

Comment Response Matrix

Little City Commons Special Exception Entitlement

SEE Resubmission Date: June 3, 2019

Comment Response Date: SESP First Submission, June 1, 2020

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
1 Staff	Total proposed Gross Floor Area (GFA) for both phases of development is approximately 1,482,000 square feet based on the Phasing and Program Summary chart in the SEE booklet. The resulting Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 3.6 based on the estimated acreage of the overall commercial development, which is within the FAR discussed in the Special Revitalization District for Education and Economic Development	Acknowledged
2 Staff	Based on the latest SEE submission, a fiscal impact analysis was conducted by staff. The preliminary annual net fiscal impact projections are \$5,101,955 for Phase 1 and \$1,839,466 for Phase 2.	Acknowledged
3 Staff	Additionally, the proposed uses will continue to be evaluated as part of SESP, based on the primary and secondary criteria for Special Exceptions, to determine if significant commercial (retail, office or hotel) uses are included in the project and where the residential uses contribute significant positive net revenue benefits, build community, and help achieve the goals and strategies of the "Special Revitalization District for Education and Economic Development" and related plans and policies. [Sec. 48-488(b)(1)b.] Please provide an updated Fiscal Impact Analysis Data Sheet with your site plan submission;	An updated fiscal impact analysis data sheet has been provided with this first SESP submission.
4 Staff	The proposed retail at the corner of Haycock Road and Street A, as well as the relocation of grocery store to the corner of Haycock Road and Rt. 7, are improvements with the latest submission, and offer commercial activity along Haycock. Continue to explore ground floor design elements, as part of SESP, along Rt., Haycock Road and Street A to further activate the streetscape along the perimeter of the project. This will help activate the site to the east and potentially provide a retail connection to the adjacent commercial development, as well as, attract pedestrians/drivers along Haycock and in adjacent property.	Applicant is sensitive to the City's concerns and will ensure that street frontages are active and will continue to pursue design elements that activate the streetscapes to the extent feasible. A potential daycare use located at the intersection of Haycock and the former Street A has been included in the SESP design of Block A, which will help activate the frontage. The grocery's main entrance remains at the intersection of Route 7 and Haycock, as proposed in the SEE. Finally, the retail spaces along Route 7 will further activate those frontages as desired by the City.
5 Staff	Phasing Plan and Program Summary: Please continue to update and reconcile with the latest Voluntary Concessions during SESP.	The Phasing Plan and Program Summary has been updated with the SESP submission.
6 Staff	The building massing and height adjacent to the school plaza has improved. The hotel is moved to the north half of Block B and the micro-unit apartment building would be located on Block C. The revised plans would provide an alternate layout that these two uses could switch locations. In either case, the building massing is proposed to shift height away from the school plaza and placed mostly along Commons Drive.	Acknowledged
7 Staff	Continue to coordinate with the Schools for the most appropriate design/transition along the perimeter of the project adjacent to school. At SESP, explore architectural elements that offer visual reliefs and breaks along these elevations.	Please see SESP submission for latest design proposals for the uses along the school property line.
8 Staff	Comment Response Matrix: Responses to comments regarding design integration of community heritage, history and cultures references the Placemaking and Amenity Plan. Please include more specific information and examples in future submission during the SESP for review.	Applicant met with members of the arts and historical commissions to discuss a variety of Falls Church references that could be incorporated into the placemaking design. See Placemaking and Amenity Plan for details regarding how we are anticipating incorporating such elements into the design. Applicant anticipates furthering this discussion with staff and the community throughout the SESP review process.
9 Staff	All applicable pages/sheets: Campus site layout and the WFC layout plans do not seem to align, particularly where the two plans meet at Street B. Once coordination and design efforts with the schools are complete, future submissions should reflect final design.	SESP plans and Campus site layout have been coordinated and revised since the SEE approval. See SESP submission.
10 Staff	Mustang Alley Street Sections: The sidewalk on south side of Mustang Alley is 8 feet wide in three details on this page and 9'-6" on one detail. Please clarify this sidewalk width for proposed and alternate schemes.	Mustang Alley Street Section details have been revised and updated per the SEE Amendment sheets and clarified in the SESP submission. See Civil SESP plans and SEE Amendment.
11 Staff	Block C Ground Floor Use: The ground floor space is shown in red/retail on Page 6 of the SEE booklet, but the same space appears in a light blue shade in the Massing Diagram on Pages 12 and 14.	Ground floor plan has been revised. See SEE Amendment sheets.
12 Staff	Conceptual Landscape Masterplan: is not consistent with the Illustrative Site Plan sheets in terms of ground materials proposed along Street A.	The Illustrative Site Plan provided was for illustrative/diagrammatic purposes only. Please see landscape drawings in SESP submission for specifics details.
13 Staff	Café Zones Sheet: In the case where retail kiosks include food vendors, would areas identified as Potential Café Zone Locations along either side of Commons Drive be open to patrons of the kiosk? Are these open to general public, especially along Commons Drive?	We anticipate some Café Zones will be dedicated for the adjacent restaurants, while others may be open to anyone. This will be determined in the future as tenants are identified and certificates of occupancy are issued.

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
14 Staff	Café Zones Sheet: a mixture of Option A and B amenity/dining areas is proposed within the development. Adopting only one option may make the area look too formulaic. Improvements should alter the streetscape in such a permeant way that it will not constrict the usage of storefront space to future tenants.	The intent of the Café Zone sheet was to provide flexibility for both options and create opportunities for varied design across the site.
15 Staff	Retail along Rt.7/Haycock – retail orientation currently feels internally focused; should have retail entrances along perimeter to encourage adjacency to neighboring sites.	Please see retail plans for the latest designs, which we believe address this concern by creating new retail uses (daycare, civic space, etc.) along Rt. 7 and Haycock. We will continue to work with staff to address this comment through the SESP review process.
16 Staff	Pedestrian Connection between Mustang Ally and Street A adjacent to School Plaza: Coordinate with Schools and provide design that connects to/compliments the school plaza in terms of ground material/paving.	A coordinated design has been developed. See SESP Civil and Landscape drawings.
17 Staff	Mustang Alley/Commons Drive Intersection: Crosswalk is shown on one leg of Mustang Alley at the Commons intersection. An additional crosswalk on the opposite leg should be provided if feasible.	We can continue to discuss with staff - one has been provided due to grade issues until future VT development occurs.
18 Staff	Haycock/Rt.7 Corner: The building frontage along Haycock Road in Block A, adjacent to corner grocery entrance is shown as Residential Entrance and Amenities. Please provide details of what this space will entail at SESP. It is important to have pedestrian oriented programming/uses here to activate the street. See #17 below for related comment.	Details have been provided in the SESP submission.
19 Staff	Grocery Storefront: more active uses should be provided on the interior at the storefront to help activate the street. Additionally, if the grocery store has dining area, seating should be provided near the storefront where it can be visible from the street, and outdoor seating should also be explored	Details have been provided in the SESP submission.
20 Staff	Active Street Frontage: Applicant's response to several comments related to activating street frontages through retail uses and/or design elements along the external streets states "Applicant will ensure that street frontages are active and will pursue retail to the extent feasible..." Provide examples or potential methods on how this could be accomplished at SESP.	Please see retail plans for the latest designs, which we believe address this concern by creating new retail uses (daycare, civic space, etc.) along Rt. 7 and Haycock. We will continue to work with staff to address this comment through the SESP review process.
21 Staff	Gateway Design: The development site is identified as a City Gateway in the Comprehensive Plan. As such, building corners that are visible, particularly from Leesburg Pike and Haycock, should provide visual qualities consistent with that objective; creatively integrating urban plazas at these corners through a balanced composition of landscape, hardscape, seating and public art can also help define the corner more effectively.	Acknowledged.
22 Staff	The Corner of Leesburg Pike and Haycock: is a key corner to introduce and showcase development to the public. A raised corner, signage, architectural consideration, and landscaping would to make the space appear more engaging.	Acknowledged.
23 Staff	Garage Design: For any above grade parking garages proposed on site, continue to explore façade design that provides architectural and artistic screening as shown in examples provided in SEE booklet.	Garage façade designs are in progress - we will continue to discuss this with staff during the SESP process.
24 Staff	Trees: Consider possibility that tree groves could reflect a more natural planting of trees and vegetation. Could provide a visual and experiential relief from the highly organized and planned area.	Acknowledged.
25 Staff	Comprehensive Sign Package: this can be submitted at SESP as part of site plan, subject to review and approval by the Architectural Advisory Board. Any sign variances identified at that time will be subject to BZA approval.	A draft Comprehensive Signage Package has been provided with the SESP Submission.
26 Staff	Block B Loading: Loading bay runs the entire width of Block B along Alley 3, and appears to wrap around the corner at Leesburg Pike. Appropriate screening of this corner should be provided at SESP.	Acknowledged.
27 Staff	School Pick-pick/Drop-off Area: The Developer should continue coordination with the campus project team to determine the most efficient and appropriate layout/size for the proposed school drop-off area to maximize the Community Grove Plaza area. Additionally, potential traffic impacts should be studied further for mitigation measures.	Acknowledged.
28 Staff	Uber/Lift drop-off area: a location for drop-off should be considered and identified at site plan for staff review. If the school drop-off area also functions as general drop-off, management of conflicts during school drop-off hours should be discussed.	Loading/drop-off/pick-up locations have been contemplated as we furthered the site design for the SESP. We will continue to discuss with staff
29 Staff	Provide details and specifics for the bollard/system used to close streets. Additionally, what is the restriction system used for the area identified on Sheet C- 0404 for closure to vehicular access on Street B during school drop-off/pick up hours? How would buses need to access the road during restricted hours?	Details regarding bus circulation have been provided. See Civil Sheets. We will continue to discuss the bollard system used to close the streets during the SESP process.
30 Staff	Programming: As the design and space planning elements are finalized for the Commons area, discussions regarding the ability for CFC and FCCPS to use the area for special events should be included as a binding element or voluntary concession.	Acknowledged.

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
31 Staff	Comprehensive Plan and Urban Design Guidelines: Applicant should continue to utilize the Urban Design Guidelines by Rhodeside and Harwell as they develop their design and architecture in more detail during the SESP phase with a focus toward the following urban design elements and principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massing, building height variation, building façade and frontage design • Ground floor storefront design, glazing and programming • Treatment of building corners • Gateway features that offer a sense of arrival and express the special qualities of West Falls Church • Appropriate placement of service and loading access • Streetscape and public art • Signage, wayfinding and lighting 	Acknowledged.
32 Staff	Small Area Plan Planning Area 8 – Mobility & Accessibility: Continue to explore transportation strategies as they develop their TDM and further refine the project during SESP. The Nelson Nygaard Study offers several strategies for improving transit access and circulation within the site and surrounding areas that should be considered.	Acknowledged.
33 Transportation Planning	Providing shared use path along Mustang Alley: Plans provide the preferred option of a 12-foot shared use path (pedestrian and bicyclist) on the north side of Mustang Alley between the roadway and the Virginia Tech site. Staff supports the 12-foot shared use path option. This feature should be maintained.	Acknowledged
34 Transportation Planning	A crosswalk is shown on Leesburg Pike, adjacent to Chestnut Street. This crosswalk and other crosswalks shown should be maintained.	The design of the Route 7/Chestnut intersection is under discussion between CFC, Fairfax County, FCGP, and VDOT.
35 Transportation Planning	Space should be identified for a Capital Bikeshare station on the site. Staff recommends setting aside enough space for a 19 dock station to allow for future expansion. The length of a 19 dock station is 51.67 feet, and the width is 6.06 feet. The space set aside for a Bikeshare station should be a minimum of 55 feet in length and 10 feet in width, to accommodate access space and allow for adequate spacing between the Bikeshare station and other street furniture.	Bikeshare station location proposed and we will continue to discuss the size of the station provided with staff during the SESP process. See Civil/Landscape sheets.
36 Transportation Planning	Bicycle racks should be spaced according to the City's Bike Rack Spacing Standards. Bicycle racks provided should match with those recommended in the City's Streetscape Guidelines.	Acknowledged.
37 Transportation Planning	Please show locations of bike racks to be provided in the site plan submission.	Provided. See SESP landscape sheets.
38 Transportation Planning	TMP should follow the City's standard template, which includes (1) a preamble briefly explaining the benefits of TDM, (2) specific goals for the site (as specified in the Voluntary Concessions), and (3) a table summarizing techniques that will be used to achieve the site specific goals. For each group of site users (site-wide, residential, and office/retail/cinema) techniques should be broken down into four groups: (1) Site Design, Infrastructure and Options, (2) Promotion, Education, and, Incentives, (3) Monitoring and Enforcement, and (4) Adaptive Management.	Acknowledged.
39 Urban Forestry	The addition of alleys and a pedestrian cut-through are noted and appreciated.	No response needed.
40 Urban Forestry	Typical Street Sections (pp. 20-23): Street A at 40' or 50' wide both show a 5' wide tree planting strip, as does one side of Mustang Alley. Please note that a 6' strip, as in the City's Streetscape Guidelines, is minimal for shade trees. The narrower the planter, the greater the likelihood of pavement damage when trees mature.	Acknowledged.
41 Urban Forestry	The proposed planter widths greater than 6 feet along Route 7 and Haycock (p. 21), as well as planters holding multiple trees each, are noted and appreciated. We still have concerns about shade trees having limited branching area and possibly bending toward the street when planted 15 feet from tall walls.	Acknowledged.
42 Urban Forestry	Conceptual Landscape Master Plan (p. 28): Please try to plant along Alley 2 and Alley 3, as is shown along part of Alley 1	Acknowledged.
43 Urban Forestry	Canopy Cover sheet (p. 34): Applicants are seeking bonus canopy credits for native species and diversity, but those credits don't apply to commercial or mixed use projects where city code sets no canopy requirements. Though the credits may not apply, using native tree species and making sure that no one species makes up more than 25% of the trees are excellent strategies that will be well received. And any trees within private courtyards will also contribute to the canopy cover total.	Acknowledged.
44 Environmental Sustainability	I share the concerns previously raised by the Arborist and Urban Forester, and by the Environmental Sustainability Council (ESC), that stormwater management, green infrastructure and sustainable landscaping need to be incorporated in the site design from project inception. Addressing them after the general layout of the site has been established may significantly limit opportunities to build sustainability and resilience into the project.	SWM conceptual plans have been provided. See SESP civil sheets.
45 Environmental Sustainability	The minimization of heat island effects should be addressed in streetscape and building design, including paving and building materials selection.	Acknowledged.

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
46	Environmental Sustainability Renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic installations on roofs and awnings should be incorporated in the project. Has geothermal been considered for this site?	We explored a variety of renewable technologies as we developed the design of the site, including greywater reuse and geothermal energy, but they were determined to be not financially viable. We are considering solar PV use throughout the site and can provide more detail about what we determine will be feasible as we continue through the design review process.
47	Environmental Sustainability Electric and hybrid vehicle use in the City is already high, and is likely to increase in the future. The provision of a reasonable number of EV charging stations at build-out should be supplemented by provision of conduit to support widespread future installations.	Applicant has agreed to provide 10 EV charging stations, one publicly accessible fast-charge EV station, and conduit for an additional 30 EV stations to be installed in the project in the future.
48	Environmental Sustainability The proposed restriction of delivery/trash truck access hours to minimize interference with school traffic is a sensible precaution. Please also note the requirements of Section 14-51 of the City's Code of Ordinances regarding loading and unloading, refuse collection and vehicle idling.	Acknowledged.
49	Environmental Sustainability I fully endorse the recommendations of the ESC with regard to amending the Voluntary Concessions.	Acknowledged.
50	Fire Identify fire protection package: A clear definition of the intent of fire protection package shall be clearly stated. This shall include all typical components including, but not limited to, generator, fire alarm system, sprinkler and standpipe system. This should include the proposed level of protection for the parking garage.	Acknowledged.
51	Fire Location of Fire Department Connection (FDC): Shall be within 75 feet of the fire hydrant. Design planning shall accommodate that fire hose, when connected between the hydrant location and the FDC, remains unobstructed. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks or outdoor café shall obstruct this area. Fire hose when deployed from the FDC to the hydrant location shall not cross roadways, driveways to/from a parking garage, or egress/access points into or away from the structure. The proposed location of the FDC with the existing hydrant both located on the east side of the driveway is satisfactory, however this MUST be UNOBSTRUCTED. Identify all fire hydrants.	Acknowledged.
52	Fire Building Egress and Access Points: Design planning should provide that ALL egress and access points provide egress away from the building without obstructions. No streetscape, bus shelters, bike racks shall obstruct the means of egress away from the building.	Acknowledged.
53	Fire Streetscape: The Fire Official shall review and approve all streetscape to assure interoperability for the building egress, emergency responder operations and unhampered access to building systems.	Acknowledged.
54	Fire Radio Coverage Compliance: Public Safety Radio Coverage Compliance, this requirement is not only for the underground parking garage but includes coverage requirements inside and aboveground in the building to include stairwells. The space and amplification equipment shall be provided and maintained by the building owner. Certification by a Professional Engineer shall be provided showing the testing of signal strength and coverage has been met prior to the final C.O. being issued. The City Fire Official is the point of coordination for all city emergency services for approval of radio compliance.	Acknowledged.
55	Fire Emergency Generators: If not already required by code as a High-Rise Package and in order to maintain resiliency, all buildings shall have a generator sized accordingly to supply and sustain fire protection systems, emergency lighting and ventilation, Public Safety Radio systems, elevator service (at least 1 elevator), sump pumps as well as domestic water in order to sustain sanitary systems and other critical functions that are to remain viable during extended outages. Generators are preferred to be natural gas supplied (diesel generators are limited by fuel supply; will also require annual permits).	The Applicant has agreed to provide emergency generators as specified in the SEE Voluntary Concessions: "Natural gas emergency generator sized to accommodate code-required items such as fire alarm systems and emergency hall and exit lighting."
56	Fire Designated Fire Lanes: Fire Lanes for emergency response may be designated by the Fire Official and shall be marked and maintained by the building owner according to code.	Acknowledged.
57	Fire Signage: Signage will be required throughout the building in accordance with requirements set by the Fire Official. This shall include clear markings that identify of all exterior doors on ground level, stair and floor level landings inside stairwells, interior equipment rooms (electrical) and FDC location location. FDC shall be equipped with a "red (non-auditable) strobe light above the FDC that activates during alarm mode.	Acknowledged.
58	Fire Fire Dept Knox Box(s): Shall be installed where designated by the Fire Official.	Acknowledged.
59	Fire Parking Spaces: The project shall have a least one designated parking spaces for POLICE - FIRE MARSHAL needs (including signage).	Acknowledged. Location to be determined during SESP process.
60	Fire Pre-Construction Meeting: A Pre-Construction meeting will be required to review the requirements of chapter 33 of the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.	Acknowledged.
61	Fire Blue Light Help Stations: Consideration to install blue light stations throughout the project as emergency help stations.	Acknowledged.
62	Fire Installation of Security Bollards: This is specific to the area along Commons Drive which is the open field area to mitigate the possibility of vehicles hitting pedestrians.	Additional details regarding our proposed use of design elements such as seat walls and bollards to enclose and protect the various spaces within the Commons have been provided. See SESP Landscape drawings.

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
63	Fire Applicant shall follow all codes and apply for permits for approval by the Fire Official under the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code including but not limited to demolition and construction (chapter 33), blasting (chapter 56), hot work (chapter 35), removal of underground storage tanks, hazardous material mitigation, locations of fire department connections, fire command centers, Knox box locations, hydrants locations and fire lanes. Further clarification may be directed to the City Fire Marshal at (703) 248-5058.	Acknowledged.
64	Fire Street width open access must maintain 20 feet for fire apparatus and operations per the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code.	Acknowledged.
65	DRC School drop-off – It appears that this issue has been resolved in part through the change in the garage and the placement of the property line along the western edge of the buildings and along Mustang Alley. I would imagine there will still be some traffic through the commercial site at drop-off/pick-up if there are back-ups in other parts of the site.	Applicant has coordinated with FCCPS to create a student drop off loop adjacent to the Memorial Grove that will function appropriately.
66	DRC Management of car-share vehicles and delivery vehicles needs to be addressed at the SESP, along with bike parking. Delivery vehicles could be a problem if not managed along Street A and the Commons as they can block parking, bike lanes and travel lanes. Same with school pick-up/drop-off vehicles if folks cut through the commercial site to avoid back ups on Mustang Alley.	Loading/drop-off/pick-up locations have been contemplated as we furthered the site design for the SESP. We will continue to discuss with staff
67	DRC Parking ratios will be further detailed at the SESP along with shared parking and waivers, but the microunit ratio should be looked at 0.5 spaces per unit minimum. To the extent these are affordable units, particularly below 60% AMI, given proximity to Metro and bus service along Rt. 7, the ratio could probably be reduced further. Arlington is allowing a multi-family ratio overall (regardless of market or affordable) of 0.2 – 0.4 within ¼ mile of Metro by special exception.	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
68	DRC Parking Technologies – I didn't see a reference to them, but assume they will be part of the parking in the SESP	Applicant is exploring a variety of parking technology options to implement across the site and we will provide details during the SESP review process as they become available.
69	DRC I could not tell if the Commons Drive is right out only but that seems consistent with the plan for exiting vehicles from Mustang Alley.	See civil sheets for details of traffic movements across the site.
70	DRC School drop-off is still an open issue in that the volume of cars and the procession through the site is likely to create back-ups at both pick-up and drop-off. The morning conflict could be with delivery vehicles if loading docks are not enforced, as well as with customers and visitors in the afternoon. I think mid-day could also create some conflicts with delivery drivers and student departures (not sure if the school allows seniors to leave for lunch).	Applicant has coordinated with FCCPS to create a student drop off loop adjacent to the Memorial Grove that will function appropriately.
71	DRC Additional attention also needs to be given to the impacts of car share vehicles at drop-off/pick-up and especially special events.	Loading/drop-off/pick-up locations have been contemplated as we furthered the site design for the SESP. We will continue to discuss with staff.
72	DRC Based on some comments at yesterday's ULI Trends Conference, some exploration of how scooters will be handled seems appropriate.	Applicant anticipates continuing the discussion regarding scooter technologies during the SESP review process.
73	DRC The use of parking technologies has been noted and should be further detailed at the SESP stage.	Applicant is exploring a variety of parking technology options to implement across the site and we will provide details during the SESP review process as they become available.
74	DRC Depending on the decisions around the shared parking garage, an MOU with WMATA for overflow use seems appropriate at the SESP stage if not earlier.	Applicant can discuss the potential for an MOU with staff during the SESP review process.
75	DRC Mustang Alley – parking restrictions at drop-off and pick-up are crucial	At this time, there is no street parking contemplated on Mustang Alley.
76	DRC Parking Ratios are reduced for Phase 2 Office and Retail which is a good change and clarification from the earlier submission. This will be further detailed in the SESP along with parking waivers, shared parking and the TDM.	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
77	DRC Travel lane width – the 10' dimension should be confirmed with the Fire Department.	Per discussions with the Fire Marshal and Building Official, paved area for fire truck access will maintain a clearance of 20' width.
78	Parking Review Comments The parking ratios proposed for the West Falls Church Development skew toward a more transit-oriented ratio than comparable development in Fairfax County, particularly with respect to residential and hotel uses. Both the proposed office and retail parking ratios are on the high/suburban market side, but create opportunities for shared parking and overflow parking for the high school. Additional studies will be necessary at the more detailed SESP stage, particularly when a hotel and senior housing provider are confirmed.	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
79	Parking Review Comments Office Parking: The office parking ratio, while lower than the Zoning Ordinance ratio of 2.22/1,000 square feet, does not take into account proximity to Metro and implies that employees are expected to come to the site by auto. The implication is that this base of parking will be used for other purposes when the office is closed, such as residential parking or overflow for high school events. If this is not the case, then ratio should be changed to provide less parking due to transit proximity.	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
80	Parking Review Comments Retail Parking: The retail ratio is only slightly below code, which implies some use by employees already at the site, but does not take into account use of Metro or other ways to arrive at the site (walk, bike, bus). One key to the ultimate parking plan is whether the grocery store is a "destination" grocer, such as a Trader Joe's or Mom's Organic, or a replacement for an existing nearby store such as the Giant at the FRIT project across Haycock Road, or the Whole Foods a mile west at the Idylwood Plaza Shopping Center (Falls Church area of Fairfax County). Two stores immediately across from each other suggests one will kill off the other or they need to be different enough in their market that they will compete effectively.	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.

Staff Comments Letter (6/19/19)		Applicant Responses
81	<p>Residential Parking: The proposed residential parking ratios are lower than the Zoning Ordinance ratios, which are relatively high for a transit-oriented location. The proposed ratios seem to anticipate shared parking with office workers as well as some percentage of residents who work at the site or nearby, or who will walk to the Metro to get to their place of employment.</p> <p>The residential parking use survey conducted by staff in 2016 found an average of 1.65 spaces per condo unit and 1.47 spaces per rental unit. None of these projects were as close to Metro as the proposed project, perhaps justifying the higher ratios. The proposed 0.8 spaces per unit parking ratio seems appropriate for market rate units. A review of residential site plans near Arlington Metro Stations found that 0.8 spaces per multi-family unit and below is common, and that actual leases of parking spaces ranges from 0.49 – 1.51 leased spaces per unit. Taking this data into account, the Residential Parking Study of Multi-family site plans proposed per unit ratio policy based on distance from Metro, ranging from 0.2 spaces for units within 1/8 of a mile to 0.8 spaces at 1 mile. The higher parking ratio for condos is consistent with data from Arlington's Study.</p> <p>The ratio proposed for Multi-family micro units, 0.5 spaces per unit, is consistent with Arlington parking ratios for affordable housing at 50 – 60% AMI. The Residential Parking Study of Multi-family site plans actually recommended reductions from the market rate distance to Metro sliding scale because project data reflected lower auto ownership by households living near transit.</p> <p>The Kensington Senior project requested their parking be reduced by 36%; assuming the retail and cultural uses (3,000 sq. ft.) remained parked at code, the 88 residential units were parked at approximately 0.45 spaces per unit. Arlington's experience with Senior Housing is that residents arrive with cars, but as they age in place, reduce their car use considerably. Depending on the type of housing provided (assisted vs independent living, memory care, rehab beds for patients outside the project), staffing loads and whether employees can access work through transit, the proposed ratio may be adequate but requires further study once a provider is identified. With around-the-clock staffing, the day shift is the most likely to be able to use transit in some form.</p> <p>Parking Review Comments</p>	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
82	<p>Hotel: The proposed hotel ratio is well below the average ratio per guest room (0.99) found in the May-June 2016 hotel parking study completed by staff. This survey included the Hilton Garden Inn, the Inns of Virginia, the Marriott Town Place Suites and the Econo Lodge in East Falls Church. Parking per guest room ranged from 0.69 – 1.15 (Econo Lodge). (The Econo Lodge parking ratio was driven by proximity to I-66 and the expectation that most customers would be coming off the highway rather than from the airport by cab.)</p> <p>Given that the developer is seeking to gain approval of the ratios at the SEE stage, parking waivers, a shared parking study and a very strong TDM Plan will be crucial as SESP's come forward for approval to ensure that the parking program works.</p> <p>Parking Review Comments</p>	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.
83	<p>Site and Garage Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The offset intersection at Chestnut Street seems like likely to create issues of stacking cars and those wanting to turn into the site even with a right in/right out restriction on Leesburg Pike. • Street A – at 23 feet, the width is akin to a two-way drive aisle in a garage. This width seems tight if delivery vehicles, car share vehicles or fire and rescue equipment need to access or park there. At this dimension, the street parking will need to be closely managed to prevent street blockages. • The garage entrance off School Road is relatively close to the Leesburg Pike entrance to the site, and may have conflicts with school bus movements and cars stacking at this non-signalized point. The remaining garage entrances seem well-spaced and accessible. <p>Parking Review Comments</p>	The parking garage design has changed - please review latest plans in SEE amendment package and SESP application.
84	<p>Parking Review Comments</p> <p>Comparison with Pentagon Centre PDSP, Mosaic, & Dunn Loring Metro projects (see comment letter)</p>	Additional information regarding proposed parking ratios has been provided with the SESP Package.