

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

Y	Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
AA	AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
N	N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
O	O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 13	124	Rezoning of Other Underperforming Uses: I remain dubious that an enhanced public park at the southeast corner of Franklin and South Patrick Street (where the Liberty gas station presently is) will attract many users. It seems some focused, neighborhood serving retail would do more to activate this corner than passive green space that is unlikely to be used. Alternately, moving residential closer to the street and placing open space in a more protected location east of the building would have greater utility.	N		This open space is intended to be a visual and ceremonial open space – that will visually connect to the open space at Nannie J Lee Center. This ceremonial open space is similar to the open space at the northern entrance to Washington Street to visually reinforce this gateway entrance to the City. Also because of the character of Route 1 at this location, it is important to have a setback for the residential uses at this location. If the open space was located to the east of the townhouses it would function as back yards for the units. While having rear yards for units is desirable we felt it was important to have the open space be visually and physically accessible.
Email 13	125	Short-Term Transportation Improvements: Two Issues (1) Franklin and S. Alfred: I'd like to reiterate my concern regarding the HAWK signal the intersection of Franklin and South Alfred streets. Typically, HAWKS are not installed at intersections where there is cross-traffic. They are typically for mid-block crossings where there is no side traffic to control. In fact, the MUTCD states that HAWKS "should be installed at least 100 feet from side streets or driveways that are controlled by STOP or YIELD signs," which is not the case at the proposed location. Instead, this intersection is most appropriate for a fully signalized intersection, consistent with most other intersections in this area. I maintain that a portion of the traffic that currently uses Columbus Street for the convenience of a signalized crossing of Franklin Street would instead use Alfred Street if it were signalized. That latent demand may help meet the warrant for a signal at Franklin and S. Alfred.	Y	While a traffic signal is not warranted in terms of volume at this time (in the short term), the City will monitor volumes at this location and recommend a full signal when warranted. This option has already been approved by the Traffic and Parking Board proactively, so will not need further approval. Figures 4.2 and 4.3 have been updated.	
Email 13	126	Short-Term Transportation Improvements: Two Issues (2) Franklin and S. Henry: I'd like to reiterate my concern that the signal at Franklin and S. Henry streets be examined for conversion to an all-way stop. In fact, there was a staff recommendation to remove this signal several years ago (because it is no longer warranted) but no action was taken following a 2-2 vote of the Traffic and Parking Board. Staff should use development of this strategy to re-instate this recommendation. Operational savings from removal of an unwarranted signal here could support the cost of a new signal at Franklin and S. Alfred streets.	N		Comment Noted. Staff supports this suggestion and will explore options to revisit the Traffic and Parking Board decision in the future
Email 13	127	Page 2: The numbered blocks in Figure 1.1 are not defined until later in the document. Suggest either defining here or removing the numbered blocks from this figure.	Y	Revision incorporated as suggested	
Email 13	128	Page 3: The Strategy Objectives seems to exclude a key objective described at Planning Commission work sessions. I'd suggest including one reading, "Retain and enhance walkable access to neighborhood-serving retail/commercial, public facilities, and other neighborhood amenities."	Y	Revision incorporated as suggested	
Email 13	129	Page 7: The maps in the left-hand diagram include too much detail for the size of the map. Suggest enlarging the maps or simplifying them to improve legibility.	Y	Maps removed; Figure 1.1 updated to reflect the affordable housing sites.	
Email 13	130	Page 16: Figure 3.1 artwork should remove the noise barrier from the bottom left corner, since one of the plan recommendations (3.12) is to explore feasibility of modifying the sound wall. (Same comment where graphic is shown on page 29).	Y	Maps amended.	
Email 13	131	Page 19: Table 1: Recommended land uses on page 19 aren't visible for some rows of this table. In addition, row #7 site should read "Old Town Windows," not "Old Windows."	Y	Revised	
Email 13	132	Page 43: Table refers to recommendations 3.12 and 3.13 as addressing the VDOT sound walls, but these are covered in recommendations 3.11 and 3.12 on page 33.	Y	Revised	

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

- Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
- AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
- N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
- O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 13	133	Page 50: Side note on right-hand margin: Change “severely wind storm” to “severe wind storm”	Y	Revised	
Email 13	134	Page 58: Pie chart: Change “African” to “African”	Y	Revision incorporated as suggested	
Email 13	135	Page 63: Map is described as showing “Existing Building By Year Built.” This is not accurate, however, as it attributes older structures substantially renovated in the late 20th century as being built in the late 20th century. Examples include the townhouses at the southeast corner of Franklin and Columbus (724, 726, and 728 Franklin Street), originally built in 19th century but renovated in the 1970s. Other examples include townhouses just west of the Clayborne in the 800 block of South Columbus Street, which were originally built the same time as the other buildings on this block (1944-1966), but were renovated into townhouses after 1966. The map would be more appropriately labeled as Existing Buildings by Year Built/Date of Last Renovation	Y	Revision incorporated as suggested	
Email 13	136	Page 67: Metrobus uses the 700-900 blocks of Franklin Street, but this segment is not shown as a Metrobus route on the Existing Transit map.	Y	Revised	
Email 13	137	Page 69: Photo 5 is described as “Private Development Gates,” but the image is actually of a right-in, right-out roadway along Duke Street. The private development gates are located at the corner of S. West St. and Jamieson Street, not where #5 is shown on this map.	Y	Revised	
Email 13	138	Page 73: There are several historic sites missing from the Historic Resources map. The Jockey Club should be marked at 814 Franklin Street, the present site of the Greene Funeral Home. At 815 Franklin Street, the former location of Arch Hall should be marked. At 617 S. Washington St., the former location of Hill House should be marked. Some of these sites may be worth adding to the timeline on pages 74-75. There are also historic sites at 409 S. Henry and 500 block of S. Henry, and there may be others in the neighborhood listed here that have been missed.	Y	Revised	
Phone Call 2	139	Are there any current plans for redevelopment?	O		There are currently no submitted plans for redevelopment of any property within the core area.
Phone Call 2	140	What happens after the Strategy is adopted for residents?	Y	See #2, above.	
Phone Call 2	141	As long as affordability is maintained, I am in. Thanks to you guys, we know what to expect.	O		Comment noted.
Phone Call 3	142	The sound barrier wall should be improved to be more like the Woodrow Wilson bridge sound barrier that is clear because it is a more effective sound barrier material. The sound barrier should extend all the way to Franklin St. on the east side and possibly another block north.	N		The Strategy recommends coordination with VDOT to determine what mitigation (if any) can be accomplished with the noise barriers, including removal of portions of the wall on the western side of Franklin. A goal of the Strategy is to create walkable, pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Extending the soundwall one block North is contrary to this objective.
Phone Call 3	143	Speed camera for issuing tickets at Franklin and Route 1 intersection.	O		Comment noted.
Phone Call 3	144	Where ever it changes from 35 to 25 mph, post signs for speed camera.	O		Speed signage can be coordinated with TES and implemented as part of Vision Zero

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

- Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
- AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
- N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
- O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Phone Call 3	145	Pedestrian bridge over Franklin St. with elevator.	N		There was a pedestrian bridge located here in the 1960s, which was underutilized and eventually removed. As discussed in the charrette, people tend to not use pedestrian bridges for many reasons including perception of isolation/safety, and inconvenience/lack of direct route. The cost of such a bridge and elevator would be significant. Further, the preference is to calm the traffic, slowing it as it enters the City to make it easier and safer for people to cross route 1 at grade.
Phone Call 3	146	Lee Center doesn't get used as much because of the Route 1 crossing conditions.	AA		A goal of the Strategy is to provide safety and pedestrian improvements that stitches the east and west sides of Route 1. Creating an improved pedestrian realm will incentivize people to cross Route 1 to access community facilities and resources at the Lee Center.
Phone Call 4	147	Are there any current plans for redevelopment?	O		There are currently no submitted plans for redevelopment of any property within the core area.
Phone Call 4	148	Will I have to/be able to move to a place my kids can stay in the same school?	Y	See #2, above.	
Email 15	149	I'm pleased with the working draft, opportunities given for comment, and the engagement demonstrated by neighbors. I strongly support additional density and height assolutions for redevelopment that accommodates affordable units. I also support freshened "Site and Building Parameters" with the opportunity for some differences within Old Town's overwhelmingly uniform aesthetic. Further, I embrace the prohibition on surface parking and would support further limitations on parking for new residents that could advance Old Town as a pedestrian-friendly urban environment. My husband and I have lived in southwest Old Town 20 years and think this plan represents positive change	O		Comment noted
Email 16	150	consider incentives for rooftop development on taller buildings, such as for farming, community gardens, recreational use by residents, or community room/space	N		These items can be considered through the development review process. Incentives in the Strategy are focused on retaining the affordable housing units.
Email 16	151	increase height of buildings on parcels 6,7,8 & 9 to take advantage of views to south (which are unlikely to be obscured in foreseeable future)	N		Building heights were discussed at length with the community; feedback was that the proposed heights represent an appropriate height given the scale of buildings in the neighborhood.
Email 16	152	pedestrian ways midblock between buildings is a good idea in principle, but considering how many people (anecdotally) try to cross Patrick between signals as it is, ped controls/barriers should be considered along Patrick	AA		Pedestrian midblock connections provide pedestrian options for navigating a block - similar to an alley. They also prevent long building spans allowing light/ air and porosity between buildings. Pedestrian improvements at existing crossings and the recommended enhanced streetscapes will help create a safer pedestrian environment.
Email 16	153	consider 55' ht for all frontages along Patrick; street width seems able to support that height	N		The Strategy recommends height increases up to 55 in targeted locations. While the street width could potentially accommodate higher heights, it was important to provide height recommendations that are appropriate for the adjacent townhouse uses on Blocks 7,8, and 9, as well as to achieve variation in height on Route 1.
Email 16	154	little mention of bicycles is made. Considering that a bus path is currently mapped from west of Patrick toward Mt Vernon trail (and is a significant commuter and recreational path, crossing Patrick at two intersections); more needs to be said about bike safety, including issues such as signal timing	Y	Additional language has been added to the open space section in Chapter 3. Wilkes St is an existing designated bike route which would be enhanced with the redevelopment of sites adjacent to Wilkes Street Park. All redevelopment will be subject to existing City Plans such as the Pedestrian Bicycle Master Plan.	

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

Y	Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
AA	AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
N	N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
O	O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 16	155	consider adding bike parking at various locations; include incentive for bike repair station (tools, air pump in self-contained unit) and electric bike charging	N		Bike parking is analyzed in detail during the development review process and is provided with redevelopment. City staff can determine the amount and location of public bike parking as redevelopment projects come forward, and must meet objectives and intent of the Ped Bike Master Plan as applicable.
Email 16	156	consider dedicated bus lanes and/or bus stop locations on Patrick; consider covered bus stop shelters; consider bus bulbs	O		This scope of this Strategy does not include bus lanes or stops, however the citywide Transit Vision Study, currently underway, will do so.
Email 16	157	consider delivery truck laybys along Patrick	O		Future traffic analysis can analyze and determine the appropriate location and feasibility of delivery truck/loading facilities.
Email 16	158	include incentive for EV charging stations	O		As part of the Green Building Policy, EV charging stations and other green building technology is discussed with applicants as part of the development review process.
Email 17	159	Please provide the definitions for the terminology, as relevant to this strategy, listed below Enhance quality of life (p.1) Respectful of the neighborhood (p.1) Eligible residents (p.3) "other community-serving amenities" (p.10) as listed in paragraph 2 subheading Regulatory Tools Tenants in good standing (p.12) Diversity of housing types (p.21) CRMU-H Zone (p.33) "In the long term" (p.36) as related to mobility and safety changes "When feasible (p.42) as related to green building	Y	1. removed from text 2. massing, design are compatible with existing buildings 3. definition and description added to ch. 2 and appendix 4. streetscape improvements, underground utilities, park improvements, etc. 5. definition and description added to ch. 2 and appendix 6. different housing types, including housing for seniors 7. CRMU - commercial residential mixed use 8. for the purposes of this strategy, long term is 11-15 years - language added 9. removed	
Email 17	160	Figure 1.1 Core area, list segments as parcels with size, along with said parcel owners #s 1-2,4 AP Heritage LLC #s 3,5 OldeTowne West Properties LLC #6 Martin Harmon Retals Trs #7 multiple parcels owned by 1007 LLC and Martin Harmon Retals Trs #8 Hesss Retail Stores LLC #9 Adam Aldie, LLC	N		Parcels are depicted, not owners, since ownership can frequently change. For ease of use in the development table, commonly recognized names are used.
Email 17	161	Strategy objectives – missing information Bullet point 12, on school capacity, is truncated- what is the remainder of this point?	AA		The bullet is a summarized statement that is expressed in greater detail in Chapter 3 - School Capacity.
Email 17	162	Inset on page 3 Property owner discussions were listed as part of the "robust community engagement process", can you elaborate on this point. All of the other listed engagement processes were documented and have information accessible.	Y	Additional info added to Appendix	
Email 17	163	Southwest Quadrant Housing Affordability Inset (yellow) - has misleading elements Language describing the size of OTW and HOT is not comparable- one is listed in parcel size, the other by city blocks The third parcel illustrated for OTW is not marked as outside of the core area of this plan, or listed as outside of the SWQ Small Area Plan	Y	Revised to address.	

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

- Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
- AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
- N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
- O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 17	164	Project –Based Voucher Contracts Inset – additional information requested How many PBC's are at OTW and HOW respectively What agency oversees each PBV Are housing choice vouchers currently allowed at either property, if so are there any in use now	Y	Revised to address in appendix. Both project-based voucher contracts at The Heritage are administered by HUD. As is reflected on A53, VHDA currently administers the OTW contract. Yes, housing choice vouchers are allowed in the 104 market rate units at The Heritage; this is noted on page A53. ARHA administers the vouchers. The exact number of vouchers being used is not known.	
Email 17	165	Economics of Housing Affordability- questions The HUD commitments mentioned, do they currently apply to both HOT and OTW How do VHDA subsidies currently apply to HOT and OTW Do any of the three scenarios listed incorporate subsites by the VHDA Does scenario two reflect the use of section 7-700 of the zoning ordinance, if not, what would scenario one with the application of section 7-700 look like What percent of residents of HOT and OTW are projected to be ineligible for return What percent of residents of HOW and OTW are currently considered ineligible for return	Y	Yes, both properties operate under PBV contracts. As is described on page 52, project-based vouchers (PBVs) are funded by the federal government and are a critical source of deeply affordable housing in the City. They constitute approximately 30% of the City's committed affordable rental housing stock. Residents pay 30% of their income toward the rent, and the PBV pays the difference up to an established fair market rent, and potentially, some utility costs. PBVs operate similarly to Housing Choice Vouchers, but are tied to a specific property rather than a household. PBV contracts typically have 20-year term of affordability with varying options to renew or extend. In the City, some PBVs are administered by the Alexandria Redevelopment Housing Authority (ARHA) while others are administered through Housing Assistance Contracts managed directly by HUD or other funding agencies. Scenario #2 notes that the PBV contracts are presumed to be lost and Scenario #3 notes that the PBV contracts are retained. Staff will clarify that Scenario #1 assumes the PBV contracts are lost. Scenario #2 does not reflect the use of Sec 7-700. See response to Comment #167. Percent of residents considered ineligible will be determined at the time the proposed housing survey is completed.	
Email 17	166	Preserving and Creating Affordable Housing – concerns olf the city is implementing section 7-700 of the zoning ordinance as part of rezoning for this strategy, the 40 year term of affordability MUST be enforced Paragraph two under the Regulatory Tools subheading states, in this case the development economics require a level of density that is greater than what could likely be generated through he application of Section 7-700 What could likely be generated?	AA		Long-term affordability is described in the yellow call-out box in ch 2. Staff evaluated scenario 1 with the use of 7-700, but it doesn't achieve the necessary density to subsidize the return of the 215 existing units.
Email 17	167	Recommendations – concerns Point one, ensuring affordable housing at a minimum and Point two, expand housing affordability Increasing the number of affordable units as it relates to an additional increase of density is not ideal- the prosed density to retain the 215 units is already very high, an increase of density to the area should be kept to the bare minimum required to retain the current housing affordability	O		As was discussed during recent community meetings and in the draft plan text, preserving affordable housing and fostering successful mixed-income communities involve a range of tools, including partnerships, multilayered financing and leveraging of non-City resources, as well as the use of regulatory incentives. The plan provides property owners with flexibility to pursue different approaches to preserving housing affordability at a range of income levels. One approach could involve the use of low-income housing tax credit equity, the primary source of equity funding for affordable rental housing. If this approach were used, it would not increase density further than described in the Strategy, but rather diversify income levels served (for example, it could provide for higher-levels of affordable units at 60%-HUD 80% AMI). This could potentially offset the likely loss of the 104 workforce affordable units currently at HOT.

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

Y	Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
AA	AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
N	N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
O	O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 17	168	The last sentence of the first paragraph implies that zoning and design changes implemented by this plan would set precedent for zoning and design for the entirety of the SWQ Small Area Plan This is undesirable as the SWQ Small Area Plan already has faced an increase in density and mix use redevelopment with the established zoning ordinance (CRMU/L) for two areas of the plan At the most, any rezoning should follow the established high density mix use zone already in use in the SWQ Small Area Plan	Y	Language clarified to specify that the projects outside the core area are subject to the existing SWQ SAP, and the projects within the core area are subject to the Strategy document.	
Email 17	169	Importance of Design, a design concept standard similar to what was used in the Old Town North Small Area Plan restructuring should be created Already design examples and elements brought forth by the city for this strategy are lacking for this plan The Clayborn was referenced many times as a design example to follow, yet there is no mention of this in the draft strategy presented	AA	Similar to other recent Plans, the Strategy includes site and design parameters (in chapter 3) to guide future redevelopment. Images of the Clayborn are included in the Strategy.	
Email 17	170	Table 1- questions and concerns Sites should be listed by each individual parcel not by site, as for some sites there are multiple parcels and not all said parcels are owned by the same entity	N		All of the sites listed in the development table are under common ownership.
Email 17	171	What is the existing FAR for each site listed in the table	O		FAR for the existing zones is between .75 and 1.25.
Email 17	172	The number of proposed units cannot be inferred by FAR	Y	Bar chart graphic from previous presentations has been added to indicate an estimate of the number of units, as well as language to help explain why a precise number is not realistic in advance of more detailed information that will be available at the time of the submitted development application, including unit size, number of bedrooms, and other project development factors.	
Email 17	173	The existing zoning for each site has a maximum gross density, what is this for each site	O		Maximum square footage under existing zoning for each site is the FAR allowed under existing zoning times the parcel square footage.
Email 17	174	What is the recommended development gross density of each site listed in the table	O		The new zone recommends FAR not density.
Email 17	175	Point 5, why would the recommended rezoning potential occur as CRMU-H rather than CRMU/L as found in other areas of the SWQ Small Area Plan Why is there a potential for a new zone to be introduced	O		The new zone is recommended to achieve the intent of the strategy - retention of the existing affordable units.
Email 17	176	Point 6, the increase of 5 feet to the allowed 55' building height for architectural embellishment counters what was presented in past community meetings (max 60' vs max 55') Past meetings presented proposed building heights as 55' rather than 50' as an ability to allow five story buildings that could better house green initiatives and architectural embellishments	O		The recommended increase in maximum allowable building height from 50 feet (existing zoning) to 55 feet is to allow the use of additional density to incentivize the retention of the existing 215 committed affordable units on-site, if and when redevelopment occurs. In order to ensure appropriate building height variation and architectural articulation, an increase of five feet may be permitted to achieve better building breaks, setbacks and ground floor open space as detailed in Chapter 3 of the Strategy.
Email 17	177	Point 7, Section 7-700 has a buyout option attached (as listed in the city zoning), will this use be prohibited ion this situation	O		The purpose of the Strategy is to preserve housing affordability on-site. The off-siting of units would not be consistent with the Strategy and would interfere with the extension of the rental subsidy contracts.

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

- Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
- AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
- N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
- O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 17	178	Is it true that allowing the 22 units of OTW (outside of the SWQ Small Area Plan, as listed on page 7) to be a part of this recommended development allows the owner of the property (ASBC) to apply section 7-700 for use on other redeveloping ASBC properties	O		The 22 units are part of ASBC's 75-unit PBV contract. Regardless of whether the ASBC achieves approval of its church expansion project, it is anticipated that ASBC will need to utilize a range of tools to preserve its committed affordable units. This would likely include the use of additional density/height, layered financing, and partnerships.
Email 17	179	Recommendation- questions and concerns Point 3, Future zoning will allow for ground floor accessory commercial uses supportive of the residential use, such as day care The option to include said commercial uses should be allowed as an either/ or incentive with density for owners to redevelop, as in to retain the current affordable housing unit numbers the properties can be zoned to increase density for more units or zoned to include accessory commercial uses- not BOTH	N		The first priority is to provide the affordable housing units. Any accessory use must be accommodated within the permitted FAR and be compatible with the neighborhood.
Email 17	180	Point 6, provide space for community facilities Again, if the goal of this strategy is to maintain the number of affordable housing units while being "financially sustainable, responsive to the needs of residents, and respectful of the neighborhood" (page 1) then there needs to be an either/ or approach A negotiated, responsible model cannot sustain acceptable density for the neighborhood, all affordable units and all desired amenities	O		The first priority is to provide the affordable housing units. Any accessory use must be accommodated within the permitted FAR and be compatible with the neighborhood.
Email 17	181	Point 33, if school capacity, enrollment and after school enrollment is to be addressed by the City and ACPS then a comprehensive plan needs to be developed and implemented alongside this strategy The schools districted for the properties in this strategy need to be looked at not in just the vacuum of this proposed strategy but examined in the context of all the Small Area Plans (and proposed overlays and changes to said plans) that the schools serve If any of the SWQ Small Area Plan is redistricted due to the impact of this proposed strategy or any changes made to the SWQ Small Area Plan or the surrounding Small Area Plans the public should be made known of said redistricting or anticipated redistricting prior to a strategy or plan's adoption	O		The City and ACPS work in close coordination to review capacity and enrollment comprehensively citywide.
Email 17	182	Guiding Principle City's already in place Complete Streets Design Guidelines and Vision Zero Action Plan The changes proposed in this strategy seem as if they would need to be implemented regardless of the adoption of the strategy as to meet the City's aforementioned guidelines and plan The SWQ Small Area is overdue for a traffic assessment as the area has become increasingly more trafficked due to surrounding area development and the nature of the major thoroughfares and arterial streets located in the Small Area Plan	O		The recommendations of this Strategy enable prioritization of these improvements to happen sooner, as well as additional improvements provided through redevelopment. 2) Future redevelopment will be required to conduct a traffic study and implement mitigation if warranted.
Email 17	183	Is the time line put forth by this strategy in line with the time line that individual property owners plan on executing	O		For planning purposes, some assumptions were made about timing and phasing, but ultimately phasing will be driven by the market, available tax credits, and is the developer's decision. It is unknown which blocks will come first or in what order, but it is likely that one or two blocks will submit a development application within the next two years, and the remaining blocks would be phased over the remaining 15 years.

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

Y	Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
AA	AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
N	N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
O	O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Community Meeting #8	196	Would like to echo appreciation to City Staff in being forthright and transparent. Would like to know the extent of owner/developer feedback and whether it has been identified in the spreadsheet of comments. Also, can you elaborate more on the resident survey?	O		
Community Meeting #8	197	What is the Dillon Rule?	O		
Community Meeting #8	198	What is the urgency behind this planning process?	O		
Community Meeting #8	199	What happens if the properties do not renew the affordable housing contracts?	O		
Community Meeting #8	200	What leverage does the City have to ensure that the units remain affordable and that the existing residents have the right-to-return?	O		One tool that the City has is to allow density and height bonuses in exchange for providing affordable housing.
Community Meeting #8	201	How much notice will the residents get before they have to relocate?	O		
Community Meeting #8	202	Why does the City need a plan to incentivize developers to provide affordable housing when it seems like the Alfred Street Baptist Church is already committed to affordable housing? Shouldn't we focus on building partnerships instead of giving incentives?	AA		
Community Meeting #8	203	Developers work for profit. The residents need the City to help.	O		
Community Meeting #8	204	What about preservation of the existing properties?	AA		
Community Meeting #8	205	Why are the terms of affordability only for 30 years? Can there be a ratio between 30% AMI, 60% AMI, and market rate units?	AA		
Community Meeting #8	206	Can the City give advance notice prior to meetings?	O		
Community Meeting #8	207	Will the monthly rental fee during relocation be the same as what the residents currently pay?	O		
Community Meeting #8	208	Are there special programs for the military families?	O		
Community Meeting #8	209	The Environmental Action Plan should also be considered in this Strategy.	Y	language will be added referencing the EAP and environmental policies with regard to development review process.	
Community Meeting #8	210	The pedestrian connection recommendations in the Strategy are good. Would like to expand the Wolfe Street connection across S. Patrick Street.	AA		
Feedback from #211 on are in response to the July 13 Revised Draft					
AlexEngage 6	211	There is an error on the map captioned "Circulation: Bicycle Access & Facilities" (page 67 of the 13 July draft). The map depicts South Fayette Street between Wilkes Street and Duke Street as an Existing Bike Route(s)/Trail(s). This is incorrect. The existing bike trail continues west on Wilkes then north on Payne, west on Roundhouse then north on West Street (thence also to Jamieson). I know that this error appears on many depictions, but it is not correct. If you don't believe me, come look at the pavement markings!	Y	The Circulation: Bicycle Access and Facilities map has been updated to reflect the correct bike routes.	

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

Y	Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
AA	AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
N	N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
O	O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Written Comments from paper copy in neighborhood 2	212	It would be helpful if there were an indexed definition fo terms somewhere. For example, "FAR", which appears on p. 31, must refer to the ratio of floor area to (something), but what?	N		Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is defined in the call out box on page 29 in Chapter 3 in the section on Zoning.
Written Comments from paper copy in neighborhood 2	213	Bringing the translated text was very nice!	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 18	214	This new draft plan is a significant improvement in recognition of accommodations for Alexandria residents of differing abilities and needs. It is significant to see the mention of accessibility needs of residents in Recommendation 2.9 and "features to enable residents to remain and age safely inthe community and to ensure new homes are accessible..." Recommendation 2.12	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 18	215	The GUIDING PRINCIPLE: Safe streets for all recognizes the need for accommodations for the safety of Alexandria residents and others who do not bike and have mobility and other limitations which challenge their safety crossing streets. The last sentence use of "inclusive and accessible" was welcome. Similarly, the Open Space paragraph was a great improvement.	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 18	216	In the development of these plans it would be very important to involve the Alexandria Commission on Persons with Disabilities (ACPD) and the Alexandria Commission on Aging (COA) for their observations on accessibility and usability of these facilities.These two organizations are appointed by the City Council to provide assistance and expertise in the development of plans benefiting Alexandria residents.	O		A member representing each organization mentioned was among the Charrette Group Volunteers that participated in the Charrette and numerous other community engagement events.
Email 18	217	The specific mention of "senior housing" was welcome.	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 18	218	As as a resident of the South Alfred Street community, I congratulate you on your work to make this city plan serve the needs of all Alexandria residents.	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 19	219	I think the revised draft of the Route 1 South Housing Affordability Strategy is much improved	O		Comment acknowledged
Email 19	220	I am pleased to see the revised zoning strategy 3.34 state that "the zone will be predominantly for residential uses, however, ground floor commercial uses supportive of the residential use, such as day care, as well as neighborhood-serving ground floor commercial and retail uses compatible with adjacent residential uses, will be permitted." I also appreciate the addition of the strategy objective on page 4 to "retain and enhance walkable access to neighborhood-serving retail/commercial, public facilities, and other neighborhood amenities." However, while the last draft of the plan discouraged retail/commercial, this draft does not do much to encourage it. I would add a paragraph to the Zoning section on page 29 elaborating on the nature of ground-floor retail envisioned ("neighborhood serving uses compatible with adjacent residential uses"), noting the consistency with the strategy objective of enhancing walkable access to neighborhood-serving retail/commercial. In strategy 3.34 you might consider changing the word "permitted" to "encouraged."	Y	We added language to page 29 discussing the nature of the ground floor uses, and will change permitted to encouraged in 3.34.	
Email 19	221	The revised plan focuses on the core area, without mentioning the broader study area that was addressed. Why the change? Shouldn't the study area be disclosed?	AA		The Strategy focuses on the core area (potential redevelopment sites) and the mobility/connectivity issues across and along Route 1 and within the neighborhood, as applicable.
Email 19	222	Can you address my previous comment about treatment of underperforming commercial parcels outside the core area (the CL zoning in the study area not recommended for rezoning)? I noted that the strategy focuses on redevelopment of two types of uses: the existing affordable housing, and commercial properties on South Patrick Street (Route 1). However, there are underperforming commercial properties elsewhere in the plan area not addressed, including the commercial at the southeast corner of S. Alfred Street and Gibbon Street. What is the rationale for not addressing those properties as part of this strategy? It seems like a lost opportunity while such intensive planning is happening in the nearby area.	AA		These areas were analyzed at a conceptual level early in the process. Existing zoning allows townhouse redevelopment and can also utilize Section 7-700. We determined that redevelopment of these sites, if desired, was both feasible and also appropriate under existing zoning given adjacent low scale townhouse development using the existing zoning.

ROUTE 1 SOUTH HOUSING AFFORDABILITY STRATEGY

Community Feedback on the June 4 and July 13 Draft Strategy Releases (June 4 - Aug. 17) with Responses

Please note that page #s in the Revised Draft (dated July 13) have changed since the June 4 draft. Where possible, chapters are referenced.

Legend

- Y - Yes, revision(s) proposed/incorporated
- AA - Topic Already Addressed/ No revision proposed
- N - No revision proposed/ incorporated
- O - Other

Source	No.	Question/ Comment/ Suggestion	Revision Proposed? (see legend)	Response/ Proposed Revision	Response/ No Revision Proposed
Email 19	223	The illustrative figure of Route 1 North on the plan cover, in Figure 3.1, etc. continues to show the sound wall. If we can visualize this stretch without the gas stations, etc., we should be able to visualize it without the sound walls south of Franklin St.	Y	We can make update the perspective but it will be after the public hearing, given the time necessary to amend the graphic.	
Email 19	224	On page 74, Hill House (#27) is incorrectly located on the map. It should be at 617 S. Washington St., just northwest of the intersection of S. Washington Street and Franklin Street.	Y	The location of the #27 dot has been moved.	