory Group

2.74 Advisory Group

2.75 Advisory Group

2.76 Advisory Group

2.77 Advisory Group

2.78 Advisory Group

2.79 Advisory Group

2.80 Advisory Group

2.81 Advisory Group

2.82 Advisory Group

2.83 Advisory Group

2.84 Advisory Group

2.85 Advisory Group

2.86 Advisory Group

2.87 Advisory Group

2.88 Advisory Group

2.89 Advisory Group

2.90 Advisory Group

2.91 Advisory Group

2.92 Advisory Group

2.93 Advisory Group

2.94 Advisory Group

2.95 Advisory Group

2.96 Advisory Group

2.97 Advisory Group

2.98 Advisory Group

2.99 Advisory Group

2.100 Advisory Group
Graphics are illustrative, but limited in what they can show. Standards require stepbacks, articulation, building breaks, etc.

This applies throughout document. Make all references to open space "Minimum" instead of providing the plus/minus sign in front of them. I would also be interested in seeing a scalable section, where the scale of the graphic being contrasted is actually a longer cut-away view. For instance, where the graphic notes (15,000 sf) of open space, show on the graphic an outline of that amount of square footage in a different color. The graphics show the entrance, sidewalk, extra space for flexibility, etc... and it is difficult to know exactly how much 15,000 square feet equates to and think the picture is slightly misleading as currently shown since it artificially makes the space look larger with the addition of the adjacent entrance and "fluff" area. I am not suggesting changing the amount of open space, just clarifying graphically how much the citizens are getting.

The Plan recommends that maker space be incorporated in designated places in multiple districts.

The Plan does not recommend removal of the existing parking. The future design will be in coordination with the community. The future maintenance will be determined when the park is developed.

Advisory

Revised

Response - Not incorporated into Plan

Graphics

Language has been added to street cross-section

Plus/minus is used because the numbers are approximate and not based on survey data.

Chapter Page # Comment Section Theme Response - Incorporated into Final Plan Response - Not incorporated into Final Plan

2 20 The heights in the future multifamily buildings lining Route 1 need to be updated to the correct numbers. The district descriptions would benefit from a discussion about the location of loading docks/how deliveries will be made to businesses. This has come up multiple times in the discussions and would be good to mention here.

Advisory Group Building Heights Yes, heights reviewed. Added standard that locations of loading docks be addressed in the development review process.

2 20 District 3 - Much of District 3 currently serves as retail. Some of the District should remain retail. In addition, permanent trash cans similar to the trash cans in Del Ray should be established throughout the area to collect trash coming from District 2 and into the Lynnhaven neighborhood.

Advisory Group Guidance Provided for permanent, secondary trash can.

Trash cans: Standard added to Urban Design Chapter and will be required through Development Special Review (Development Special Review process).

2 25 This graphic makes it look like a lot of tall buildings right on Rt. 1 with no step backs and no articulation.

Advisory Group Graphics Language was added to street cross-section.

2 25 Identify A, B, C, D and E on Scale Transitions map

Indicate what A, B, C, D, E are showing

Advisory Group Graphics Identified in text

2 25 The Plan recommends that maker space be incorporated in designated places in multiple districts.

Advisory Group Maker Space Revised

2 25 The Plan recommends that maker space be incorporated in designated places in multiple districts.

Advisory Group Maker Space Revised

2 25 Making some changes from draft to B-0K in cucumbers (i.e., street location)

Advisory Group Building Heights Revised

2 25 Would be more done that this applies to all districts. Maybe have the beginning of "Plan districts" chapter, or places in "Plan frameworks" chapter need to "F. Building heights" pages.

Advisory Group Building Heights Revised

2 25 The graphic section is too big for the background/graph. It will be too step back and no attribution.

Advisory Group Graphics Revised

2 25 Are we not in accordance with Route 1 Corridor comments? How will undergrounding be done for future transmitter and switch equipment to be handled for the future designer with the City allow undergrounding utilities within the right-of-way and possibly under the sidewalk? If so, how will that affect the transverse along each street? Tysons Center is currently going through some very difficult discussions right now since when the plan was originally created, very little thought was given to the sometimes 80'x25' vaults that are needed to store underground electrical equipment. Procedures for the placement of that equipment should be discussed at this level since they could significantly affect building footprints if required to be placed on site and accommodate DVP's stringent horizontal and vertical clearances.

Advisory Group Underground Utilities Language has been added to street cross-section.

3 General Graphic space should be a non-FOI

Advisory Group Public Space Revised

3 General District 4 is largely one way - too high. It's looking extremely similar to Crystal City and not a true neighborhood feel that the Bay is known for. These new buildings will have over the existing homes and will tower over the existing homes and will take away the charm. These buildings should be limited to 3-5 stories and nothing like what is currently being developed across Alexandria.

Advisory Group Building Heights Revised

Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and setbacks in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

Also, the heights in District 3 and 4 were corrected - they were shown higher in the working draft that they should have been.
Response - Incorporated into Plan

District 4 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.

Regardless of the dwelling types ultimately built in District 4, steps also need to be taken to shield the existing neighborhood from the impact of garbage, traffic, parking, and other widespread activities that are likely to occur near the area of the buildings. The ground level open space for District 4 does not appear sufficient to meet General Standards 4.19 or 4.20 (pg 14).

Great neighborhoods need great streets. What is the great street in Oakville Triangle? Don’t tell me Swann Ave. The only reasonable option is Oakville St. / north-south Rd. lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Rowan Ave, which provides a better, more continuous facility. District 3 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.

District 3 includes a new north-south road (continuation of Oakville Drive in District 2) connecting Calvert Street to Globe Road as part of the redelineations. In addition, all of the streets are to have urban pedestrian scale streets and each street will have a unique character. Bike lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Rowan Ave, which provides a better, more continuous facility. District 3 includes a new north-south road (continuation of Oakville Drive in District 2) connecting Calvert Street to Globe Road as part of the redelineations. In addition, all of the streets are to have urban pedestrian scale streets and each street will have a unique character. Bike lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Rowan Ave, which provides a better, more continuous facility. District 3 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.

District 2/3 will include a new north-south road (continuation of Oakville Drive in District 2) connecting Calvert Street to Globe Road as part of the redelineations. In addition, all of the streets are to have urban pedestrian scale streets and each street will have a unique character. Bike lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Rowan Ave, which provides a better, more continuous facility. District 3 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.

District 3 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.

District 3: The open spaces depicted in the Plan are illustrative. New multi-family buildings will be required to provide 20% at grade and 15% on "roof top."
Max height discrepancies—especially on Lynhaven—should be 45' not 55'.

Standards: General or specific?

Advisory

Themes

Response - Incorporated into Plan

Response - Not incorporated into Plan

4.11: add "Canopy lighting shall be down directed or reflected"

Lynhaven traffic

Open space

5.2

A Risk Road really use "A" streets?

Advisory

Park Road

Park Road is designated as a road to принимать cukuts and preserve the pedestrian character of the street alignment to Park.

5.4

An bike and Ped Network be stated up to follow the Street Hierarchy page?

Advisory

Non-standardized with this will be added as part of the final version.

5.5.1. General Recommendations 4.8.3, add language that "curb cuts should be to the best extent possible aligned with curb cuts on the opposite side of the street".

Advisory

Specifications - added

5.5.2 not sure "a standard street is formed by "A"-street user" because the standards on the different types of road are based on rating a related term

Advisory

Specifications - added

5.5.3 "Senior Assisted Living Facility" burglary

Advisory

Specifications - added

6.11.2. "Canopy Lighting shall be down directed or reflected"

Advisory

Lighting impacts - added

6.11.3 Lighting changes - as information in the area, we found slightly less for the lighting distances in the plan area with minimal inconvenience to residents and electric charging stations could more easily be built into garages or part of retail spaces. The gas stations on Route One mainly benefit commuters driving through Alexandria.

Advisory

Lighting impacts - added

6.11.4 Building heights - especially on Lynhaven - should be 60' not 55'

Advisory

Building heights/Correction - final corrected

6.11.5 Building heights/Corrections made (Upper and lower) - A-Street user needs to be added.

Advisory

Building heights - all in the proposed height will be added there said in the upper space before the (A-Street) use.

6.11.6 What is the definition of "Building Height"? - does it include rooftop utilities like WPHC or rooftop ventilation like a canopy for a pavilion?

Advisory

Building heights definitions - please refer to Sec. 2-154 of the City's Zoning Ordinance for the complete definition

6.11.7 What about bike parking facilities in that plaza?

Advisory

Bike facilities - shall be included as part of the design of the plaza and development special use permit process.

6.11.8 Add ADA Complaint Access to Park

Advisory

Accessibility - added

6.11.9 Standards, none required for 4.21: why not required?

Advisory

Parking facilities - language has been added to clarify what is required.
Bike parking is not provided on private property, but two bike share locations are proposed in the plan area. 

The standards do not address this; however, these details will be addressed through the development review process.

I think the park plan shows the bike path leaving Mt. Jefferson Park at this point and continuing along Fannon, leaving the highest portion of the park as pedestrian path.

I don't see any outdoor play areas or playgrounds anywhere in the plan. It seems kind of irrelevant.

While the text on pg 55 includes this I would also like to see the standards in this section include similar language "The rooftop open space on buildings in close proximity...".

The plan has been revised so that a pedestrian crossing can be added at Raymond and Rt 1; better flow.

I don't see any outdoor play areas or playgrounds anywhere in the plan. 4.22 seems kind of redundant.

We (Del Ray) suggest not to approve proposed changes to the current (approved) height levels. Who would want to live in a house next to a 60-, 90-foot tall building?

This is not the first time we've voiced our strong disagreement, however, our opinions were not reflected in the final draft. Does the city care about its increased revenues 

calmat run-off, noise, and inconvenience to current residents.

- In continuation of the discussion at the last meeting, I think the signalized pedestrian crossing might better serve the community for metro access, access to mt

- Little surprised that bike lane doesn't have at least planned shared bike lane. Please explore placing bike accommodations on these streets.

- Is there a plan to add a signalized pedestrian crossing at Raymond and Rt 1. I think the signalized pedestrian crossing might better serve the community for

- I am pretty surprised that there aren't even shared bike lanes on that street. Please explore placing bike accommodations on those streets.

- I suggest alternative pedestrian crossing at Raymond and Rt 1; better flow for pedestrians to metro.

- The plan has been revised so that a pedestrian crossing can be placed between Cuts and Globe.

- I think the park plan shows the bike path leaving Mt. Jefferson Park at this point and continuing along Fannon, leaving the highest portion of the park as pedestrian path.

- I don't see any outdoor play areas or playgrounds anywhere in the plan. The map was showing the plan area outline as a shared bike path.

- The plan has been revised so that a pedestrian crossing can be added at Raymond and Rt 1; better flow.

- I think the park plan shows the bike path leaving Mt. Jefferson Park at this point and continuing along Fannon, leaving the highest portion of the park as pedestrian path.

- I think the park plan shows the bike path leaving Mt. Jefferson Park at this point and continuing along Fannon, leaving the highest portion of the park as pedestrian path.

- As of 8.12.15 Responses to AlexEngage and Advisory Group Feedback

- Bicycle facilities

- Gateways

- Ped crossing location

- Graphics

- Rooftop Amenity Space

- Outdoor play area

- Signature façade

- Clarification

- Added language re a variety of users and ages. 4.28

- Architecture

- Added language to clarify
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Chapter 4

General

Open space: have a minimum rather than +/-; lock it in and have graphic reflect

Advisory Group

Open space

The minimum is established in the Design Guidelines

General

Standards for open space should not impact existing neighborhood; rooftop open space shouldn’t be too close to existing

Advisory Group

Rooftop amenities, space impacts on neighborhoods

Language has been added to standards

General

The building heights are simply too high. 90 feet is a very tall building, and is incompatible with the neighborhoods on either side of the development.

Advisory Group

Building height

Proposed heights were carefully considered. Discussion and agreement over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and stepbacks in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

General

A major problem identified early on in this process with the Oakville Triangle is that the property only has one means of egress to Route 1 North. With the imminent redevelopment of the Oakville Triangle, there will still only be one means of egress to Route 1 North and two other areas of egress to Route 1 South. This seems problematic for handling the huge increase in traffic until the North "South Road is completed. This road won’t be built until the multiple properties North of Calvert/South of E Glebe are developed which could be 25 years or more.

AlexEngage

Lack of connectivity

A Transportation Study was conducted to review the proposed development plan width and ensure the viability of the transportation network. It recommends adjustments/improvements where necessary.

General

As usual for an Alexandria plan, the highlight for bicycling is in the park. The idea that bicycling is accommodated in parks and nowhere else is old-fashioned nonsense. This will be yet another Alexandria development without bike lanes. Not one. We will have to shoe-horn bike lanes in later, as in Carlyle. If Alexandria doesn’t learn from their mistakes, the developers don’t want them to.

The Oakville North-South road will likely be busy enough to need bike lanes if children in this area are expected to ride to school. Same for Swann St.

AlexEngage

Lack of bike facilities

Graphics and text in the Plan have been updated to better show that both Swann and Glebe will have bike lanes as well as bike access from Swann through the park to Del Ray.

General

Residents along with city staff give great time, effort and consideration in the decision to close Wesmond Dr, Evans Lane and Lynhaven Drive. Closure was a great decision then and an even better one now. The streets must remain closed.

AlexEngage

Wesmond/Evans

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

General

4A. Park St. will be a quiet residential street - a B street (not A). Oakville Street is where the action needs to be - that is the A street.

Section F Figure 26 Block 3 should have different maximum - a 45' strip to match other buildings along Park but 75' to match the rest of the development.

Section I Oakville St. and north-south Road need dedicated biking facilities, not street parking.

AlexEngage

Park Road

Park Road has been designated as a street to provide curb cuts and preserve the pedestrian character of the street adjacent to the park and sidewalks.

SoI

Well developed

AlexEngage

General Support

NA

10
Building Transitions Standards, Section II. Multi-family: The multi-family building transition standards should incorporate a requirement similar to the townhouse

Added language to include maximum

Advisory
Response - Incorporated into Plan

That is a potential option, but would be limited to a small area nad would require approval of a Development Special Use Permit.

Added the word "generally"; it's and important standard

5.3 Really? This seems awfully specific given the variety of property lines and building heights.

Wesmond/Evans; Montrose

5.10 Required to what? Be Built?

Language clarified in plan

5.6 “…exceed 15ft above the maximum…” – so now we are at 115’ at

To be discussed during Advisory Group meeting

Approximately 5 years ago, the Lynhaven Citizens (LCA) and other concerned parties met with the City of Alexandria re: the East Glebe Road and Montrose Avenue

Recommendation 5.10 should incorporate language similar to 5.17 with the appropriate height maximums “The building shoulder shall be no taller than 15 feet taller than

5.33, 4th bullet - What are these (masonry units)? How about 7”x15” or

General
Advisory
Response - Not incorporated into Plan

Language has been added

5.10 Not sure what this last sentence means. Might need to be rephrased.

5.2 Any reason not to have a maximum

5.39 Not sure why “vertical fenestration” has to be called out as a specific feature. Not sure what this means in the context of modern architectural styles.

Chapter 5 (pgs 62-82): Character

A.A

3.3 They mean not to have a maximum

Advisory Group
Building design
A.A

3.4 A.Riley: This seems awfully specific given the variety of property lines and building heights.

Advisory Group
Building design
A.A

3.4 Added standard - “Townhouse buildings shall vary in height, width, material and color so as to avoid flat architecture” (or something to that effect)

Advisory Group
Building design
A.A

3.4 1A - “sounded off about the maximum….” so now we are at 125 ft at

Advisory Group
Building heights

A.A

3.44 Should strongly recommend staff to do the architectural plans for the town centers instead of having staff that are vaguely and no restrictions (being

Advisory Group
Architecture

A.A

3.45 Needs a plan to reduce speed. I think the plan is to reduce speed and to change the opening from 2 sides to 1 side parking only.

A.A

5.14 Recommended to widen and/or not

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.15 Recommendations shall incorporate language similar to 3.1 and the appropriate height measures. The building shoulder shall be no taller than 15 feet taller than

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.16 Q.18 Not sure what this last sentence means. Might need to be rephrased.

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.16 Building Transitions Standards, Sentinel Road/Dundie. The multi-family building transition standards shall incorporate a requirement similar to the townhouse

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.17 "signal at Route 1 and Montrose will be combined with traffic calming improvements along Montrose Ave, and a signal at the intersection of

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.18 Should the parking for townhouses be limited to the area to be covered by the requirement of 1 car that access be provided via a multi family

Advisory Group
Questions

A.A

5.19 Should the parking for townhouses be limited to the area to be covered by the requirement of 1 car that access be provided via a multi family

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.20 A.A. Section B1: What are these (masonry units)? How about 7”x15” or

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.21 A.A. Section C3: "character development" shall be added not as a standard feature. The word that describes the look of modern architectural styles.

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.22 A.A. Section C4: “character development” shall be added not as a standard feature. A feature that describes the look of modern architectural styles.

Advisory Group
Building design

A.A

5.23 A.A. Section C5: "character development" shall be added not as a standard feature. A feature that describes the look of modern architectural styles.
### Chapter 5 - Page 73

**Comment:** Mention brick facades with various brick and stone combinations to try exceptionally to disguise the parking garage. A 7-9' overhang over windows, to be done attached to parking structures, is in the code book. Can that be healthily?

**Response:** Accepted for review.

### Chapter 5 - Page 74

**Comment:** Page 74 - Maybe greater the longevity of growth of something (ie, wall, etc) what there should be provision(s) or mention for pick up and drop off or lots and Bikeshare or bike lanes? Could there be set aside for things like Bicycle Share?

**Response:** Made general or leaving the discussion.

### Chapter 5 - Page 75

**Comment:** 1st proposed date and then elevation - 2nd date ( above and inner notes)

**Response:** Written to add.

### Chapter 5 - Page 76

**Comment:** Shall top use consistent on the elevation?

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Specific open porches - not to be closed in.

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** An why not denote the areas above all.

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Shall it be free height of the screening? Or if building is now nearly 130'

**Response:** Written to add.

### Chapter 5 - Page 77

**Comment:** 5.42 - Maybe given the trajectory of growth of carsharing (ie, Uber, Lyft, etc) there should be provisions or mention for pick up and drop off or lots and Bikeshare or bike lanes? Could there be set aside for things like Bicycle Share?

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Trees

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** 5.74 I'm not sure what these types of windows are, but wondering if we need to be more specific?

**Response:** Written to add.

### Chapter 5 - Page 78

**Comment:** 5.88 A max height for the screening? Our 100' building is now easily 110'

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** The maximum height is for the building. The Zoning Ordinance addresses rooftop screening.

### Chapter 5 - Page 79

**Comment:** Building heights

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Building heights

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Loading – for multifamily and commercial standards need to be included

**Response:** Written to add.

### Chapter 5 - Page 80

**Comment:** More focus on the character elements of retail and maker spaces. This plan should put more emphasis on the question of what we want there and not so much on the ways to get there.

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** The Retail Study conducted during the planning process indicated unmet demand now and with new development (see appendix).

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** Trees

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** More focus on the character elements of retail and maker spaces. This plan should put more emphasis on the question of what we want there and not so much on the ways to get there.

**Response:** Written to add.

### Chapter 5 - Page 81

**Comment:** Images on this page and the next all look like ground level is higher than 4 feet. I don't think we want to encourage that. Maybe we could find some examples more in the 2-3 foot range.

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** More focus on the character elements of retail and maker spaces. This plan should put more emphasis on the question of what we want there and not so much on the ways to get there.

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** How will all of this new development affect street parking within the city (neighboring)? Especially to visitors to these new mid-family buildings. Will they be expected to provide guest parking?

**Response:** Written to add.

**Comment:** More focus on the character elements of retail and maker spaces. This plan should put more emphasis on the question of what we want there and not so much on the ways to get there.

**Response:** Written to add.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response - Reincorporated into Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.</td>
<td>Water space</td>
<td>Building will be required to address these requirements in development special use permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>A secondary road in existing &quot;maker&quot; businesses by switching to more costly smaller spaces. Where could the existing businesses continue to operate while the construction is going on?</td>
<td>Water space</td>
<td>Added general language regarding the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>We should incorporate some of the considerations of the Ad Hoc workgroup on A-Frame &amp; Digital Signs. In particular, the generalization of the menu sign used by businesses is, allow a daily special sign to the window.</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Added general language regarding the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Signs are professionally painted and gold leafed individual letters are (or should be) a thing of the past. In this modern era, Window signage is typically cut or printed vinyl letters and graphics and is applied to the inside of the glass. It is not ideal for better visibilities.</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Added general language regarding the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Maker Space</td>
<td>The arrangement is impossible for light industrial/commercial use (makers). I would eliminate the need for residential development above ground floor uses for more flexibility.</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Added general language regarding the process and how the design standards fit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Window signage is typically cut or printed vinyl letters and graphics and is applied to the inside of the glass. It is not ideal for better visibilities.</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Added general language regarding the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Building will be required to address these requirements in development special use permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although it is not specifically called out in the text, the map would suggest that these routes are to be reconfigured to open onto Route 1. This would significantly increase the amount of traffic on the upstream intersections, one with an increasing amount of small children (facing my own, and one is benefit for added value to the community. A smarter plan would perhaps be to simply make those connections more pedestrian and bicycle friendly, but still prohibit vehicle traffic. Reopening those up to the large amount of traffic on Route 1 would encourage even more pass traffic, especially during commuting hours. Very strongly opposed.

I agree. This should maybe be ‘Route 1 Streetscape’ instead of ‘Commercial Uses’. Also, what parts of Potomac Yard should be shown in the streetscape or is it one of the later buildings?

Again, not sure what part of Potomac Yard this is.

Shouldn’t we show the proposed building on south side of Fannon instead of existing?

Can we verify this in a ceased past year?

Concerned about density of public vs. private widths.

Need to show specific space for bike lane, maybe with a bicyclist to make it clear.

Would strongly suggest staff restart the ability to place dedicated bike lanes on the north south road. All the way south, shared lanes should be incorporated. Permits said it for the streetscape (p. 9 of 36C), reduce the toss lane to 11’ (p. 12 of 36C) and encroach into the walkable area by 2’ on each side to create a total of (6) 5’ wide dedicated bike lanes.

Wesmond/Evans

General

Bicycle facilities

Advisory Group

Non-substantive edit

Advised

Response - Incorporated into Plan

Parking

Separate bike lanes on route 1.

Oakville Triangle/Route 1 Corridor Vision Plan and Urban Design Standards and Guidelines

Non-substantive edit

Graphics

Advised

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The mapsgraphs have been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
Green Buildings

The dog exercise area in Mount Jefferson Park will remain.

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

The Plan incorporates Traffic/Safety/Conn.

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

The Plan incorporates Traffic/Safety/Conn.

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

We've heard a lot about “connectivity” in the public outreach surrounding the Oakville development, but the only actions taken to date have reduced connectivity for Del Ray by eliminating the ability of motorists on Raymond and Hume cross Route 1.

The Plan incorporates Streetscape and Wayfinding requirements for the plan area.

The Plan incorporates Traffic/Safety/Conn.

The Plan incorporates Streetscape and Wayfinding requirements for the plan area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Response - Incorporated into Plan</th>
<th>Response - Not Incorporated into Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Del Ray</td>
<td>Building height/neighborhood compatibility</td>
<td>Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and step-backs in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>AlexEngage</td>
<td>Building heights/neighborhood compatibility</td>
<td>Building heights/neighborhood compatibility</td>
<td>Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and step-backs in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>AlexEngage</td>
<td>Non-substantive edit</td>
<td>In final revision, can consider moving recommendations to front.</td>
<td>Chapter 7 has been revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>