

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee
April 11, 2019

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting location: Langston Brown Community Center
2121 N Culpeper St.
Arlington, VA 22207

1. Roll Call and Brief Neighborhood Report
 - a. Alyssa Cannon (Clarendon-Courthouse) announced their CA will have a shredding event on May 4th from 9 am to 12 pm.
 - b. Thora Colot (Lyon Park) announced their CA has completed and submitted its new NC Plan, and is preparing to celebrate their civic association's Centennial anniversary.
2. Approval of Minutes from March 14, 2019 NCAC Meeting:
 - a. The Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Officers and Staff Report
 - a. The NC Spring Funding Session will be held at the June NCAC meeting. In preparation, the Points Committee will meet at the end of May. May 15th is the deadline for submitting new or reaffirming first and second priority projects.
 - b. Tim McIntosh informed the group that the County's Streetlight study and Master Plan is now complete. It has not been determined how or when proposed NC street light projects will be affected.
4. Discussion / Action Items:
 - a. Update on the NC Program Review (NCPR) with the Co-Chairs, Anthony Fusarelli (Asst. to the Director of CPHD) and Hans Bauman (Waycroft-Woodlawn NCAC Rep. and former NCAC Chair)

The NCPR working group is being formulated now. A web page has been created for this effort, at: <https://projects.arlingtonva.us/neighborhood-conservation/nc-plan-program/neighborhood-conservation-program-review/>
The first meeting of the group will be held in May, posted on the web page.

Questions/Comments:
 - i. Ken Matzkin stated that he believes Arlington County has a serious problem with public relations. He noted there are many valuable programs in the County, including the Neighborhood Conservation Program, and there does not seem to be a system to publicize them. He hopes the NCPR will explore this and make recommendations to

address it. He gave example of his involvement with a Community Development Blocks Grant that gives large amounts of money to worthy projects, but he doesn't believe most people in the County are aware of it. Needs to be addressed on a County level, not just for NC.

- ii. A question was asked if the working group will be looking at Neighborhood Complete Streets (NCS) program.

Anthony replied that other infrastructure programs including NCS will be looked at.

- iii. Brent Buriss noted that currently when civic associations want sidewalk projects they are deflected to the NC Program.

Hans confirmed this is the standard practice right now.

Brent noted there is a perception in the community that NC project funding goes primarily to engaged neighborhoods, and asked if this will be addressed through the NCPR.

Hans agreed this is an important question and there are rumors about it out there. He noted that currently the program rewards neighborhoods that have civic engagement.

Brent asked if it is possible to have flexibility to ramp up or down the program.

Hans replied that to date, stable funding had been pushed for by the NCAC. It also provides for stability within the program and its staff.

Brent asked about some of the costs included in a NC project that make a project very expensive.

Hans stated it is a hard balancing act when infrastructure needs to be included and determining who should bear the cost.

- iv. Bill Braswell observed that the new Reed elementary school in Westover will need new sidewalks and crosswalks to improve the surrounding walk zones. He asked how better coordination can be achieved with the use of NC bond funds. He is also interested in how to better coordinate with other programs and how to improve the meaningfulness of the NC Program.

- v. Deborah Wood asked if the NC Plans will be looked at, along with their strengths and weaknesses.

Anthony replied yes. The plans are not the primary focus of the working group, but there is flexibility to increase focus if needed.

- vi. Eileen Janas believes there are two gaps of missing information on the NC Program website – the funding budget over the past decade and a list of the completed projects and their cost.

- vii. Jackie Wilson observed the word "Conservation" sounds like historic preservation, and asked whether it reflects the real identity of the program. Possibly a better name would be the "Neighborhood Improvement Program".

- viii. Thora Colot noted a positive side of active citizenship through the NCAC, is their coming up with projects which have to do with safety and safe walks for kids going to

school. She suggested the NCPR focus on empowering the NCAC and NCAC Representatives to reach other agencies to work to solve some of the problems within their neighborhood.

- ix. David Haring discussed frustration at how it can take a long time for a project to get through the NCAC process, and would like to see that get fixed. He also wondered how other jurisdictions handle this.
- x. Howard Solodky asked if the NCPR has a plan to communicate and educate the County Board (CB) and County Manager (CM) about the program.

Anthony responded that the NC Program review process will have built in points in which they brief the CB and CM.

Rob Swennes added that it would be useful to have a public relations person explain how the NC Program works to the public.

- b. Presentation on Accessory Dwelling Units by Joel Franklin (Associate Planner, Housing Division) and Timothy Murphy (Associate Planner, Comprehensive Planning)

The results of a zoning study which examined side and rear setback options for new, detached accessory dwellings was presented to the group.

Questions/Comments:

- i. Sarah McKinley asked if an existing shed can be converted to an accessory dwelling by building a loft and raising the roof up without changing the shed's footprint.
Joel replied no, as that would be considered "new construction".
- ii. Emily Pfister suggested the Housing Division revisit allowing a home to be divided into more than one, as that would be easier and more cost effective than what they are trying to do with accessory dwellings.
- iii. Bill Braswell asked if we are behind other jurisdictions with accessory dwelling units and other housing solutions.
- iv. Brent Buriss observed that accessory dwellings work for large lots but do not help the majority of Arlington homes as their lots are too small.
Joel noted that this does not solve all issues but is another tool that can be used.
- v. Joel let the group know that the draft standard for Accessory Dwelling Regulations will be presented to the CB on May 18th for final consideration and action.

5. Other/New Business:

None.

6. Meeting adjourned.