

# Calculation of Parking Ratio on American Legion (SP#439) Comparables (APAH Properties)

SPRC Meeting, SP#439, Dec. 10, 2018

Aleksandr Belinskiy,  
Atlington, VA  
abelinskiy@aol.com

# APAH Parking Study –Comparables[1]

Project Name	Address	TOTAL Units	Parking Ratios			
			Supply		Demand	
			Total Parking Spaces	Parking Ratio	Spaces Utilized at Max. Occupancy (12-3AM)	Parking Occupancy Ratio
Calvert Manor	1925-1927 N. Clavert St. Arlington, VA 22201	23	19	0.83	6	0.26
Marbella	1301 N. Queen St. Arlington, VA 22209	134	84	0.63	62	0.46
Courthouse Crossings	1410 N. Scott St. Arlington, VA 22209	112	93	0.83	73	0.65
Parc Rosslyn (Affordable Only)	1531 N. Pierce St. Arlington, VA 22209	100	64	0.64	46	0.46
Queens Court*	1801-1805 N. Quinn St. Arlington, VA 22209	39	18	0.46	8	0.21
The Springs	555 N Thomas Street Arlington, VA 22203	104	104	1.00	74	0.71
			Average	0.73		0.40
Proposed American Legion Site	3445 Washington Blvd Arlington, VA 22201	160	76	0.48		<u>0.46</u>

Simple Average 0.46, Weighted Average 0.53

\*Parking Data for Queens Court obtained when building was fully occupied

[1] Applicant presentation on Dec. 10, 2018 SPRC Meeting [https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2018/12/Legion-SPRC-2\\_POSTED120718.pdf](https://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2018/12/Legion-SPRC-2_POSTED120718.pdf) (p.30)

## Weighted Average Parking Ratio for selected APAH Properties

Project Name	Units [1]	Off-Street Car Parking		Parking Permits (2016) [2]	Commissioner of Revenue [3]
		2018? [1]	4/2016 [2]		
Calvert Manor	23	6	10	18	n/a
Marbella	134	62	66	85	102
Courthouse Crossings	112	73	90	76	106
Parc Rosslyn (Affordable Only)	100	46	63	n/a	n/a
Queens Court (2016)	39	8	8	19	13
The Spring	104	74	n/a	n/a	n/a
Parking Ratio		0.53	0.58	0.64	0.88

[1] See previous slide, Col.3 & 7.

[2] APAH Parking Study, April 2016, submitted to County in Nov. 2016, Col. 12 and 16 & 17. County's FOIA response, Sep. 12, 2017

<https://goo.gl/UyDqbw> (or [https://drive.google.com/open?id=1K1Y\\_-di5kjf\\_1h-gTqOt7J6QfupVflKj](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1K1Y_-di5kjf_1h-gTqOt7J6QfupVflKj))

[3] County Staff, 2017, Parking Demand for All-CAF Projects. Col. 1, 4. County's FOIA response, Sep. 15, 2017, <https://goo.gl/p3QQQp> (or <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1KqO5pPJLz4yN3sERw6pO0gKKAJIKRJos>). Note: COR parking ratios is adjusted by 0.1 from average 0.78

Parking Survey - Developments with Affordable Housing  
2016 updated

Project Name	Address	Units (By Bedroom Size)				TOTAL Units	Total Parking Spaces		Parking Available Per Units	From 4/2016 update Spaces Utilized at Max. Occupancy (12-3AM)	Parking Occupancy- Cars Parked/Unit	Cost of Parking (Enter "Free" or Actual Amount Charged)	Method of Parking Access/Control (none, decal/hangtag, or access card/gate)	# of Permits (if Applicable)		Cars Per Unit (if Available)	Property Walkability, Transit, Bike Score*	Proximity to Metro and Bus	Current TDM measures at the site
		Efficiency	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR		4 BR	Resident Spaces						Visitor Spaces	Total # of Permits				
Arlington Mill	901 S. Dinwiddie St. Arlington, VA 22204	8	13	78	23	0	122	117	0	0.96	116	0.95	Free	Access Cards	112	15	not available	Walk Score= 68%, Transit=57%, Bike=64% .02 miles away to MetroBus and .01 ART bus	yes
Arna Valley View	2300 S. 25th St. Arlington, VA 22206	0	36	25	40	0	101	165	11	1.74	134	1.33	Free	Decal	62	0	not available	Walk Score= 66%, Transit=50%, Bike=82% .02 miles away from ART bus; .36 miles to	
Barkalow	2708-2718 N. Pershing Dr. Arlington, VA 22201	0	12	1	1	0	14	0	0	-	0	-	Free	Decal	0	0	not available	Walk Score= 81%, Transit=62%, Bike=80% ART bus and .02 miles away MetroBus	
Buchanan Gardens	926 S. Buchanan St. Arlington, VA 22204	0	55	33	22	1	111	91	0	0.82	91	0.82	Free	Decal	83	20	not available	Walk Score= 69%, Transit=57%, Bike=66% .11 miles away MetroBus and ART bus	
Calvert Manor	1925-1927 N. Clavert St. Arlington, VA 22201	2	13	5	3	0	23	19	0	0.83	10	0.43	Free	Decal	17	1	not available	Walk Score= 84%, Transit=62%, Bike=82% .06 miles to MetroBus and .11 ART	
Cameron Commons	2036-2040 N. Cameron St. Arlington, VA 22207	0	0	10	6	0	16	17	0	1.06	9	0.56	Free	Decal	7	0	not available	Walk Score= 80%, Transit=40%, Bike=77% .2 miles to MetroBus; .22 miles away ART	
Carlyn Springs	4318-4322 N. Carlin Springs Rd. Arlington, VA 22203					0											delivers on 10/14/16	Walk Score= 92%, Transit=73%, Bike=80% .58 miles to Ballston Metro, .07 MetroBus	yes
Columbia Grove	1010 S. Frederick St. Arlington, VA 22204	0	100	108	0	0	208	217	0	1.04	191	0.92	Free	Decal	201	40	not available	Walk Score= 59%, Transit=59%, Bike=53% .01 miles to ART; .08 miles to MetroBus	
Courthouse Crossings	1410 N. Scott St. Arlington, VA 22209	1	24	55	29	3	112	93	0	0.83	90	0.80	Free	Decal	68	8	not available	Walk Score= 76%, Transit=69%, Bike=68% .13 miles to MetroBus; .22 miles away ART; .4 miles away Courthouse Metro Station	
Fisher House	1211-1201 N. Kennebec St. 5701 N. 11th Rd. Arlington, VA 22205	0	16	15	2	0	33	0	0	-	0	-	Free	Decal	0	0	not available	Walk Score= 62%, Transit=42%, Bike=76% .14 miles away MetroBus and .65 miles away ART bus	
Leckey Gardens	2031-2037 N. Woodrow St. Arlington, VA 22207	0	13	25	0	2	40	43	0	1.08	33	0.83	Free	Decal	37	12	not available	Walk Score= 79%, Transit=36%, Bike=79% .12 miles away to MetroBus and .12 ART bus	
Marbella	1301 N. Queen St. Arlington, VA 22209	2	105	20	7	0	134	84	0	0.63	66	0.49	Free	Decal	78	7	not available	Walk Score= 85%, Transit=69%, Bike=73% .04 miles away to ART bus and .05 to MetroBus	
Parc Rosslyn (AFF)		6	58	28	8	0	100	64	0	0.64	63	0.63						Walk Score= 92%, Transit=73%, Bike=74% .1 to MetroBus and .43 miles to Rosslyn Metro and .45 miles to Clarendon Metro	
Queens Court	1801-1805 N. Quinn St. Arlington, VA 22209	5	34	0	0	0	39	18	0	0.46	8	0.21	Free	Decal	18	1	not available	Walk Score= 90%, Transit=72%, Bike=81% .05 ART bus, .14 MetroBus, and .43 Miles away from Rosslyn Metro and .45 Courthouse Metro Station	
TOTAL Parking Spaces Utilized for Affordable (without Parc Rosslyn Market Units)																			
Average of the Average utilization										0.78		0.61							

**Parking Demand for All-CAF Projects**

Property Name	Distance to Metro Band (miles)	Number of Units	Vehicles Registered	Vehicles per Unit	Adjusted Registration Figures (vehicles/unit)	Maximum Utilization (Vehicles Parked per Unit)	Source
The Jordan	0.25-0.50					0.80	Site Plan Performance Monitoring Studies
Courthouse Crossing	0.25-0.50					0.80	Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing
Key Boulevard	0.25-0.50					0.40	AHC via presentation to Meeting #2 of the City of Alexandria Parking Standards Task Force for Phase 1, slide 23
Frederick	0.25-0.50					1.00	AHC via presentation to Meeting #2 of the City of Alexandria Parking Standards Task Force for Phase 1, slide 23
Parc Rosslyn (Affordable units)	0.25-0.50					0.63	Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing
Queens Court	0.50-0.75					0.21	Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing
Woodbury Park	0.50-0.75					0.70	AHC via presentation to Meeting #2 of the City of Alexandria Parking Standards Task Force for Phase 1, slide 23
Calvert Manor	0.50-0.75					0.43	Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing
Marbella	0.50-0.75					0.49	Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing
CLARENDON COURT	0.25-0.50	103	111	1.08	1.18		Commissioner of Revenue
QUEENS COURT	0.25-0.50	39	13	0.33	0.43		Commissioner of Revenue
KEY BLVD APTS.	0.25-0.50	41	34	0.83	0.93		Commissioner of Revenue
COURTHOUSE CROSSING	0.25-0.50	90	106	1.18	1.28		Commissioner of Revenue
THE CARLIN	0.25-0.50	162	54	0.33	0.43		Commissioner of Revenue
THE JORDAN	0.50-0.75	90	75	0.83	0.93		Commissioner of Revenue
WOODBURY PARK	0.50-0.75	364	289	0.79	0.89		Commissioner of Revenue
THE FREDERICK AT COURTHOUSE	0.50-0.75	100	98	0.98	1.08		Commissioner of Revenue
MARBELLA APTS.	0.50-0.75	120	102	0.85	0.95		Commissioner of Revenue



December 7, 2018

Stephen Hughes, SPRC Chair

**Re: American Legion/APHA Site (SP#449)**

Commissioner Hughes:

In advance of the December 10, 2018, SPRC meeting on the above captioned project, Lyon Village Citizens Association submits this letter outlining some of our questions and relating to topics to covered at the SPRC.

**Overall Site Design**

The footprint is too big for the site. It would be better to shrink the footprint and build higher if necessary than to build the building as currently designed.

**Washington Blvd. Side of the Building**

We identify two problems with the building as it faces Washington Blvd. First, it cantilevers over the sidewalk beginning at 14 feet up, shrinking the setback to 11 feet from the parking lane curb. It depicts what looks like a "large" street tree in the planting strip but it is only 14 feet tall. Is it a tree or a bush? A canopy street tree like a willow oak will not fit in that space with the building overhang above. If the trunk of the tree is centered in the planting strip (3 feet in from the curb -- the planting strip is about 6.7 feet), tree growth above 14 feet is limited to about 7 feet to the building face. No one wants tree branches scraping against their windows. There is precedent for the cantilevering in the County in Michael Fosters new building on Wilson at Adams but he think in the end he pulled the lower floors of the building back further than required at street level. There is precedent in another building in Courthouse on the old Wendy's site where this was done (I think the building is still under construction) without setting the building back further, and this significantly limits tree size and also closes in the street. This also brings the apartments that face Washington Blvd. closer to street noise, including fire truck sirens late at night, particularly with sound bouncing off the large building across the street.

Second, the building setback does not leave adequate space for a functioning arterial street. Our standard 4-lane arterial street width is two travel lanes in each direction, with one of the lanes at least 11 feet wide and the other at least 10 feet wide. Parking lanes are normally 8 feet wide so that an SUV can fit into the space without encroaching on the travel lane (putting aside the question of opening the driver's side door). Buses and trucks are 10 feet wide. The drawings show the east bound Washington Blvd. lanes staying at 9.2 feet (curb lane) and 10.0 feet (inside lane) and the west bound lanes at 10.6 feet (curb lane) and 10.0 feet (inside lane), with parking lanes (in limited places) of 7 feet. Several questions:

1. Why don't the lane widths meet County standards?
2. How will a bus safely pass a truck, or a truck pass a bus, without crossing the center line?
3. With an aging population, how will a driver park a car in a 7 foot parking lane and safely exit the car?

The bottom line is that a lot of new density is being added to this section of Washington Blvd. and the building should be pushed back to allow a complete street, with 10 and 11 foot travel lanes in both directions and an 8 foot parking on the entire north side of Washington Blvd. The building face should be at least 18 to 20 feet back from the curb with no cantilever encroaching on that setback.

### **The Alley on the West Side of the Building**

The proposed alley seems small considering its proposed uses. The alley has two lanes of 11 feet (a total of 22 feet) plus a 7-foot parking lane in places. It provides access to the main entrance of the building, the parking garage, and the loading dock. On the building side there is a 5.5 foot planting strip and 6 foot sidewalk. First, a general comment: residential building entrances are better located on side streets of some kind as they are quieter, allowing tenants to enter and exit the building more safely than if on a busy arterial street. In addition, we have several questions:

1. Why is the loading dock located next to the main entrance and between Washington Blvd. and the main entrance? This forces tenants to walk past the loading dock. How deep will the loading dock be and will trucks be able to back into the loading docking without blocking the 6 foot sidewalk and even part of the alley? If they block the sidewalk, will this force pedestrians, including mothers with small children and elderly with walkers, into the alley travel lanes in order to get to the entrance?
2. Can the loading dock accommodate a large 45 foot moving van? Building rules may prohibit trucks that size but such trucks in real life are almost never turned away.
3. There appears to be no turn-around at the end of the alley. How will a large truck get out of the alley? How will a UPS truck that does not have access to the loading dock turn around?
4. Where will pizza delivery trucks park? Where will taxi cabs wait? Where will visitors park? Where will an Uber or a relative pick up a tenant wait? Will the parking in the alley be managed, and if so, how will that be done?
5. Will some of the alley spaces be reserved for the American Legion?

6. What kinds of trees do you expect to plant in the alley? The drawings literally show them growing into the side of the building.
7. Is the 6-foot sidewalk next to the building sufficiently wide, taking into account the fact that it includes the shy zone next to the building face?
8. Is the alley likely to serve the building eventually built on the west side of the alley and how will any such building affect access to the parking garage and loading docks and exiting of vehicles, including large trucks?

### **The Entrance to the Alley**

The entrance to the alley appears to be about 22 feet wide and it appears to be designed as a driveway entrance rather than a street entrance. Several questions:

1. What are the likely turning radii for large trucks entering the alley? Will they likely need both lanes of Washington Blvd. to make a turn? Will they likely run over the street nub at the alley entrance? Given the lack of a turn-around in the alley, will a large truck need to back out of the alley into the traffic on Washington Blvd?
2. Has the alley, where it meets Washington Blvd., been designed to read as a driveway or as a minor street to Washington Blvd. pedestrians and drivers using the alley? Design affects both driver and pedestrian behavior. Pedestrians tend to use more caution when crossing a minor street than when crossing a driveway.
3. Please describe the sight lines for pedestrians and drivers at the alley entrance. At what point will a pedestrian be able to see a car or truck exiting the alley? How far out into Washington Blvd. will a driver have to go to see on-coming traffic and decide whether to turn into a traffic lane? Will a car or truck block the sidewalk in doing that?

### **Parking**

Lyon Village is concerned that the requested number of parking spaces will be inadequate for the building and result in tenant and tenant guest vehicles being parked on neighborhood streets that are already overburdened by inadequate parking in existing buildings (or as a result of parking in buildings that is priced above what vehicle owners are willing to pay).

When Arlington first enacted zoned parking in the 1970s, office commuters were the primary concern, and parking was only restricted during typical workday hours Monday through Friday. Arlington has changed considerably in the last four decades as we now have dense urban corridors filled with multifamily residential, bars, restaurants, hotels, and various other retail and commercial uses directly abutting the preexisting low density residential neighborhoods. Limiting zoned parking to only Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. is no longer adequate to protect the quality of life in Lyon Village and our sister neighborhoods along the denser corridors of Arlington.

Arlington's zoned parking regulations need to be updated to reflect these present day conditions to include restricted parking into the evenings and on weekends. It may be the case that lifestyles and transportation options today are such that the parking ratios for certain projects do not need to be what they were in the past. However, until County parking policies are updated to increase restricted parking hours beyond the outdated business hours approach, Lyon Village and similarly situated neighborhoods are being put in a very difficult position when asked to support projects with parking ratios lower than historical norms.

Lyon Village is supportive of the denser development along the Roslyn-Ballston corridor and we fully appreciate that our proximity to this corridor is major component that makes Lyon Village and similarly situated lower density neighborhoods desirable. At the same time, it is important that we protect the character and lifestyle of these lower density neighborhoods along these edge conditions. Lyon Village appreciates that the County is undertaking a review of the current zoned parking program, and many Lyon Village residents are actively engaged in this process. However, so that effects of reduced parking site plan projects can be reviewed and evaluated with context of potential consequences to adjacent low density residential neighborhoods, this review process should have come before any major changes parking ratio standards. Until zoned parking restrictions are updated, an unnecessary conflict of interest will exist among the stakeholders along the edges Arlington's dense corridors.

---

Lyon Village Citizens' Association looks forward to further discussion of this project on December 10.

Sincerely,

John Carten, President  
Lyon Village Citizens' Association

cc:

Carmen Romero, Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing  
Matthew Weinstein, Bean, Kinney & Korman PC  
Peter Shultz, Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development

Transportation Concerns for APAH-Legion Site Redevelopment Friday,  
December 7, 2018 9:45:59 AM

To:  
Cc  
Subject:  
Date:

---

Peter & Rob,

Thank you for your time last week and throughout the SPRC process. In addition to some of the issues discussed at our meeting we have additional questions:

-For parking- what number of spots will be dedicated for staff and how many staff are expected for the property?

-If disabled veterans are anticipated for the property (which we aren't sure about but have heard it mentioned), what is the plan for handicap parking spaces? Will there be more than is normally required?

-What is the plan for managing parking for Legion events to be held in the evenings and on the weekend? We do not believe 20 spaces will be enough to support Residents and Legion events.

-Is the Legion still planning to rent out parking spaces to local area businesses as is the current practice?

-What is the rate of parking enforcement e.g. number of hours or trips to our neighborhood on a weekly basis?

We've also had the chance to meet with our neighbors and have developed the following requested site plan conditions.

1. We request an increase to the residential zone hour coverage so that the hours are 9 AM to 11 PM daily. We understand the RPPP is on a moratorium but assume it will come back eventually and would like the same treatment as other nearby neighborhoods with similar development near their homes and similar zone restricted hours.

2. We ask for a commitment to increase parking enforcement personnel in our neighborhood as currently such personnel are rarely, if ever, in the neighborhood. We believe the costs incurred for such enforcement will be self-funding.

3. We request the parking ratio for APAH be increased. We are concerned that given the number of 2- and 3-bedroom apartments planned, the expectation that families will live in them, and the fact that our neighborhood does not have access to walkable elementary or middle schools, it's not feasible to assume residents without a car or that even one car per unit will be sufficient.

4. With the assumption that emergency vehicle access is worked out between APAH / YMCA, both temporarily and permanently, that there be no vehicle access between 12th Rd and the applicant property permitted. This is consistent with the GLUP and should be a condition of the site plan.

5. Before the applicant's property can connect to 12th Rd for ped/bike connectivity, requisite safety improvements are required along 12th Rd, at the expense of either the Applicant or the County. Neighbors have a more general safety concern of people walking in the street given that there are no sidewalks, lighting is so poor on Kansas and 12th, and it's a "small street" that is planned to get a lot of new "stuff" without much consideration. Neighbors with homes on 12th Rd N are also concerned about their ability to see bikes, scooters, and pedestrians when backing out of their driveways, especially if there is a new path envisioned along the road. Further, emergency egress should be temporary until other redevelopments are completed (which will allow egress from within the redeveloped area). Once such redevelopment is complete, we request a barrier be erected along 12<sup>th</sup> Rd N to prevent vehicular traffic.

6. We ask that land be reserved for any traffic improvements required on Washington Blvd.

Pending the answers to the questions above, the new APAH presentation, and the discussion on Monday we may have additional requests, but we wanted to provide you with what we have for now.

We look forward to discussing the plan more on Monday.

Best,

Cara