

Summary Minutes

Alexandria Waterfront Committee Meeting Thursday, May 26, 2011

Room 2000, Alexandria City Hall

Members

Present: Engin Artemel, Citizen east of Washington St. and north of Pendleton St.
Christine Bernstein, Founders Park Community Association (FPCA)
William Cromley, Alexandria Park and Recreation Commission
Linda Hafer, Old Town Business Association
Charlotte Hall, Alexandria Chamber of Commerce
Nathan Macek, At-large citizen and Chair
Jody Manor, Alexandria Convention and Visitors Association (ACVA)
Robert Taylor, Alexandria Seaport Foundation
Van Van Fleet, Old Town Civic Association

Excused: Jay Atkinson, Citizen east of Washington St. and north of King St
Mel Fortney, Citizen east of Washington St. and south of King St.
Doug Gosnell, Alexandria Marina pleasure boat lease holder
Peter Pennington, Environmental Policy Commission (EPC)
Pete Peterson, Alexandria Archaeological Commission
Paul Smedberg, Alexandria City Council

City Staff: Jack Browand, Recreation, Parks, Cultural Activities (RPCA)
Jim Hixon, Dockmaster, RPCA
Nancy Williams, Planning and Zoning (P&Z)

Guests: Polly Burke
Susan Cohen
Linda Couture
Tim Elliott
Peter Farnham
Harvie D. Goodin
Al Kalvaitis
Andrew MacDonald
Sarita Schotta
Andria Stowers
Boyd Walker
Bob Wood
Margaret Wood

Welcome and Introductions

The Committee was called to order at 4:12 p.m. and members and guests introduced themselves.

Discussion of Waterfront Small Area Plan

Macek welcomed guests and appreciated their interest in the discussion topic. He said that the Waterfront Committee meeting was not a public hearing and that while members of the

gallery were welcome to observe, they would not be permitted to participate in discussion. After further discussion, the Committee agreed to provide a time for public questions and comments at the end of the agenda.

Williams noted on behalf of P&Z that its responses to Council questions would be available to the public prior to Council's June 11 workshop.

General Comments

Macek invited members to share individual comments and concerns regarding the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan. Each Committee member in attendance offered the following comments:

Bernstein:

- The Waterfront Plan has merit in regard to integrating art.
- Visitors are clamoring to see and learn more about history. Alexandria has robust history, has that been captured by the Plan? The Plan could be more robust in regard to incorporating Alexandria's history.
- The area most concerning was the Robinson Terminal North property. Building on the property as presented in the Plan would have a negative visual impact. The waterfront greenway frontage of 55 feet is limited. Façade-building in this location impedes any invitation to enjoy the waterfront. As a practical impact of the hotel, in the early morning all one has to do is walk or bike to see service trucks required to support commercial entities. There is a general feeling that additional traffic does not support the objective of opening up park lands to continual visual access.
- One potential solution is for property on the west side of Union Street owned by Robinson Terminal to be developed to some extent, and for property east of Union Street to become an open expanse of park land. Residents would be mollified by the provision of additional open space, but the Washington Post Company would still be able to develop some of the property.
- There is a strong feeling that there hasn't been an alternative to developing Robinson Terminal North and South, which residents believe is unacceptable. FPCA seeks additional options, which should be considered.
- Regarding a museum on the Robison North site, FPCA would like to see options. A museum is an option, but is not the only option. There could be mixed use development with park land and some historic component.
- There is no guarantee that tax revenue generated on the waterfront will stay on the waterfront.

Manor:

- Any type of commercial use is going to entail traffic.
- The Plan does not dictate that the Robinson Terminal sites be used as hotels. Bernstein responded that she believes that is what is supported by the City, including documents by P&Z and the Planning Commission that specifically state the sites should be boutique hotels of 150 units.
- Revenue is a concern because additional park land has maintenance costs. As a business owner, maintenance is an issue on the current waterfront. Maintenance issues are not restricted to the Marina. Hotels are generators of tax benefits, which should be applied to the waterfront.

- Represents ACVA, and ACVA's position is well-known.
- As business owner, the proposed transportation add-on tax would have had a significant impact on business competitiveness. Small businesses that don't grow are more vulnerable to failure.
- From perspective of business owner on the waterfront, there's very little revenue currently generated, and very little emphasis on the existing waterfront. There's a single landlord who controls much of the existing waterfront who is not highly motivated to improve those areas. That is something the City struggles with.
- The present areas set-aside as commercial properties are not generating the commercial activity we'd like to see. There's one place with outdoor waterfront dining, Chart House, which needs some competition.
- Recognize people don't want to look out at a brick wall, but we have robust Board of Architectural Review (BAR), and a height of 55 feet won't look like the Sheet Metal Workers Building. There is the possibility of designing space that is not eyesore that does not restrict access.
- Tax revenue and added vitality from hotels are part of what the waterfront needs.
- The Plan should integrate arts and history proposals. Bernstein agreed that as a historic town, the Plan should emphasize Alexandria history, stating it should "baked in" to the Plan.

Taylor:

- Echoes what Manor said.
- There are misconceptions regarding height limits. There is a 45 foot height limit on the east side of Robinson North, which must be stepped down toward the waterfront. There is a 50 foot open space buffer, then a 30 foot height limit, and a 45 foot height limit on the east side of Union Street. West of Union Street, more height is allowed, up to the height of existing office buildings immediately west of Robinson Terminal north, which I believe is 60 feet.
- The hotel is going to generate the most economic activity for the City as the site will allow. 150 is the maximum number of proposed rooms for the boutique hotel.
- Parks are not the answer to everything.
- Supports something that the public would like to see—dining, shopping.
- There is presently no deep-water port in Alexandria because it is silted in. South Robinson Terminal only supports a 17' draft.

Hafer:

- Old Town Businesses are looking for a plan supports business here, but of course it must not destroy what makes Old Town beautiful and attractive. There are ways to bring in something that can generate tax revenue and support local businesses.
- It's going to be important to make sure that development occurs in a method that's compatible with what Alexandria is looking for.
- The Plan lists a "preferred" use for hotels on the Robinson Terminal sites, but "required" use for hotel on Cummings/Turner block, where The Art League School is located. Currently, there's an art element in the Waterfront Plan, and such "required" zoning could take away the basis for The Art League School to be on the site. Would a hotel activate the site in the same way as the art school?

Hall:

- It must be an efficient plan, and it's a conceptual plan. There are still a lot of questions out there, and SUP process is going to weigh heavily in how it's implemented.
- Want to see something that can pay for itself. The City does not have the money to implement the plan by itself.
- Need something that exposes the City to history and art.
- Need to have a support structure for visiting tall ships.
- Robinson Terminal concerns are understood, but it will all weigh on the SUP process. We could go around in circles about what to put on the Robinson Terminal site.
- Need to register a caution about the food pavilion. Let's look at what we have now and what we don't have now.
- May not be in our best interest to discuss the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) now. Would be grateful for a walkway, but it's not for the City to tell them what to do.
- Concerned regarding parking situation and the loss of parking on The Strand.
- The biggest bugaboo with the concept Plan is the maintenance and upkeep of the waterfront. We don't do a good job of it now because we don't apply the resources necessary to maintain our waterfront. There's much more we could be doing to remove debris from the river. Baltimore has scooper to remove debris from the Inner Harbor, and it's a constant problem here. We should address this.
- We've been focused on the land, but need to consider the waterside too.
- Bernstein responded that a caution regarding potential uses should be registered now rather than delaying until the SUP process.

Van Fleet:

- Agrees with Bernstein's premise that if you wait until SUP process, you're dead meat.
- There are a lot of things in the Plan that need to be taken out because they're impossible to do.
- Piers proposed in the Plan violate the pierhead line that delineates the navigation channels and the border between D.C. and Virginia. No need to talk about those, because you're not going to get permission to do it.
- Regarding Fitzgerald Square, ODBC owns the property, but it's not going to give up the parking lot. The Planning Commission put the concept back into the Plan, but there's just no way it's going to happen.
- Two-thirds of the Chadwick's parking lot is owned by the Mann and Sweeney estates. Doubts they'll sell the lots. The 100 cars parked there support several waterfront businesses, and the parking can't be replicated elsewhere.
- Hotels would have a height limit of 55 feet. Parking can't be placed below grade along the river. These sites would need to have above-ground parking, which means a 55 foot height limit could be higher with parking. Williams responded that the height limit is different than a floor area ratio (FAR), which doesn't take into account parking. The height limits cannot be violated even with ground floor parking.
- Three hotels are too many. There are 2,860 rooms in the Old Town area, many with vacant rooms already, so don't the City doesn't need more hotel rooms.
- Along Union Street, the parking and congestion is already there and may be made worse.
- A boutique hotel should be 45 rooms like the Morrison House, not 150 rooms as defined by the Planning Commission.

- A major issue is flooding, and before anything else, the City needs to fund flood mitigation improvements.
- Doesn't see a lot of open space in the Plan. The City would have to pay a lot to buy the Robinson Terminal sites, but it's already paying a lot for a new Metro station, High School, and police headquarters.
- The cost of the program needs to be finely reviewed the revenues won't support the expenditures the City is proposing in the Plan.
- Citizen questions are important to answer. Staff should answer citizen questions in addition to Council members' questions in its response to Council.

Cromley:

- There seems to be a huge disconnect between what's in the Plan and what's perceived by the public.
- Even if money is available to support the purchase of Robinson Terminal Sites, the City should not create more park land on the waterfront.
- The Plan focuses on end of King Street, the head of the City's commercial spine. A vibrant King Street needs a vibrant Waterfront.
- There shouldn't be more town houses on the waterfront. Another option is office buildings, but they're dead hulking boxes at night. Staff is advocating hotels for another reason, to provide activity, eyes on the street, and spread traffic out throughout the day. There are by-right uses and those owners have to be willing to sell for development to occur.
- The nightmare scenario is if construction occurs under the by-right development that's currently permitted.
- Maybe it shouldn't be called a boutique hotel, but the City should put limit on its size. But the question is what's going to happen on the proposed hotel sites. It's not likely to be donated to or bought by the City. Its best use is as commercial development, and that's a place maker.
- Wish more people would address what would happen under by-right development if there weren't a plan.

Artemel:

- Wears many hats—member of Old Town Civic Association, Waterfront Alliance, Chamber of Commerce, and is a professional waterfront planner.
- Not a single dime was spent by City for Oronoco Bay Park, it was donated by Texaco. Under Artemel's tenure as Planning director, Waterfront Park was redeveloped and the Torpedo Factory was created.
- Some wanted the Torpedo Factory to be torn down
- A lot of good things happen in Alexandria, and am going to start raising my own flag.
- As a Waterfront Committee member, represents Old Town North and their wishes, which includes Rivergate. By and large, the majority or the Rivergate board voted that after the changes the Planning Department has made, they support the Plan.
- Live on Madison Street and see Robinson Terminal North, as well as the coal train daily. Rivergate would love to see Robinson Terminal become a 5-star hotel, especially if shown as in the Plan with a setback. Not so sure about the height limits, but would like to see the hotel. Rivergate has never been bothered by the Crowne Plaza hotel that's right near by.

- Agrees with Van on the point of losing parking on the Strand. It's the most used parking lot in the City.
- Would like to see the end of King Street open, if for no other reason than because it was formerly closed, regardless of Fitzgerald Square.
- As rep of Old Town North, they are going along with the Plan, with some caveats.

Macek:

- Noted that it was important as an at-large representative to reflect a City-wide perspective on the waterfront. The Waterfront is for the enjoyment of the all City residents, in addition to those who live nearby.
- Alexandria's history was as a commercial waterfront, and re-development of industrial uses as commercial uses was consistent with the City's history. He said he supported hotels as an acceptable Waterfront use.
- Noted Taylor's comment that Robinson Terminal sites could still be empty warehouses in 40 years, stating that the Plan must support rezoning that will permit timely redevelopment of these parcels
- Waterfront is a poor location for surface parking, but agrees the impact of any Strand redevelopment on existing parking should be mitigated.
- Said he believed it was important for the Waterfront Committee to take a firm stand on the Waterfront Plan in its role as advisors to City Council
- Suggested that the Committee review the draft talking points to determine where there is agreement, with votes accordingly.

Manor said that Robinson Terminal could be re-developed now, and that he was concerned about what is permitted right now, which could be residential or retail.

Taylor said that additional residential uses on the waterfront could make them more privatized. A hotel is not a prescribed use, but a preferred use. Robinson Terminal properties are owned by a publicly owned company, which is not going to donate the property. It has to be feasible for owners to sell the property—they want to be able to sell to developers.

Cromley said when he walks behind residential properties, it feels different than behind the Torpedo Factory. Macek said that while the public is free to walk behind residential areas, you would never find the activity like musicians and magicians there like on Torpedo Plaza.

Bernstein said she wanted to emphasize the impact that trucks can have on the neighborhood—streets are congested with trucks because that's when things are serviced. Think of the practical impact on the neighborhood. Congestion on the south end of Union Street could be repeated at the north end because of hotel infrastructure. Cromley noted that impacts of trucks can be mitigated. Have to consider the practical impact of infrastructure required, and it can be managed, such as at 675 N. Washington St., where Trader Joe's other mixed uses are located.

Discussion of Letter

The Committee then discussed the draft talking points that had been prepared by Macek, discussing and voting for approval of each paragraph individually.

Moved by Taylor, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Alexandria Waterfront Committee is a unique City-wide assembly of Waterfront stakeholders established by City Council in 1989 to study and advise the City on Waterfront issues. We represent a wide cross-section of the community and have the best interests of the Waterfront at heart. Members include City residents, businesspersons, and members of selected business associations, non-profit organizations, and City commissions.

Moved by Hafer, seconded by Taylor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-1 on a voice vote, Van Fleet dissenting.

We believe a new Plan is necessary to guide future development and civic investments. We have long advocated for development and enactment of a new Plan, and believe it is essential to establish guidelines for future development before any specific projects are proposed. Today's Waterfront does not meet its full potential to serve residents or improve the City's economy. Existing infrastructure is aging and needs to be revitalized for the area to be competitive with neighboring waterfronts. A Waterfront Plan will assist in addressing these shortcomings.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Van Fleet, to adopt the following paragraphs regarding the Waterfront Committee's past deliberations on the Waterfront Small Area Plan. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

Over the past two years, the Waterfront Committee, its members, other community groups, and the public at large have collaborated to create the Plan recently endorsed by the Planning Commission. Throughout the plan-making process, the Waterfront Committee offered critical feedback on multiple drafts of the Plan.

- In May 2009, the Waterfront Committee offered its [Waterfront Plan Principles](#), a 91-point summary of the elements we thought critical to include in any Waterfront Plan. Many elements of these principles were incorporated into the Waterfront Plan's goals and objectives.
- In February 2010, the Waterfront Committee, Department of Planning and Zoning, and Department of Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Activities jointly sponsored Marina Night, an interactive community discussion on the City Marina and future maritime needs of the Waterfront. This event culminated in the Waterfront Committee's [Marina Vision Statement and Briefing Paper](#). This paper helped shape the Plan's proposed marinas, which provide a waterside gateway to Alexandria that separates pleasure from commercial watercraft.
- In June 2010 the Committee provided Planning staff 10 pages of [comments](#) on the Concept Waterfront Plan. This letter carefully outlined our critique of the early draft relative our Committee's May 2009 Waterfront Plan Principles. These comments were addressed by staff as the Plan evolved over the next six months.

- In March 2011 we again offered [detailed feedback](#) when the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan was released, with particular concerns regarding implementation the Plan's parking strategy; the scale and tenor of redevelopment; the proposed Waterfront Park restaurant building; and the implementation timeframe for completion of the long-delayed Windmill Hill Park Plan. These recommendations were generally addressed by staff in advance of the May 3 Planning Commission meeting, although the Waterfront Committee has some lingering concerns, summarized at the end of this letter.
- In April 2011 [we wrote](#) the Planning Commission urging the proposed Fitzgerald Square to remain the Plan's vision for the foot of King Street. The Planning Commission responded by amending the Plan to state that Fitzgerald Square remains the proposed alternative for this location.

The Committee then discussed a series of paragraphs regarding how the Plan accomplishes key objectives urged by stakeholders.

Moved by Hall, seconded by Taylor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan balances new areas of economic vitality with quiet places for contemplating the water. The Plan respects existing neighborhoods, many of which are the product of past Waterfront planning efforts. It proposes re-development only in those locations with existing commercial and industrial uses.

Moved by Taylor, seconded by Hafer, to adopt the following paragraph, striking a sentence reading, "Waterfront parking lots would disappear, replaced by new parks and a public plaza". Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan provides new open space and enhances existing parks. A vast portion of the Plan's acreage includes renewed open space. Long-stalled plans for Windmill Hill Park would be realized, as well as improvements to Oronoco Bay Park. Founders Park would remain passive open space.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Hafer, to strike the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-1 on a voice vote, Macek dissenting.

The Plan is unique to Alexandria. Its design concepts are compatible with the historic tenor of Old Town and the City's long heritage of maritime and commercial waterfront activity. It has the "look and feel" of the best of what's already here, and continues to differentiate Alexandria's waterfront and the Old Town business district from others in the region.

Moved by Cromley, seconded by Artemel, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-1 on a voice vote, Van Fleet dissenting.

The Plan provides an anchor in Fitzgerald Square, which would serve as a central hub tying together disparate pieces of existing Waterfront amenities with Old Town's commercial artery. The square would provide a celebratory sense of arrival on Alexandria's

Waterfront both from the landside and the waterside. Without the central anchor that Fitzgerald Square provides, other worthwhile public improvements contemplated by the Plan will not have the meaningful focal point that is required to link them together.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan provides enhanced connectivity and preserves and enhances Waterfront vistas. Redevelopment of the existing Robinson Terminal sites and City-owned parcels along The Strand would provide the much sought-after continuous pedestrian access along the Waterfront, enabling riverfront walks from Jones Point Park north to Marina Towers and beyond. This element of the Plan would make productive use of little-used existing public parks at street ends, and provide the public sweeping views of the Potomac.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Hall, to strike the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan proposes a strategy for addressing parking challenges in the vicinity of the Waterfront core area. The Plan recognizes the negative impact that parking may have on neighborhoods immediately adjacent the Waterfront and proposes that any redevelopment include off-street parking sufficient to meet projected needs. The Plan also recommends better management of the existing supply to serve present and future demand for parking in Old Town, monitored by a new parking implementation group.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan interprets the history of Alexandria, and provides a stunning vision for incorporating the arts. The community can be proudest of two resident-led efforts the Plan incorporates: the Waterfront Public Art Proposal and the Waterfront History Plan. The Public Art Proposal, if realized, would make Alexandria's Waterfront a showplace for the arts, including public, fine, and performing arts, most notably by developing an art walk parallel to the river. The History Plan envisions a Waterfront that recognizes the significance of Alexandria's place in American history, incorporating historic preservation and interpretive measures along the Waterfront to preserve existing architectural treasures and re-tell the fascinating history of Alexandria to future generations.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Hafer, to adopt the following paragraph, with the addition of text stating that this may be accomplished with expanded piers within the existing pier head line. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan maintains Alexandria's working Waterfront, with expanded facilities for commercial boat services and a relocated pleasure boat marina. Proposed piers, even if within the existing pier line that delineates the present boundaries between Virginia and the District of Columbia, would provide space for existing excursion services to expand, as well as for new operators to enter the Alexandria market. The Plan relocates the water taxi dock to facilitate access to King Street, and provides a prominent docking location for tall ships and other historic vessels. The Plan separates pleasure boats from the commercial

marina, mitigating the conflicting maneuvers present at the current Marina. It proposes to enlarge the City Marina to an economically-viable size, which could wean the Marina from City subsidies and provide a more secure location for private vessels.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Artemel, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

The Plan sensitively integrates nuisance flood mitigation measures. As April showers once again demonstrated, the Alexandria Waterfront is susceptible to nuisance flooding on a regular basis. The City's recent flood mitigation study outlined a cost-beneficial approach to mitigating nuisance flooding of up to 6.0 feet, such as the April 16, 2011 storm that resulted in flood levels of 4.77 feet. But while original engineering designs featured stark flood walls that would separate Alexandrians from the river, the Waterfront Plan takes a subtle approach, integrating barriers into proposed infrastructure and landscape improvements. This combination of form and function allows flood mitigation to enhance rather than impede public access to the Waterfront.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Cromley, to adopt the following paragraph, using the word "framework" in place of "strategy." Motion carried 7-2 on a voice vote, Bernstein and Van Fleet dissenting.

The Plan provides a framework to fund improvements without increasing taxes or establishing a business improvement district. The Implementation chapter of the Plan demonstrates a method of covering the cost of public improvements to the Waterfront with revenues generated from redevelopment of existing industrial and underutilized commercial parcels. The boutique hotels proposed for these locations that would be enabled by the Waterfront Plan's zoning ordinance text amendment are among the Alexandria's most productive revenue-generating land uses, of benefit not only to the Waterfront, but also to the City in general.

The Committee then discussed a series of paragraphs regarding key issues for City Council to resolve prior to adopting the Plan and as it is implemented.

Moved by Cromley, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-1 on a voice vote, Van Fleet dissenting.

Fitzgerald Square Concept: The Waterfront Committee strongly disagrees with proposals to relocate the proposed Fitzgerald Square from the foot of King Street to Prince Street or elsewhere along the Waterfront. We agree with the Planning Commission that the original proposal for Fitzgerald Square is the preferred, optimal design, and believe that it has the potential to be not only the centerpiece of the Waterfront, but also one of the City's crown jewels. Realizing this vision, however, will require leadership by City Council. We encourage the City to continue negotiations with the Old Dominion Boat Club, especially when reasonable alternatives exist. However, in no instance should the King Street right-of-way be blocked by a relocated parking area.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Hafer, to adopt the following series of paragraphs regarding the waterfront extension and Marina design. Motion carried 8-1 on a voice vote, Van Fleet dissenting.

Waterfront Extension and Marina Design: The Draft Waterfront Plan proposes two major extensions into the Potomac River, including piers at the foot of King and Cameron streets and a pleasure craft marina off the current Robinson Terminal South location. The financial ramifications—including construction costs and ongoing maintenance expenses such as for dredging—of the proposed marina designs are not clear.

The Plan envisions a new marina area off the current Robinson Terminal South. The Waterfront Committee has two concerns regarding this structure. The first concern is about the technical feasibility of such a structure in a river that can surge from meteorological events and can carry large tree trunks and, at times, ice floes. The second concern is about the economic feasibility of the structure. Whereas the management details are for future discussion, the Waterfront Committee's own research suggested a minimum size of 150 berths before a marina can become viable. The same research also showed that a marina of such a size would require storage areas and proper transfer points for families to load and transition from land vehicles to watercraft.

Similarly, increased commercial traffic will require storage facilities for boat operators.

Given the impact on other elements of the Plan, this issue should be considered prior to Council adoption.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Taylor, to adopt the following paragraph regarding the parking implementation plan. Bernstein and Taylor accepted a friendly amendment from Van Fleet to add "limited" before valet parking. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

Parking Implementation Plan: The Draft Waterfront Plan cites the Old Town Area Parking Study, which found that "issues with Old Town parking relate to proximity, rate, and availability and not to overall capacity." The study—and the Draft Waterfront Plan—recommends better management of the existing supply to serve present and future demand for parking in Old Town. If this indeed the case, we urge the immediate implementation of the recommendations of this chapter, including wayfinding, limited valet parking, and shuttle services aimed at maximizing existing parking capacity, coupled with enhanced enforcement of existing parking policies in adjacent residential areas. Such a pilot program will mitigate existing parking issues, and provide a model as implementation of the full Waterfront Plan unfolds. There is no reason to wait for further development of the Waterfront to address the parking issues that presently exist. Let us test this concept during the summer of 2011 to see if it works.

Moved by Artemel, seconded by Hafer, to add the following sentence to the parking implementation plan paragraph. Motion carried 9-0 on a voice vote.

Furthermore, we believe no existing public parking spaces should be removed without assurance of reasonable replacement spaces.

Moved by Cromley, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph, including a statement regarding mitigation of hotel impacts on surrounding neighborhoods requested by Bernstein. Motion carried 7-2 on a voice vote, Bernstein and Van Fleet dissenting.

Waterfront Hotels: The Plan will support commercial land uses, including hotels, which enliven the Waterfront and help to pay for the Plan. A key consideration, however, is what types of commercial uses are appropriate. We support the Plan's call for re-zoning three locations to permit hotels with no more than 150 rooms each, and meeting space for no more than 50 persons, especially relative to the by-right development currently permitted on these sites. Residential, commercial, and visitor-oriented Waterfront development must be carefully balanced, including civic and cultural attractions for both visitors and residents. Too much residential development may give the Waterfront the feel of being a private area primarily for residents, while too much commercial development may leave the area vacant at night. However, any development must mitigate the traffic, parking, trash, and noise impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

Artemel was excused from the meeting.

Moved by Taylor, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-0 on a voice vote.

Existing Cultural institutions: We echo the Plan's support of maintaining existing cultural institutions on the Waterfront, including the Seaport Foundation, The Art League, the Alexandria Archaeology Museum, the Torpedo Factory Art Center, and others. We encourage the City to take proactive measures to retain these organizations on the Waterfront as the Plan is implemented.

Moved by Taylor, seconded by Manor, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-0 on a voice vote.

Incorporation of History: The Plan should be unique to Alexandria. Its design concepts should be compatible with the historic tenor of Old Town and the City's long heritage of maritime and commercial Waterfront activity. It must have the "look and feel" of the best of what's already here, and continue to differentiate Alexandria's Waterfront and the Old Town business district from others in the region. We encourage excellence in design as the Plan is implemented.

Moved by Bernstein, seconded by Hafer, to adopt the following paragraph. Motion carried 8-0 on a voice vote.

Dedication of Waterfront Revenues: We believe that net additional City revenues generated by redevelopment on the Waterfront should be solely applied to Waterfront-area amenities, including parks, programming, and other public uses. We encourage Council to add language to the Plan dedicating new Waterfront revenues as such.

The Committee then discussed whether it would voice overall support for the Waterfront Plan. Moved by Cromley, seconded by Hall, to support the Plan with the following qualifications (as documented above) to be addressed by Council to strengthen the Plan.

Van Fleet commented that he didn't believe the Committee should support the Plan, period. He said a plan is needed but better alternatives were needed to choose from. He said there had never been an alternative proposed other than one single plan, and the public needed to be able to choose from amongst a number of alternatives.

Cromley said that staff formulated the based on hundreds of hours of public opinion and community input.

Bernstein said a lot of points weren't necessarily incorporated in the Plan by staff.

Motion carried 6-2, with Bernstein and Van Fleet dissenting.

Motion by Van Fleet, seconded by Bernstein, that the Committee note that there was only one alternative to the Plan, and that multiple alternatives should be considered before the Waterfront Plan is approved.

Hafer said that there had been incremental changes to the Plan. Van Fleet said that the Plan did not evolve over time. Taylor said that the City was not going to get a plan that everybody would like. Van Fleet said that there should have been alternatives to get the best plan. Taylor asked who was to dictate what alternatives are better than others.

Motion failed 2-6, with Cromley, Hafer, Hall, Macek, Manor, and Taylor dissenting.

Citizen Comment

Resident Bob Wood offered several questions for the Waterfront Committee to consider:

- How has the Waterfront Plan accomplished the Committee's 11 goals?
- What was the metric for the Committee's opposition to the Plan?
- Why hasn't the Committee asked for a simpler Plan with a lower cost?
- What is proposed for the Robinson Terminal South site?
- Does the Committee support a zoning change?

Resident Margaret Wood commented that Committee missed an opportunity to receive resident comments on the Waterfront Plan. She said that museums, parks, and other attractions could draw local tourists to Old Town better than hotels. She said residents were concerned about losing businesses on King Street. She said additional park space would be attractive to local families and tourists. She said a plan was needed but not this plan.

Announcements

Macek reminded members that the Waterfront Committee's annual Waterfront Walk would be Saturday, June 4, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. beginning at the Windmill Hill Park bulkhead, and that the Alexandria City Council would hold a workshop on the Waterfront Plan on Saturday, June 11, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in the Council Chambers at Alexandria City Hall.

Macek announced that the Alexandria Waterfront Committee's next regular monthly meeting will be Tuesday, June 21, 2011 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 2000 of Alexandria City Hall.

Taylor announced that the Alexandria Seaport Foundation would hold a wine tasting fundraiser event on Saturday, June 4, 2011 at the Alexandria Seaport Center, 2 Duke Street. He also announced that the June meeting would be his last as a member as Seaport Foundation Executive Director Kent Barnekov would be taking the seat.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned without objection at 7:56 p.m.