

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

List of Acronyms

- CPHD – Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development
- HPP – Historic Preservation Program
- DES – Department of Environmental Services
- DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation
- AED – Arlington Economic Development
- PC – Planning Commission
- LRPC – Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission
- HALRB – Historical Affairs and Landmark Review Board
- TC – Transportation Commission
- PAC – Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- PRC – Park and Recreation Commission
- UFC – Urban Forestry Commission
- FRIT – Federal Realty Investment Trust (applicant)
- WETA – Washington Educational Telecommunications Association (applicant)
- PDSP – Phased Development Site Plan
- FAR – Floor Area Ratio

Sources

- Public Comment – a comment received from a member of the public
- Public Survey – a response to staff’s online survey on the draft Study Document

| ID             | PG.   | SOURCE        | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|----------------|-------|---------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>GENERAL</b> |       |               |  |                |                          |  |
| 1.             | 83-84 | Public Survey | Tree percentage should not be below the County baseline. (9)               | Comment noted. |                          | 25% is above Shirlington’s current canopy coverage, and below the 40% average for the County, but our County average includes large wooded areas and parks. Shirlington is an urban area and increasing to 25% would already be a big lift for this area. Setting realistic targets is more appropriate for sites like this. |
| 2.             | 72    | Public Survey | Enhanced tree canopy should be mandatory instead of “where possible.” (11) | Staff concurs. |                          | Change Guiding Principle 19 text to “greatest extent possible.”  |
| 3.             | 102   | Public Survey | Note should be included to fix intersection at S. Randolph St. (23)        | Staff concurs. |                          | Add note on map p. 102   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID | PG.   | SOURCE        | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)                            |
|----|-------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 4. |       | Public Survey | Should be noted that lower building heights along Arlington Mill Dr. will prevent walling off Shirlington from Green Valley. (32)   | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |
| 5. |       | Public Survey | Should there be a note in the document referencing the recent changes to building use due to COVID 19? (5)  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          |  |
| 6. |       | Public Survey | Should there be a note regarding safety for pedestrians at night in surrounding neighborhoods Four Mile Run, S. George Mason, Green Valley, Shirlington Rd? (8)   | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | While an important issue, this is outside the area and the scope of the study. |
| 7. | 85-87 | Public Survey | The draft GLUP plan does not significantly speak to transportation in and around the Shirlington area and how it relates to the Arlington Master Transportation Plan and our long-term sustainability goals. (15)   | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |
| 8. | 101   | Public Survey | Should we be addressing how the need for outdoor seating has evolved during the pandemic and what flexibility there may be with ROW and parking in the long-range plans? (19)   | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |
| 9. | 102   | Public Survey | Urgent need to replace 4-way stop at Campbell Ave. and S. Randolph St. with a signalized intersection. Traffic volume, visual distractions and heavy pedestrian traffic are not suited for a 4-way stop. Signals should provide for an on-demand all-way simultaneous (incl. diagonal) pedestrian crossing with "no turn on red" restrictions. (20) | Comment noted.                      |                          | add note on p. 102 map.  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG.        | SOURCE        | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable)   | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|-----|------------|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 10. |            | Public Survey | A detailed traffic management analysis is needed to determine if the existing intersections and street network in and around VAS will support the proposed density scenarios and will be able to maintain the easy access to VAS that now exists. (22)  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |  | This is outside the scope of the study.   |
| 11. | 86/<br>102 | Public Survey | 1. Include definitions and generous recommended minimum widths for all existing and planned sidewalks (landscaping zone, clear zone, shy/cafe zone), 2. Ensure that cafe zones do not impinge upon clear zones - plan for wider sidewalks as needed, 3. Existing passageway between Campbell Ave. and parking lot has 22 steps - and no obvious ADA alternative. (23) | Staff concurs.                      | p.86 "The existing north-south passageways on both sides of Campbell Avenue should be preserved and improved when redevelopment occurs."<br><br>p.102 "Staff's urban design analysis identified several potential improvements, primarily to support pedestrian movement." | Add text p.86: "The existing north-south passageways on both sides of Campbell Avenue should be preserved and improved with better defined clear paths and universally accessible design when redevelopment occurs."<br><br>Add text p. 102: "Staff's urban design analysis identified several potential improvements, primarily to support pedestrian movement. Consideration should also be given to flexible street design that allows the expansion of outdoor uses such as dining and pop-up retail whereby sections of the streets are closed to vehicular traffic."<br><br>Add note on p. 102 map. |
| 12. |            | Public Survey | Not enough focus on housing affordability. Could there be opportunities for more affordable housing - including the potential for a CAF development within the study area - if more density/height was on the table? (27)   | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |  |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG.   | SOURCE        | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-------|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 13. |       | Public Survey | Nothing is stated about where the additional APS students, generated by the increased residential density in this plan, would attend school. (42)  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | When new development is proposed a student generation factor is applied and considered in the discussion of the merits of the site plan application. |
| 14. | 17-28 | Public Survey | The document could do a better job referring more specifically to other components of the Arlington Comprehensive Plan, such as the Master Transportation Plan, Public Space Master Plan, Public Art, Urban Forestry, where relevant. (44)   | Comment noted.                      |                          | P. 17-28 reference these elements of the Comprehensive Plan.   |
| 15. |       | Public Survey | Has there been a noise study to identify the potential for increased noise from increased traffic as well as patronage at new rooftop terraces that may be elements of new construction? (50)  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | The County has a noise ordinance which addresses this issue.   |
| 16. | 26    | Public Survey | Please identify by name that Green Valley is the neighborhood/community immediately adjacent to the project area and that existing elements referenced in the plan, such as Jennie Dean Park, Shirlington Park (which will be renamed), and the dog park, are part of that community. The plan should offer information to educate and reinforce that these elements, often mistakenly considered part of Shirlington (due in part to their incorrect names), are in fact located in a separate neighborhood. (50) | Staff concurs.                      |                          | This will be addressed on p. 26 and several references to Green Valley will be added.  |
| 17. |       | Public Survey | Is there a record of how the current affordable units are doing in Shirlington and surrounding neighborhood? (13)  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | This is outside the scope of the study.  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE        | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable) |
|-----|-----|---------------|---|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| 18. |     | Public Survey | <p>Consideration of increased density must include a detailed analysis of traffic impacts not just in Shirlington but in the surrounding neighborhoods. It is important to consider what the impact of additional density will be at key nearby intersections such as those at Walter Reed Dr./Arlington Mill Dr. and 31<sup>st</sup> St. S./S. Abingdon St... Within Shirlington, the ongoing traffic bottleneck at the Arlington Mill Dr./Shirlington Rd. intersection must be improved as a precondition for increased density. A current traffic study may not classify that intersection as a Level F, but it will be at that level with more density which will also negatively impact the flow of traffic to and from Shirlington Circle. (22)</p> | Comment noted. |                          |   |
| 19. |     | Public Survey | <p>The Green Valley neighborhood urgently needs Arlington County to make the Shirlington Bridge pedestrian/trail project a much higher priority. (32)</p>   | Comment noted. |                          |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE        | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-----|---------------|---|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| 20. |     | Public Survey | The recently installed crosswalk light between Arlington Mill Dr. and Four Mile Run Dr., which connects the 4MR Trail from the boundary with Alexandria to the Shirlington Rd. bridge, neither reduces traffic impacts as mandated nor sufficiently protects cyclists and pedestrians from an extremely dense block that includes an interstate exit ramp, WETA traffic, buses, Vulcan cement trucks, and fast cars that do not always stop. (32)   | Comment noted. |                          |  |
| 21. |     | PRC           | We would support a more direct, explicit reference to other county planning documents, such as the Public Spaces Master Plan, the Master Transportation Plan, the Historic Preservation Master Plan, the Public Art Master Plan, the Urban Forest Master Plan, etc. where appropriate. Although this is a document designed to support amendments to the GLUP, we note that the fourth bullet of the study scope calls for it to address "recommendations of County plans and policies, as applicable." And yet as far as we can tell there is no mention of these other plans and policies even as a general reference, in the document. | Comment noted. |                          | <p>P. 15-28 make several specific references to these elements of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as other plans and policies on p. 33-34, that provided guidance on the plan's analyses and recommendations.</p> <p>P. 115-116 of Implementation Matrix references several plans that would also need to reference these same documents.</p> <p>P. 25 references the Urban Forest Master Plan in the discussion of tree canopy targets.</p> |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-----|--------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 22. |     | PRC    | We do find the biophilic references weaker than we would like to see. The concept, designated in the Public Spaces Master Plan, and sanctioned by the County Board in December 2019, should be an overarching theme for the GLUP and other county plans and policies. The biophilia concept is useful for helping tie the values of the trees, natural landscape areas, pedestrian walks and other lifestyle aspects (including outdoor art) together. Having a stronger and more robust referencing and description (not just using the term itself without much content) would explain the value and guide future planners and designers. | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | Where possible, biophilia is encouraged and noted specifically or indirectly by incorporation of the principles of biophilia on p. 81, 84, 89, 90, 94 and 101. |
| 23. |     | PRC    | We particularly support language in the document that proposes that public easements should be secured where public access has been permitted, but where the easement is not officially recorded. We are not aware of such a declared intention in other County planning policy documents.  | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |
| 24. |     | SCA    | With regard to Building Heights, the SCA finds the staff recommendations on several parcels too limiting. The SCA fully supports the views expressed by the Applicant, the longtime property owner of the Village, in its July 2 letter to the County Board about this Special GLUP report.   | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG.   | SOURCE                | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                               | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-------|-----------------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| 25. |       | WETA                  | WETA supports the Shirlington Civic Association’s and FRIT’s requests to maximize development potential within the Plan, particularly as to appropriate heights and densities for new development, which are necessary to achieving the Plan’s vision and transit goals. From our own experience as an employer in Shirlington, we understand that mixed-use development emphasizing new transit opportunities is a powerful combination for attracting and retaining new employees in the Village. | Comment noted.                               |                          |  |
| 26. | 37    | Green Valley Resident | Typos – (Shirlington's Shirlington's).  | Comment noted.                               |                          |  |
| 27. | 55    | Green Valley Resident | Typos – (given).  | Comment noted.                               |                          |  |
| 28. | 85/87 | Green Valley Resident | Typos – p. 85 (maintenance), p. 87 (wayfinding).  | Comment noted.                               |                          |  |
| 29. | 116   | Green Valley Resident | Typos – p. 116 (completion).  | Comment noted.                               |                          |  |
| 30. |       | TC Motion             | The Transportation Commission recommends that the County Board defer adoption of the Shirlington GLUP Study Plus pending further refinement of the recommendations on non-motorized modes of transportation and the potential to support additional density in Shirlington. Vote was 10-0.  | Comment noted.<br><br>Staff does not concur. |                          | Much of this is outside the scope of this Special GLUP Study.<br><br>Staff does not support the inclusion of additional density, as the modeling scenarios at the proposed heights indicate densities generally commensurate with “Medium” Office-Apartment-Hotel and C-O-2.5. |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|-----|-----|--------|---|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| 31. |     | TC     | <p>1)The overall street sections lack specificity and legibility....</p> <p>2)...Minimum sidewalk clear zones need to be set out in the study...</p> <p>3)...state a clear goal of an eventual pedestrian route through or along the edge of the Trades Center...</p> <p>4)...the study should make it clear how the future bike network will get people from the trail into the heart of Shirlington...</p> <p>5)...Overall, we are concerned that the lack of specificity around transportation in the Shirlington Special GLUP study will make it difficult to ensure that Shirlington’s non-automotive transportation network can evolve and grow to properly support new homes, businesses and offices in Shirlington...</p> | Comment noted. |                          | <p>1)The street sections are intended to primarily show building heights and relationships to the street. These are not intended to be detailed cross sections. Those would be developed as part of the PDSP amendment and update to the design guidelines for the Village.</p> <p>2)This can be addressed as part of the PDSP amendment and update to the design guidelines for the Village.</p> <p>3)Staff will share this comment with DES.</p> <p>4)/5) Comments noted.</p> |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID                                   | PG. | SOURCE         | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)                    |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION (PAGE 1-6) |     |                |  |                |                          |  |
| 1.                                   | 5   | Public Comment | First paragraph – Consider including the list of community reps in the same sentence as the commission list. Right now, by separating them it makes it seem the community reps were not on the same footing (seating?) as the commission reps. | Comment noted. |                          | The intention was not to present the groups in any hierarchical order. |
|                                      |     |                |  |                |                          |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE                    | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|---|-----|---------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| CHAPTER TWO: HISTORY OF SHIRLINGTON (PAGE 7-14) |     |                           |  |                |                          |   |
| 1.  | 9   | HPP                       | Attempt to find the source info for the two historic photographs. Also, change the current caption to "Early Businesses along Quincy Street."  | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 2.  | 11  | Fairlington Resident, HPP | Suggest adding a section prior to the "Decline and Revitalization Efforts, Mid-1960s to 2007" on page 11, that provides the story of the Sit-Ins that took place in Shirlington in June of 1960. | Staff concurs. |                          | <p>Add text:<br/> <i>"Shirlington Lunch Counter Desegregation</i><br/>           On June 18, 1960, a group of fourteen demonstrators staged sit-ins at two Shirlington Business Center establishments, the Lansburgh's Colonial Room and the Woolworth's lunch counter. On the day of the sit-ins, although the demonstrations did not result in violent confrontation, both businesses responded by closing their counters. Laurence Henry, a Howard University divinity student, acted as spokesman for the protesters and told newspapers that the demonstrators had sent letters to business owners asking for them to negotiate. Woolworth's in Shirlington was the first lunch counter to desegregate on June 22, 1960, followed that same day by the Shirlington Lansburgh's among other area lunch counters."</p> <p>Add historic photos of sit-ins in the Village.</p> |
| 3.  | 11  | HPP                       | Caption - For the caption with Figure 2-10, "Washington" is spelled incorrectly.   | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 4.  | 11  | HPP                       | Italicize paper reference for consistency ( <i>The Washington Star</i> ).  | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 5.  | 13  | HPP                       | Fix paragraph spacing.   | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
|   |     |                           |  |                |                          |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE         | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable)  | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|---|-----|----------------|---|----------------|---|---|
| CHAPTER THREE: EXISTING CONDITIONS (PAGE 15-34) |     |                |   |                |   |   |
| 1.  | 21  | TC             | Show more of the transit system.  | Staff concurs. |   | Replace Figure 3-17 with a system map.  |
| 2.  | 22  | Public Comment | Parking paragraph - Do you think it helpful to note that the 5 garages that "serve" the area are not under one ownership? And that they serve their respective buildings/areas and some have public parking after 5? Or something that sets up one of the challenges we have. | Staff concurs. | "The Village at Shirlington is generally served by five parking garages and one large surface parking lot. There are approximately 3,023 off-street parking spaces. In addition, there are approximately 137 on-street parking spaces on Campbell Avenue, South Randolph Street and South Quincy Street. A parking study conducted in June 2019 revealed that there is a significant supply of off-street parking spaces. Each of the parking facilities reaches its peak at different days and times with varying degrees of occupancy. As for on-street parking, it is highly utilized for parking, deliveries and shared ride users with a peak at noon on Saturdays." | "The Village at Shirlington is generally served by five independently owned parking garages and one large surface parking lot. There are approximately 3,023 off-street parking spaces. While most are for the private use of building users, some are available to the public, especially after 5PM. In addition, there are approximately 137 on-street parking spaces on Campbell Avenue, South Randolph Street and South Quincy Street. A parking study conducted in June 2019 revealed that there is a significant supply of off-street parking spaces. Each of the parking facilities reaches its peak at different days and times with varying degrees of occupancy. As for on-street parking, it is highly utilized for parking, deliveries and shared ride users with a peak at noon on Saturdays." |
| 3.  | 23  | HPP            | 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence - Replace the word "classifications" for "categories" when discussing the HRI.  | Staff concurs. |   |   |
| 4.  | 23  | HPP            | 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, last sentence - Affirm should be singular without "s."   | Staff concurs. |   |   |
| 5.  | 23  | HPP            | 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence - Streets should be lowercase since including more than one street name.  | Staff concurs. |   |   |
| 6.  | 23  | HPP            | 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence - Insert "in" before June 1960.   | Staff concurs. |   |   |
| 7.  | 23  | HPP            | Last row in table - "CPHD, NSD" instead of semicolon in between.  | Staff concurs. |   |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE                | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-----|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 8.  | 26  | Public Comment        | Is the description of Jennie Dean reflective of the adopted – although not fully executed – plan for the park?   | Staff concurs, no changes proposed. |                          | This is reflective of the adopted plan.  |
| 9.  | 34  | CPHD                  | Delete the reference to the renaming of the Town Square as this is unnecessary.  | Staff concurs.                      |                          |  |
| 10. | 15  | Green Valley Resident | Note that Parkfairfax is in Alexandria. Otherwise, it may give an impression that Arlington has some authority over this neighborhood.   | Staff concurs.                      |                          |  |
| 11. | 26  | Green Valley Resident | Under Parks and Public Space - the mention of "Shirlington Park" - There is a proposal to rename it, which should be noted, similar to how the Town Square renaming is noted on page 34.   | Comment noted.                      |                          | Staff will remove the reference to changing the name of the Town Square and not include a reference to changing the name of Shirlington Park, as no changes have been officially made at this time.  |
| 12. | 26  | Green Valley Resident | Confusing to have a "future" rendering under a section called "existing conditions" - replace it with a current photo. Same is true for the future rendering on page 28. Replace it with a photo of an existing art piece.   | Comment noted.                      |                          | There does not appear to be a future rendering on pages 26 or 28. With regards to the rendering of the Walter Hood project on page 27, this image should stay since it is a well-known image and the project is under construction.  |
| 13. | 27  | Green Valley Resident | Public Art section - Please reword last sentences. Suggestion: "Nearby in Green Valley, two projects are currently underway. A town square is being designed by artist and landscape architect, Walter Hood, and, in Jennie Dean Park, artist Mark Reigelman is designing a structural gazebo. Delivery of both projects is expected in 2021." | Staff proposes new language.        |                          | "Nearby in Green Valley, two projects are currently underway. A town square is being designed by artist and landscape architect, Walter Hood, and, in Jennie Dean Park, artist Mark Reigelman is designing a functional artwork. Delivery of both projects is expected in 2021." |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| <b>ID</b> | <b>PG.</b> | <b>SOURCE</b>         | <b>COMMENT</b>   | <b>STAFF RESPONSE</b>  | <b>OLD TEXT (if applicable)</b>  | <b>EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)</b>  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 14.       | 28         | Green Valley Resident | It would be helpful to see a map of the 2040 forecast of affordable housing with better street delineation.  | Staff does not concur. |  | Appendix C of the Affordable Housing Master Plan is made up of a series of maps. These maps include both areas with defined boundaries (established planning corridors) and areas without defined boundaries that are descriptive of the area of the County (such as the I-395 Apartments). The third map of the appendix depicts a forecasts the future distribution of affordable housing in the County, the areas without defined boundaries in this map are better understood by looking at the previous map on page 43 of the AHMP that shows the locations of multi-family rental housing in the County. All streets are shown, but not labeled due to the scale of these maps. |
| 15.       | 29         | Public Comment        | Think about adding a little more verbiage about the legacy buildings. Using define and anchor are good – but do they define the roadway or do they represent the existing character? Think about words that go to placemaking and the “feel” that residents and others clearly want to maintain per comments at meetings and public forum. | Staff concurs.         | Art Deco historic buildings are other important assets that help to anchor and define Campbell Avenue. | Art Deco buildings perpetuate the legacy of the Village as a venerable place in Arlington as well as other important assets such as the street trees and brick sidewalks. Together this ensemble helps to reinforce the traditional main street character and expresses the unique feel of Campbell Avenue.   |
| 16.       | 21         | DES                   | Ensure that this is the most up-to-date map.   | Staff concurs.         |  | Staff will update the map if a newer version is available.  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID                                  | PG. | SOURCE                | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE         | OLD TEXT (if applicable)  | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|------------------------|---|---|
| CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS (PAGE 35-54) |     |                       |   |                        |   |   |
| 1.                                  | 35  | FRIT                  | The Plan contemplates “retaining the village scale by preserving the building frontages.” We request that the Plan provides clarity that the goal is to preserve the façade, or equivalent character, and that each site will be evaluated on a case by case basis, and not a recommendation of full building preservation.   | Staff does not concur. |   | The frontages of the buildings listed as Important on the HRI are recommended for preservation, however changes to the storefronts are permitted to accommodate these buildings continuing to adapt over time.  |
| 2.                                  | 34  | Green Valley Resident | Add a reference to the Arts and Industry District in the list of plans and policies.  | Staff concurs.         |   | Add a description on p. 34 to the Four Mile Run Valley Area Plan description.<br><br>“Four Mile Run Valley Area Plan – Adopted in 2018, this plan sets forth a vision for the industrial and commercial area located on the north side of Four Mile Run. Key goals of the plan are to maintain the industrial character of the area, improve Four Mile Run and access to the stream, provide better access and safety for pedestrians and cyclists, expand arts uses and investigate the feasibility of an Arts and Industry District, reserve space for County needs and existing businesses, and address parking issues.” |
| 3.                                  | 35  | Public Comment        | Should it be an ellipsis or a colon before the bullet points? And in the bullet points about authentic character note – desire voiced by residents and others? Keeping the authentic village character noted by residents as important – or something like that.<br>Second bullet – retaining the well-loved village pedestrian scale and feel already established by legacy buildings... | Staff concurs.         | Retaining these buildings, however, is not a stand-alone action, as it is important to work with all of Shirlington’s existing assets and enhance them through various means, including:...<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retaining the authentic character of the Village</li> <li>• Retaining the village scale by preserving the building frontages</li> </ul> | Retaining these buildings, however, is not a stand-alone action, as it is important to work with all of Shirlington’s existing assets and enhance them through various means, including:<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping the authentic village character as noted by study participants.</li> <li>• Retaining the well-loved pedestrian village scale and feel already established by existing buildings.</li> </ul>  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|-----|-----|--------|---|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| 4.  | 35  | HPP    | Fix paragraph spacing at bottom.  | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 5.  | 35  | HPP    | 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, last sentence - In HRI sentence, towards the end, replace "architectural significance and physical integrity" with "architectural and historical significance and physical integrity." | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 6.  | 35  | HPP    | 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph - Change to "Village at Shirlington" instead of "Village of Shirlington."   | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 7.  | 35  | HPP    | Bottom of left side of page – For the :... – suggest just using the :   | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 8.  | 35  | HPP    | Bottom of right side of page - Fix spacing of bullets in right column.  | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 9.  | 36  | HPP    | Bullet 4 – Delete the sentence "This approach reduces the carbon footprint of a building." because the last sentence in this bullet already says that statement.  | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 10. | 36  | HPP    | Bullet 6 – Edit the last sentence.  | Staff concurs. |                          | An easement <u>qualifies</u> as a charitable contribution for federal income and estate tax <u>purposes</u> .   |
| 11. | 36  | HPP    | Bullet 7 – Delete the word "ethnic." It should just be restaurants.   | Staff concurs. |                          |   |
| 12. | 38  | HPP    | Edit the first sentence.  | Staff concurs. |                          | Exterior changes to existing buildings are expected to continue <u>in order for the Village</u> to retain its economic vitality and competitive edge <u>with other</u> nearby commercial areas. |
| 13. | 38  | HPP    | Edit the last sentence.   | Staff concurs. |                          | The end of the sentence should read "will continue to enhance the Village at Shirlington's identity."   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE                | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable)   | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|-----|-----|-----------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| 14. | 42  | Public Comment        | With the parking...I again wonder about not including something about the garage being private. A lot of people think the garages are publicly-owned.  | Staff concurs. | There are five parking garages and one large surface parking lot in the Village which offer approximately 3,023 spaces. On-street parking spaces, of which there are approximately 137, are highly sought after particularly with the number of restaurants and shops in the area, leading to a perception that there is a need for additional parking. This study, which also looked at utilization rates, revealed, however, that there is an adequate supply of parking spaces in the Village. There is a significant supply of off-street parking spaces and each of the parking facilities reaches its peak at different days and times with varying degrees of occupancy. The, in some cases confusing and overly complex, parking restrictions by use and time of day in garages, if addressed, could allow for even greater off-street parking capacity. Better signage and wayfinding alone, not to mention in concert with real-time parking technology, could also greatly improve parking ease and efficiency throughout the Village at Shirlington. | There are five independently parking garages and one large surface parking lot in the Village which offer approximately 3,023 spaces. While most are for the private use of building users, some are available to the public, especially after 5PM. On-street parking spaces, of which there are approximately 137, are highly sought after particularly with the number of restaurants and shops in the area, leading to a perception that there is a need for additional parking. This study, which also looked at utilization rates, revealed, however, that there is an adequate supply of private parking spaces in the Village. There is a significant supply of privately owned off- street parking spaces and each of the parking facilities reaches its peak on different days and times with varying degrees of occupancy. If better coordinated, the oftentimes confusing and overly complex parking restrictions could allow for even greater off-street parking capacity. Better signage and wayfinding alone, not to mention in concert with real-time parking technology, could also greatly improve parking ease and efficiency throughout the Village at Shirlington. |
| 15. | 49  | Green Valley Resident | Map of susceptibility-to-change is interesting and should remain.  | Staff concurs. |  |  |
| 16. | 53  | Public Comment        | I am not sure the (over) use of the word historic is really descriptive enough and could it be using legacy, original, etc. in place might be helpful. And help to better convey the stated desire of keeping the "feel" of Shirlington. | Staff concurs. | "Should preservation of the retail core of Campbell Avenue, which has historic buildings, a strong sense of place and a human scale, extend to the full buildings, the frontages or the facades?"  | "Should preservation of the retail core of Campbell Avenue, which has legacy buildings, a strong sense of place and a human scale, extend to the full buildings, the frontages or the facades?"  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG.   | SOURCE                | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|---|-------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| CHAPTER FIVE: VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES (55-76) |       |                       |   |                                     |                          |  |
| 1.  | 65    | FRIT                  | On page 65 the Plan references the Green Valley neighborhood in Guiding Principle #7. While we value the Green Valley Civic Association's perspective and those thoughts should be included in the Plan, the document sparsely references the values or priorities of the Shirlington Civic Association, the most affected civic association by the Plan. We request that staff clarify the views of the most affected civic association included in this planning process with the reference to the Green Valley neighborhood in this Guiding Principle. | Staff does not concur.              |                          | The Shirlington Civic Association is noted throughout the document and appendices. This principle is directed to those users on the opposite side of Arlington Mill Dr., which is in the Green Valley Civic Association, who are most impacted by the design of the facades facing Arlington Mill Dr.. |
| 2.  | 59    | Green Valley Resident | Substitute "neighborhood center offering a wide range of options" for "diverse."  | Staff concurs.                      |                          |  |
| 3.  | 63-74 | Green Valley Resident | The mix of photographs - some from Shirlington and some from other places - is deceptive. Please include language describing the mix (along the lines of, "The following set of photographs display sites from Shirlington as well as aspirational examples from other locations.")   | Comment noted.                      |                          | This will be added as a footnote.  |
| 4.  | 65    | Green Valley Resident | #6 - Higher building heights are more appropriate along the periphery of the Village of Shirlington <u>parallel to the interstate.</u>  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID | PG.   | SOURCE | COMMENT   | STAFF RESPONSE                      | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)  |
|----|-------|--------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 5. | 63/64 | WETA   | WETA is also pleased that the Plan's Guiding Principles 1 – 4 emphasize that a mix of uses are necessary for the Village's viability, particularly as an employment center and an arts and cultural center. WETA would encourage the Board to place additional emphasis in the Plan on maintaining Shirlington's arts and cultural assets into the future.  | Comment noted.                      |                          | Guiding Principle #2 mentions the retention of arts and cultural assets. Since the Guiding Principles were already reviewed by the applicants, the LRPC, and other stakeholders, changes to the wording may be problematic at this juncture. |
| 6. |       | SCA    | In our view, staff has done a good job in the Vision and Principles section describing and protecting the authentic character the Village at Shirlington. They have protected it for the foreseeable future, and we thank them sincerely for the care they have taken.  | Comment noted.                      |                          |  |
| 7. | 71/72 | UFC    | Sustainability and Biophilia: While we support inclusion of recommendations 17, 18 and 19, rather than being a subset of recommendations, we recommend that these concepts are more broadly integrated into all elements of the planning. These principles represent a design opportunity to shape our community in a manner that supports livable and sustainable development. The Covid-19 experience has magnified the need for regular and easy access to natural environments for everyone in our community. We have a unique opportunity to include nature-human connections and the natural environment as this area is redeveloped, and that should be identified as a high priority. | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |                          | Where possible, biophilia is encouraged and noted specifically or indirectly by incorporation the principles of biophilia on p. 81, 84, 89, 90, 94 and 101.  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| <b>ID</b> | <b>PG.</b> | <b>SOURCE</b>  | <b>COMMENT</b>   | <b>STAFF RESPONSE</b>               | <b>OLD TEXT (if applicable)</b>   | <b>EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)</b>   |
|-----------|------------|----------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 8.        | 73         | Public Comment | 21 – Maintain (not provide) the tangible connection to Shirlington’s past and provide a bridge to the future...<br><br>22 – Recognize, support, <i>and provide opportunities for additional</i> third spaces | Staff concurs.                      | Provide a tangible connection...<br><br>Recognize and support the preservation of “Third Places.” These can be civic, cultural, arts and institutional uses, local businesses and outdoor spaces. | Maintain a tangible connection...<br><br>Recognize and support existing “Third Places” and provide opportunities for additional locations. |
| 9.        | 66         | PC Members     | Some PC members requested that clarity be added to the characterization of LRPC versus community support for historic preservation. Other PC members said that staff had characterized this accurately.      | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |   |  |
| 10.       | 65         | CPHD           | Replace photo associated with Principle 6.   | Staff concurs.                      |   | Substitute a similar photo for the current photo.  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| ID  | PG. | SOURCE    | COMMENT  | STAFF RESPONSE | OLD TEXT (if applicable) | EXPANDED STAFF RESPONSE or NEW TEXT (if applicable)   |
|---|-----|-----------|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| <b>CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS (PAGE 77-112)</b> |     |           |  |                |                          |   |
| 1.  | 95  | PC Motion | ...move that the Planning Commission recommend to the County Board to direct staff to amend the <i>Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan</i> to articulate design guidelines to specifically require welcoming entrances to buildings along the periphery including stepbacks and tapering to avoid creation of the appearance of a walled Village. | Staff concurs. |                          | <p>General Design Guidance to be applied to redevelopment at all edges of the Village:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Building heights should vary along the periphery of the Village to add interest to the skyline.</li> <li>2) Building heights along the periphery shall taper in height generally following a concave shape with the lower heights midpoint where the gateway entrances to the Village are located.</li> <li>3) Buildings should stepback from all street frontages where possible as referenced on the heights map, including private shared streets.</li> <li>4) Building facades should be composed of a distinctive base, middle and top.</li> <li>5) First floor facades should be articulated to enliven the street and enhance the pedestrian experience on all sides, particularly at the building entrances.</li> <li>6) Street level residential should feature individual entrances and building articulation to animate the façade and add interest to the streetscape.</li> <li>7) Street level commercial should feature a minimum 50% window transparency, frequent and welcoming pedestrian entrances with canopies or awnings and/or signage that varies with the commercial use.</li> <li>8) Street level above grade garages should feature green walls or active uses following guidelines above.</li> <li>9) Where balconies are provided, they should be designed as an integral component of the façade.</li> <li>10) Heights shown on heights map are measured to the cornice of the uppermost recommended floor and do not include mechanical screen and elevator overruns as defined in the Zoning Ordinance at the time of a future site plan approval.</li> </ol> |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|    |    |     |   |                |  |   |
|----|----|-----|---|----------------|--|---|
| 2. | 94 | DES | Add text regarding a potential future reduction in parking requirements.  | Staff concurs. |  | Add text: "A potential parking reduction could be considered subject to further analysis and staff resources."  |
| 3. | 79 | UFC | Historic Preservation: Mature trees should be included as an element of the historic preservation discussion. Tree lined streets provide the basis for a pedestrian friendly environment and that should be more clearly identified as a priority in the historic analysis. Likewise, mature trees greatly contribute to a sense of place, and that connection should be more clearly identified. | Staff concurs. |  | Staff will add language referring to the tree-lined streets as an important component of the pedestrian-friendly environment in the historic preservation section on p. 79. Staff will also add language to this section about mature trees contributing to the sense of place. |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|    |    |   |   |                |  |  |
|----|----|---|---|----------------|--|--|
| 4. | 79 | Public Comment  | <p>Do we want to call it historic preservation or Preservation of Place?</p> <p>Is there a bullet or phrase that could be inserted into page 79 that segues to Sustainability – because preserving buildings and adapting their elements makes them sustainable? It all works together.</p> | Staff concurs. | <p><b>Historic Preservation</b> current subtitle</p> <p>It is important, therefore, not only to address the density, height, setback and setbacks of buildings throughout the Village in order to preserve the area’s sense of place, but also to preserve the historic buildings themselves.</p> <p>Any construction work in this area should be carefully done to ensure that the root structures of these trees are not adversely impacted.</p> | <p><b>Preservation of Place</b> new subtitle</p> <p>It is important, therefore, not only to address the density, height, setback and setbacks of buildings throughout the Village in order to preserve the area’s sense of place, but also to preserve the historic frontages themselves.</p> <p>Tree-lined streets, particularly those with large mature trees such as on Campbell Avenue, provide the basis for a pedestrian friendly environment and strong sense of place.</p> <p>Preservation of existing healthy trees should remain a high priority, especially noting the importance of proper care in any repairs of the brick walkway to ensure that tree roots are not damaged. Any construction work in this area should be carefully done to ensure that the root structures of these trees are not adversely impacted.</p> <p>Further, the preservation of these trees and the adaptive reuse of these buildings and facades furthers the County’s goal of sustainability as described in the next section of this document.</p> |
| 5. | 78 | Green Valley Resident                                     | Please show a reference to "Note 6."  | Staff concurs. |  | Staff will update the map.   |
| 6. | 79 | CPHD, Green Valley Resident Shirlington Civic Association | Note 29 date is wrong, 19/99/20.  | Staff concurs. |  | Change to Note 6 and update with ultimate adoption date.   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |       |                       |  |                |  |   |
|-----|-------|-----------------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| 7.  | 89    | Green Valley Resident | Please identify the photograph location (Madison Square, NYC).   | Staff concurs. | “Public spaces designed to be adaptable and activated for children become a magnet for all ages and serve as engagement points in the community.”  | “Public spaces designed to be adaptable and activated for children, such as this example in Madison Square Park in New York City, become a magnet for all ages and serve as engagement points in the community.”  |
| 8.  | 93    | Public Comment        | I would suggest using the graphic from the Retail Action Plan might send some mixed messages about design desired in Shirlington. While it is a line drawing, it is stark, and we do see some retail built out looking like the drawing and that’s not the design feel for Shirlington.  | Staff concurs. |  | Remove graphic on p. 93 and replace with image of storefronts from Boulder, CO. Change caption to read, “Historic facades on Pearl Street in Boulder, CO have been adapted over time.”  |
| 9.  | 94    | Green Valley Resident | Above-Grade Garage Frontages Section - Take the first sentence of the second paragraph (“The examples shown...”) and attach it instead to the end of the first paragraph. The second paragraph would then read, “On edges such as...” Since garages are not encouraged along Arlington Mill Dr. anyway, this would provide a separation. | Staff concurs. | “As these garages are improved or replaced, the frontages map indicates where those areas where attractive design and screening are most critical.<br><br>The examples shown demonstrate a few of the multitude of ways to screen above-grade parking. On edges such as along Arlington Mill Drive...” | “...those areas where attractive design and screening are most critical. The examples shown demonstrate a few of the multitude of ways to screen above-grade parking.<br><br>On edges such as along Arlington Mill Drive...”  |
| 10. | 98    | Green Valley Resident | Quincy Street Potential Section - Please remove “greater sense of enclosure” and add, “... and draw focus to the heart...”   | Staff concurs. | “... the WETA garage has the potential to become a site for active ground floor uses, above-grade parking and an office or residential tower, once again providing some visual and auditory screening from Interstate 395 and creating a greater sense of enclosure within the heart of the Village.”  | “... the WETA garage has the potential to become a site for active ground floor uses, above-grade parking and an office or residential tower, once again providing some visual and auditory screening from Interstate395 and draw focus to the heart of the Village.” |
| 11. | 77/95 | WETA                  | The Plan’s guidance for future development up to 2.5 FAR is in line with WETA’s current proposal. Moreover, the Plan’s call to develop the WETA garage at 12 stories and up to 2.5 FAR provides opportunities for reimagining WETA’s assets in a manner compatible with the future vision of the Village.                                | Comment noted. |  |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |     |   |                       |  |  |
|-----|----|-----|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| 12. | 83 | UFC | <p>Tree health and sustainability: The study in essence provides a case study of the importance of choosing appropriate tree species, adequate soil volume and tree care: mature trees are thriving in some areas, while trees in other areas with inadequate soil volume and soil compaction are suffering. Preservation of existing healthy trees should remain a high priority, especially noting the importance of proper care in any repairs of the brick walkway to ensure that tree roots are not damaged.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |  | <p>Add text to p. 79. "The decorative brick sidewalks throughout the Village at Shirlington add to the character of the streetscape, as well as support the healthy tree canopy found along the older part of Campbell Avenue and other areas of the Village. This type of early brick sidewalk construction (pre- 1990's) often does not utilize the same standard concrete base detail that is commonly used today. Many of these brick sidewalks employ a sand setting bed that allows for a certain amount of oxygen and water permeability to be accessible to the roots of mature street trees along Campbell Avenue, Arlington Mill Drive and other side streets. It can be a challenge to replace bricks and pavers of this era without damaging existing tree roots, but with care in construction and ISA-Certified arborist supervision, it can be accomplished."</p> |
|-----|----|-----|---|-----------------------|--|--|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |                               |  |                |  |  |
|-----|----|-------------------------------|--|----------------|--|--|
| 13. | 83 | UFC                           | <p>Tree Canopy: The preservation of existing mature trees was identified as a high priority during the community engagement process. The study notes that the existing tree canopy in the study area is 13%, which is below the target of 15% for central business districts, and well below the 25% target for urban residential, which is how this area is classified. Retention of the mature trees in the study area, especially those along Campbell Avenue, is critical as they provide the foundation for the existing tree canopy in the study area. While providing important aesthetic appeal, the existing mature trees also provide key ecosystem services such as absorbing storm water, cleaning the air, providing shade and reducing the heat island effect in an area with such extensive impermeable surfaces. The UFC strongly supports the recommendation that existing mature trees in the study area are retained, and that aggressive tree planting accompanies any redevelopment to increase the overall tree canopy in this area.</p> | Comment noted. |  | See language on retention and replacement in the recommendations on p. 83. |
| 14. | 87 | Shirlington Civic Association | <p>The improved access to parking garages described on p. 87 should be taken seriously and implemented with full County cooperation. This is the <u>biggest complaint</u> of our visitors, theatres, businesses and residents.</p>   | Comment noted. |  |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |                               |   |                        |  |   |
|-----|----|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---|
| 15. | 95 | Shirlington Civic Association | The heights of the two new residential buildings along South Arlington Mill Dr. (SAMD) to be proposed by the Applicant should be allowed to be comparable to nearby existing buildings on SAMD, with appropriate good design to be fully reviewed by the community in a future Site Plan. Setbacks will be needed to enhance a new <u>interior</u> plaza across from retail stores there. | Comment noted.         |  | <p>Proposed heights for the two new residential buildings along South Arlington Mill Dr. relate to the adjacent hotel on the west end and IO Piazza on the east end.</p> <p>The development area footprint is narrow. To accommodate a typical residential tower development, the footprint may limit the ability for significant lower level setbacks. Regardless, a stepback is strongly encouraged where the above-grade garage meets the residential tower above.</p> |
| 16. | 95 | Shirlington Civic Association | The height of the AMC cinema parcel should not be limited to 6 stories for the next 20 years. This could become a new arts or entertainment venue but to be commercially viable, it would need more office or residential on top.   | Staff does not concur. |  | <p>No design alternatives or economic pro forma have been presented by the applicants to make the argument for greater height.</p> <p>The 6-story height is compatible with the height of the other two buildings on the block which are 4 and 6 stories high and which are unlikely to redevelop.</p>  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |                                |   |                        |  |   |
|-----|----|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---|
| 17. | 95 | Douglas Park Civic Association | We are at a loss to understand staff's proposals regarding height limitations on both the AMC Theatre site and the surface parking lot along Arlington Mill Dr. The proposed limits are significantly lower than the heights of surrounding buildings and would have the effect of limiting the ability of profitable future redevelopment to occur and thus jeopardize the vitality of the Village at Shirlington in future years. The proposed limits should be abandoned in favor of general guidance that future building heights should conform to the general nature of the existing skyline with specifics to be determined through the site plan process on individual parcels as they are redeveloped. | Staff does not concur. |  | <p>The proposed heights on both AMC Theater and the surface parking lot are both higher than heights of directly adjacent buildings. No design alternatives or economic pro forma have been presented by the applicants to make the argument for greater height.</p> <p>Special GLUP Study Plus plans and other long-range plans consistently include height limitations. In addition, many in the broader community expressed concerns about additional height and density during the online survey, as have adjacent neighborhoods.</p> |
| 18. | 87 | Douglas Park Civic Association | It is our impression that the amount of parking in the Village is probably adequate, but appears to suffer from poor allocation. Many spots go unused for long periods because they are specifically reserved for the exclusive use of particular businesses. This leads to visitor frustration when convenient parking is not available, especially during daytime hours for restaurant lunch patronage and for short-turn spaces for visitors using such amenities as the Post Office and the UPS Store. We urge staff to conduct a full study of parking resources in the Village with a goal of improving ease, utilization, and turnover rate.   | Comment noted.         |  | The need for a parking study and better wayfinding is noted in Chapter 7: Implementation on p. 116.   |

**ATTACHMENT D**

**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |      |   |  |  |  |
|-----|----|------|---|--|--|--|
| 19. | 95 | FRIT | <p>1)The potential heights shown on page 95 of the concept plan are limiting and prevent the variety and viability of potential reinvestment in key areas of Shirlington.</p> <p>2)We are not proposing specific heights, but instead a range of heights to be evaluated at the PDSP and 4.1 Site Plan stage of public review.</p> <p>3)We believe the Plan should provide future applicants with an opportunity to submit project proposals that adhere to the Plan’s guiding principles, that are consistent with existing building heights, and adhere to C-O-2.5 Zoning District regulations.</p> <p>4)This desire has been consistently articulated by the community and the applicants throughout the process but has been ignored in this initial draft of the Plan.</p> <p>5)Staff’s proposal to arbitrarily limit future building heights well below the height of existing surrounding buildings defeats the purpose of a long-term GLUP study.</p> <p>6)Additionally, the Existing Building Heights graphic shown in the Plan provides building heights in terms of stories instead of actual height, which is misleading and suggests a building form that is less than what exists in Shirlington. The proposed building height standards should reflect the actual height of the structure, which can be clearly defined and measured and more appropriately applied to new building plans.</p> | <p>Comment noted, no changes proposed.</p> |  | <p>1)Height limitations are fundamental to maintaining the desired scale appropriate for a non-Metro served mixed-use commercial destination. Height is also the primary way to limit density in this area. Potential development projects should have densities that relate to the proposed “Medium” Office-Apartment-Hotel and C-O-2.5 designations, not FARs associated with “High” Office-Apartment-Hotel.</p> <p>2)Long range plans such as Special GLUP Studies typically include maximum heights that are used to guide subsequent site plan applications.</p> <p>3)The plan offers many creative and flexible ways to achieve good urban design and numerous development opportunities at the densities needed for a vibrant and successful district.</p> <p>4)Several members of the community have expressed opposition to this approach. See appendix for survey summary results and comments.</p> <p>5)There is currently zero available density in the Phased Development Site Plan for the Village at Shirlington. The proposed GLUP amendment would allow for significantly more density in this area. And, in all cases, proposed heights for new development are in excess of the immediately adjoining buildings, particularly those that are not anticipated to redevelop in the near term.</p> <p>6)Both stories and heights are shown in the legend and are assumed to be the top cornice line of any occupied and enclosed space and do not include additional height allowances for penthouse enclosures and elevator overruns.</p> |
|-----|----|------|---|--|--|--|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |                      |  |                                    |  |   |
|-----|----|----------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 20. | 95 | FRIT                 | 7)Finally, there is no clear connection between the building height restrictions proposed by staff and the twenty-two guiding principles detailed within the Plan. The purpose of the Plan should be to establish the guidelines and expectations for the review of future development submissions, not to arbitrarily prescribe exactly how future development must occur in Shirlington. | Comment noted, no change proposed. |  | 7)The Vision and Guiding Principles were supported by both applicants and were developed based on community feedback as noted on p. 58 and the Vision on p. 60, calling for compatible architecture. Principles 6, 7 and 20 speak directly to creating complementary new development through careful management of scale, design, transition and building height. Plan recommendations are derived from these principles. |
| 21. | 97 | Public Comment       | Include guidance making sure the buildings [on Arlington Mill Drive] have two active sides – the internal and external – to draw folks in from outside the neighborhood, but also tie in on the internal side.   | Staff concurs.                     | “... this cross section demonstrates a potential scenario with above-grade parking, a stepback from Arlington Mill Drive and residential uses up to 10 to 12 floors overlooking Shirlington Park and the Four Mile Run.” | “... this cross section demonstrates a potential scenario with above-grade parking, a stepback from Arlington Mill Drive and residential uses up to 10 to 12 floors overlooking Shirlington Park, the Four Mile Run to the north and to the south, the small plaza and shops behind Campbell Avenue. Active ground floor uses and high-quality architectural design are recommended.”                                     |
| 22. | 89 | Fairlington Resident | Appreciates the idea of including children’s needs in the design of spaces/activities.   | Staff concurs.                     |  | P. 89 recommends adding spaces for young people that should be designed flexibly for children’s activities.   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |  |            |   |  |  |  |
|-----|--|------------|---|--|--|--|
| 23. |  | PAC Member | <p>Minimum dimensions of existing and planned sidewalks: The dimensions of existing and proposed sidewalks need to include minimum widths for each sidewalk zone: clear zone for pedestrian use only, landscaping utility zone, and shy/cafe zone. Each zone needs to be defined in the document and needs their minimum widths specified - for all future projects, as well as for any renovations. We have learned during Covid-time that adequate sidewalk clear zone width is essential to our health and safety - and generous minimum clear zones should be specified in the report (minimum of 10' wide clear zone). Likewise, we have learned that healthy street trees need a much larger tree pit - include a minimum of 6' wide and 12' long/per tree. The report only states that some zones are inadequate or too narrow and that some sidewalks need to be wider.</p> | <p>Comment noted, no changes proposed.</p> |  | <p>These are useful suggestions, however specificity on existing and proposed sidewalks is beyond the scope of this GLUP Study. These and other streetscape items, such as tree pits and clear zones will be addressed during the PDSP update and any future site plans will need to adhere to the standards and policies in place at that time.</p> |
|-----|--|------------|---|--|--|--|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |     |            |  |                |   |   |
|-----|-----|------------|--|----------------|---|---|
| 24. | 102 | PAC Member | <p><i>Cafe Zone Creep and Cross:</i> The cafe zones for most of the restaurants on Campbell Avenue seem to have a severe case of cafe zone creep (into the clear zone), especially during Covid-time when outdoor dining and PUDO food delivery have been expanded. The restaurant cafe zones are also not uniformly aligned; some are next to the building and some are next to the street, so that pedestrians are constantly changing where they are walking. The sidewalk outside of Busboys and Poets was completely impassable today, with a planter placed across the small remaining bit of clear zone. Many restaurants on both sides of Campbell on the E-W stretch now have tables both next to the restaurant and next to the street, severely limiting pedestrian access along the much narrower clear zone. To prevent future cafe zone creep, the GLUP guidelines need to be clear that the total sidewalk space must be adequate for any future cafe zone without compromising the clear zone or landscaping zone. If you need a bigger cafe zone, then plan a bigger sidewalk to accommodate it. GLUP guidelines should also recommend uniform cafe zone locations so pedestrians can walk in straight lines. Meanwhile, since there is currently almost no room for pedestrians on the sidewalks along Campbell, let's make the street bike-ped only, with limited vehicular traffic for PUDO and emergencies. Fortunately, street parking has already been temporarily removed - let's make it permanent. There's plenty of parking nearby.</p> | Comment noted. | <p>"...bump-outs to provide additional café or retail space could be considered through a future study and/or process resulting in a PDSP amendment."</p> | <p>Add text: "Curb extensions to provide additional café or retail space could be considered through a future study and/or process resulting in a PDSP amendment. To prevent future cafe zone creep, the total sidewalk space should be adequate for any future cafe zone without compromising the clear zone or landscaping zone. In addition, uniform cafe zone locations are recommended so pedestrians can walk in straight lines."</p> |
|-----|-----|------------|--|----------------|---|---|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |            |  |                                     |   |   |
|-----|----|------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 25. |    | PAC Member | <i>Brick sidewalks on a sand base</i> (p. 39-40): Apparently these sidewalks are historic and somewhat healthier for the street trees because the sand is permeable. However, they are a challenge for pedestrians with mobility impairments and are a tripping hazard for everyone. They are also expensive to maintain and repair. Are they really the best option?                                  | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |   |   |
| 26. | 86 | PAC Member | <i>Passageways - existing</i> : Most of the existing passageways are useful and adequate. However, the passageway just south of Campbell suffers from cafe zone creep that severely narrows the clear zone passage; and the passageway north of Campbell, that connects to the parking lot/shopping to the north, has 22 steps and no obvious ADA-compliant alternative.                               | Staff concurs.                      | “The existing north-south passageways on both sides of Campbell Avenue should be preserved and improved when redevelopment occurs.” | Add text: “The existing north-south passageways on both sides of Campbell Avenue should be preserved and improved with better defined clear paths and universally accessible design when redevelopment occurs.” |
| 27. |    | PAC Member | <i>Passageways - planned</i> : These all sound like excellent ideas. We sorely need access from S. Quincy St. to S. Randolph St., as well as better access from the Trades Center to the heart of Shirlington and a much more direct route between the Trades Center and the Transit Center. The GLUP should include minimum specifications for passageways that match those for sidewalks in general. | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |   | Clear zones and universal design will be addressed during the update to the PDSP and any future site plans and will incorporate the standards and policies in place at that time.                               |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |           |            |  |                |  |   |
|-----|-----------|------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| 28. | 87 and 86 | PAC Member | <p><i>Missing sidewalks:</i> The GLUP report correctly identifies two critical missing links - one along Randolph and one behind the pedestrian bridge that goes over I-395. Both of these should be added quickly for pedestrian safety. Until a sidewalk is added, the pedestrian bridge should have a sign warning that the sidewalk does not continue. Several alleys also have missing sidewalks - and these should be added with the expansion of passageways.</p> | Staff concurs. | <p>P. 87 “The existing pedestrian bridge across Interstate 395 acts as a marker for the Village and is frequently used by residents of nearby Fairlington and beyond to access the Village of Shirlington. Owned and maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation, an extensive rehabilitation, including repainting, of this structure is needed. Additional lighting, and a potential extension northward toward Arlington Mill Drive to provide better connectivity to destinations such as Jennie Dean Park is recommended. Incorporating public art into the rehabilitation of this bridge is something that should also be considered.”</p> <p>P. 86 “While primarily service focused, this alley is frequently used by pedestrians and would benefit from better lighting, more attractive plantings and clear paths of travel.”</p> | <p>P. 87 “The existing pedestrian bridge across Interstate 395 acts as a marker for the Village and is frequently used by residents of nearby Fairlington and beyond to access the Village of Shirlington. Owned and maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation, an extensive rehabilitation, including repainting, of this structure is needed. In the meantime, a sign adjacent to the entrance/exit at Campbell Avenue is needed to advise bridge users the sidewalk does not continue northward toward IO Piazza.</p> <p>Additional lighting, and a ramp extension northward toward Arlington Mill Drive is recommended to provide better connectivity to destinations such as Jennie Dean Park. Incorporating public art into the rehabilitation of this bridge is something that should also be considered.”</p> <p>P. 86 “While primarily service focused, this alley is frequently used by pedestrians and would benefit from sidewalks on one side at a minimum, better lighting, more attractive plantings and clear paths of travel.”</p> |
|-----|-----------|------------|--|----------------|--|---|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |     |            |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 29. |     | PAC Member | <p><i>WETA Plans:</i> The GLUP report states: On South Quincy Street, the sidewalks are narrow in the vicinity of the WETA and FRIT garages. As redevelopment occurs, the building frontage should be moved back 3 to 5 feet to accommodate wider sidewalks, larger tree pits and allow for outdoor dining or displays (p. 102). I'm not aware that the WETA plans include moving back their frontage, but maybe I misunderstood what was said at the SPRC meeting. The County will be redesigning and implementing new streetscape for the Quincy/Campbell area, as noted in the Implementation Matrix. If the frontage is not being moved back, how will the much- needed wider sidewalk clear zones and tree pits be created?</p> | <p>Comment noted, no change proposed.</p>  |  | <p>WETA is not setting their proposed building back. The opportunity to achieve a setback only comes with the redevelopment of the WETA garage and the activation of the ground floor. Sidewalk width and tree pit size and location will be addressed during any capital improvements from the County and future site plans on S. Quincy St. and will incorporate standards and policies in place at that time.</p> |
| 30. | 102 | PAC Member | <p><i>Transit:</i> Pedestrian access to the <i>transit center</i> is grossly inadequate presently. As mentioned in the GLUP report, the intersection of S. Quincy St./S. 31<sup>st</sup> St./S. Randolph St. urgently needs to be redesigned, and probably signalized, to improve pedestrian safety and access. However, there is still no crosswalk that directly connects to the transit center from across the street. A safe pedestrian crossing needs to be added here, especially as the transit center expands.</p>   | <p>Comment noted, no changes proposed.</p> |  | <p>Need to consider signalization and sidewalk width are noted on p. 102. Potential for an additional mid-block crossing to the transit center will be addressed during any capital improvements from the County and future site plans on S. Quincy St. and will incorporate standards and policies in place at that time.</p>   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |  |            |   |                |  |   |
|-----|--|------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| 31. |  | PAC Member | <i>Missing bus shelter:</i> Metro bus stop 6001227, on the south side of Arlington Mill Dr., just east of S. Randolph St., has no shelter, even though it supports 5 different important Metro bus lines. Waiting for a bus at the location - the closest one to the Trades Center - is a desolate experience. Please add a bus shelter.  | Comment noted. |  | This comment will be shared with Arlington Transit. |
| 32. |  | PAC Member | <i>Pedestrian Bridge over I-395:</i> This bridge is a critical link in the bike-pedestrian network of both Alexandria and Arlington, but the bridge, as aptly described in the GLUP report, badly needs repairs and painting and better lighting and wayfinding. Again, the missing link of sidewalk needs to be added and extensions described in the report should be implemented as well.  | Comment noted. |  |   |
| 33. |  | PAC Member | <i>Crossing Shirlington Bridge on the Four Mile Run Trail:</i> The Four Mile Run Trail is an essential part of the bike-ped network, but crossing Shirlington Bridge at the trail feels very unsafe, as traffic does not yield. The County is making some improvements to the bridge, especially for north-south travelers, but making the east-west crossing safe and convenient still needs more work, yet it does not seem to be part of any current County plans. Sidewalks on the east side of the bridge would be terrific. | Comment noted. |  | This is outside the scope of this study.            |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |     |                               |  |                                     |  |   |
|-----|-----|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 34. | 102 | PAC Member                    | <i>Crossing Arlington Mill Drive</i> - All unsignalized pedestrian crossings feel unsafe because traffic does not yield and sight lines are often bad because the street has curves. Pedestrian crossings need to be made more safe - and details should be specified in the GLUP.   | Comment noted.                      |  | Add additional bullet recommending improved pedestrian connections across Arlington Mill Dr. This can also be addressed during the PDSP update and site plan review for proposed infill development on the surface parking lot and driveway connection to Arlington Mill Dr..   |
| 35. | 102 | Public Comment                | Given our current situation, I think it is prudent to look at our streets adjacent to retail to figure out how outdoor retail "space" could be initiated when needed. I think Campbell Ave., as it is now, could lend itself to being closed entirely to help peds and retail. It would put more burden on cross streets but its removal from the car grid would work. I think that's the case. So maybe that's something to note. Maybe not.  | Staff concurs.                      | "Staff's urban design analysis identified several potential improvements, primarily to support pedestrian movement." | "Staff's urban design analysis identified several potential improvements, primarily to support pedestrian movement. Consideration should also be given to flexible street design that allows the expansion of outdoor uses such as dining and pop-up retail whereby sections of the streets are closed to vehicular traffic." |
| 36. | 101 | Shirlington Civic Association | A variety of sidewalk treatments should be permitted, to meet ADA needs, an aging population, and cleanliness, as well as to reduce maintenance costs.   | Comment noted.                      |  | All sidewalk improvements will be reviewed based on conformity to adopted local, state and federal standards where applicable. See also the response to comment 12 in this section.   |
| 37. |     | PAC Member                    | <i>31st Street South</i> - Sidewalks are way too narrow and in poor shape - all the way from S. Randolph St. to Fairlington. The medians and curb cuts for the garage driveways for the Shirlington House complex on the north side of S. 31st St. are dangerous for pedestrians, forcing us into the street. The medians should have cut throughs to allow wheelchair users to roll through safely and easily. The bridge over I-395 on S. Abingdon St. should have the parking removed and replaced by bike lanes and wider sidewalks. | Comment noted, no changes proposed. |  | These are useful suggestions; however, they pertain to an area outside of the study area.   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |     |                       |   |                |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| 38. | 116 | Green Valley Resident | P. 116 - Jennie Dean Park will not be completed in 2020.  | Staff concurs. |  | Staff will update the plan to show the new completion date in the second half of 2021. |
| 39. | 79  | HPP                   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence - Streets should be lowercase since including more than one street name.  | Staff concurs. |  |  |
| 40. | 79  | HPP                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence - The “s” in TDRs redundant, delete the “s.”  | Staff concurs. |  |  |
| 41. | 79  | HPP                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentences - Should both places say frontages plural? We use plural in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> column on this page.   | Staff concurs. |  |  |
| 42. | 79  | HPP                   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence - Sentence starting “Stepping Back...” Stepping back from the preserved frontages, new construction could be incorporated up to the height limits outlined in this document with review of proposals by the HALRB.”   | Staff concurs. |  |  |
| 43. | 79  | HPP                   | 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> two sentences - Remove one of the “in terms of” phrasing because it is redundant. Instead, rephrase the sentence like this “The frontages are the most critical elements to what can and cannot be done with these Important resources.” And start the next sentence with “Their significant character-defining features (i.e., scalloped cornices...” | Staff concurs. |  |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |     |     |  |                |  |   |
|-----|-----|-----|--|----------------|--|---|
| 44. | 79  | HPP | Paragraph 4, 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> sentences: This should be replaced with revised language.   | Staff concurs. |  | “Changes to the storefronts, signage, and canopies should continue to be creative and interesting with the guidance of design principles, or an update to the <i>Shirlington Design Book</i> (2000). Such design principles could identify objectives and design standards important to the Village and its overall vision, and should be considered in future phases of this Study. Interior alterations would be permitted that do not negatively impact the frontages, thereby allowing owners great flexibility on the use and appearance of their spaces. Another comprehensive revitalization tool that the Village of Shirlington should consider is the national Main Street America program. The program strives to strengthen the economic potential, appearance, and image of traditional main streets like the Village of Shirlington.” |
| 45. | 79  | HPP | 5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph for 20’ reference - Insert “of frontages” so it should read “Preserving at least the first 20’ of these buildings’ frontages is not only important...” | Staff concurs. |  |   |
| 46. | 79  | HPP | Top Right photo - Scale spelled incorrectly; identify Lyon Hall as a Local Historic District.  | Staff concurs. |  |   |
| 47. | 79  | HPP | Bottom Left photo - Capitalize Village to be consistent; adaptable is misspelled.  | Staff concurs. |  |   |
| 48. | 111 | HPP | Lowercase main street.   | Staff concurs. |  |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |                 |  |                |  |   |
|-----|----|-----------------|--|----------------|--|---|
| 49. | 83 | FRIT, CPHD, DES | Increase clarity in affordable housing and LEED discussions. | Staff concurs. |  | <p>Add this text: “In order to access the proposed density of “Medium” Office-Apartment-Hotel, developers will need to address the County’s affordable housing and sustainable design building standards in a manner consistent with adopted plans and policies. Consistent with the Affordable Housing Master Plan and the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance, site plan applications that include an application to change the GLUP designation to achieve the recommendations of this study would be subject to an affordable housing commitment in addition to the base site plan affordability requirement of the Arlington County Zoning Ordinance. At a minimum, this should be achieved through a contribution of on-site committed affordable housing units (for residential or housing related projects) or by a contribution to the County’s Affordable Housing Investment Fund (for commercial or hotel projects) which will be calculated as a percentage of the difference between the maximum density that could be achieved under the existing GLUP designation and the individual project’s proposed density under the new GLUP designation.</p> <p>With regards to sustainability, individual projects should incorporate overall sustainability by achieving sustainable design standards consistent with the goals of the Community Energy Plan and to meet the then-applicable minimum standards specified in the Green Building Density Incentive Policy (or equivalent County policy).”</p> |
|-----|----|-----------------|--|----------------|--|---|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |    |     |  |  |  |   |
|-----|----|-----|--|--|--|---|
| 50. | 81 | DES | Add text clarifying the LEED expectations. |  |  | Add this text:<br>“Projects should incorporate overall sustainability by achieving sustainable design standards consistent with the goals of the Community Energy Plan and to meet the then-applicable minimum standards specified in the current Green Building Density Incentive Policy (or equivalent County policy).” |
|-----|----|-----|--|--|--|---|

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |  |                               |   |                                     |  |   |
|-----|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 51. |  | Fairlington Civic Association | <p>1)We recognize that additional density is an economic imperative to maintain a vibrant and competitive Shirlington... The question is what is the right balance of height and density to produce the investment that will enable Shirlington to remain vibrant without seriously damaging that which gives Shirlington its special character and makes it commercially attractive. We believe the recommendations proposed in the GLUP study effectively achieve a good balance.</p> <p>2)The historic character of Campbell Avenue is critical to the continued vibrancy of Shirlington...</p> <p>3)It is critical that Shirlington be seen as a warm and inviting community, one that reaches out to its neighbors and draws them in to shop and visit...We encourage you to support these height limitations.</p> <p>4)It is important not to look at Shirlington in a vacuum...Not considering the cumulative, interrelated effects of these developments concerns us.</p> <p>5)We encourage you to take a serious look at interconnected traffic and transit impacts – not just in Shirlington itself but in the surrounding neighborhoods...</p> | Staff concurs, no changes proposed. |  | Staff concurs with comments 1-3. Additional transportation analysis is outside the scope of this study. |
| 52. |  | TC Member                     | More detailed information on non-motorized modes of transportation is needed.   | Comment noted.                      |  |   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

|     |         |                  |   |                |  |  |
|-----|---------|------------------|---|----------------|--|--|
| 53. | 88      | AED - Public Art | Change the image of the public art sheep to another image on p. 88 to better capture public art as part of a gateway. | Staff concurs. |  | Insert this image:<br><b>Mountain Pass Pedestrian Bridge</b><br>1997, Phoenix, AZ<br>Laurie Lundquist<br>Sponsored by the City of Phoenix and Arizona Department of Transportation   |
| 54. | 104-110 | CPHD             | Add different views from the 3-D model.   | Staff concurs. |  | 6-58 no change<br>6-59 use image and caption from 6-64<br>6-60 change to: view 04_staff new caption<br>6-61: shadows no change<br>6-62: change to view06_staff new caption<br>6-63: change to view05_staff new caption<br>6-64: change to view03_staff new caption |
| 55. | 108     | CPHD             | Add different views from the 3-D model.   | Staff concurs. |  | Change top left to view02_staff.<br>Change top right view07_staff.<br>No change to bottom left or bottom right images.   |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| CHAPTER SEVEN: IMPLEMENTATION (PAGE 113-115) |  |                       |   |                |  |   |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|----------------|--|---|
| 1.   |  | Fairlington Resident  | Would like to see improvements made to the pedestrian bridge over I-395. Likes staff's proposal to connect it to Arlington Mill Dr..                      | Comment noted. |  |   |
| 2.   |  | Green Valley Resident | Would like to see work safety enhancements on the Shirlington Bridge for pedestrians and bicyclists and better connections to the Village at Shirlington. | Staff concurs. |  | Funding for a pedestrian/bicycle-only bridge parallel to the Shirlington Bridge has already been allocated. |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**

| CHAPTER EIGHT: APPENDICIES (PAGE 116) |  |      |   |                |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|------|---|----------------|--|
| 1.                                    |  | CPHD | Add summary of online survey results on the draft Study Document. | Staff concurs. |  |

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**Comment/Revision Matrix (as of 7/13/20) for Shirlington Special GLUP Study Plus and Concept Plan**