

Summary of Comment Cards from February 6, 2012 Community Meeting Penn Daw Special Study

Question: Do you support the Plan amendment?

Yes without comment – 1

Yes with comments

- Strongly support, live a 1-minute walk from Penn Daw. Please move ahead, we need to stop the blight and revitalize this area. Thanks to the task force for all of their hard work.
- Support with caveats, need quality growth in this area. Could have less residential and more retail, would like something like Pentagon Row with paths for walking.
- Upscale stores and residential units are a good plan. Do not let negative comments change the fact that some improvements need to be made.
- Don't be deterred by very vocal minority, they show up en masse because they are opposed but it skews the collective opinion of the room.
- Let's move ahead.
- Good overall plan, much better option than allowing primarily commercial district development. Reasonable response to future pressure to accommodate denser zoning for both residential and retail development.
- Current base plan is not viable and brings too much traffic. Mitigate traffic properly as you develop this site with residential and commercial.
- Support but would prefer fewer residential units or better traffic solutions. Prefer the proposed plan to the status quo.
- We fully support mixed use redevelopment of the site. Ideally this would include a change in traffic patterns to improve flow.
- Strongly support, the development of the Route 1 corridor must move forward. Instead of leaving our neighborhood to decline, we must join this effort.
- We need upscale retail and housing. I am a Realtor and our values are going down based on our current state at Penn Daw plaza. Please go forward with this plan.

No Answer/Not Sure

- Build pedestrian and bicycle paths along North Kings Highway, School Street, and Schaffer. In favor of sensible development, but not knowledgeable enough to judge which of the two above to support. Not terribly affected by many of the concerns of those directly impacted.
- Please improve the area taking into consideration what the citizens need.
- Changes should include a more walk friendly area. More retail and less residential, complete development of all traffic changes before or at the same time.
- Traffic analysis – question on large growth in population without considering weekend traffic (which is already saturated). Assumptions appear shifted to favor one outcome.

- General recommendations – Public spaces, walkability, the right retail (small grocery), general community amenities. Examples include Courthouse, Pentagon Row, National Harbor, Kingstowne, Eisenhower – Mixed use is good. Not sure if I support proposed plan yet. As a principle I don't disagree as long as it works and can support the concerns of the community. More outside the box solutions for traffic control. Roundabouts?

No with alternative

- The task force recommendations should be looked at closer. Comments – The numbers being projected are off base. There would be more than 80 kids with 750 units, at least 10% of these units would be multi-family due to low rent. The transportation study is flawed since each unit will have more than one car. This is being rammed down the throat of the citizens who live here.
- Lower density, 500 unit/90K sf retail is best for surrounding community. Comments – The interest of the developers for revenue seems to be taking priority over community wants and needs.
- A mix of good, higher-end retail plus residential should be included, remove the statement about Shaffer and Poag Streets not being connected – this is a viable alternative. Comments – In general, I support development of these parcels. Add a provision/recommendation that neighborhood improvements (i.e. sidewalks on School Street, parking on one side of School Street, etc.) should be done parallel with or before development commences.
- 4 dwelling units per acre (townhouses at most) plus more and high-quality commercial. Comments – I oppose the large number of added residential units. Let's have the developers propose several options using lower density housing. Let's make this more walkable for adjoining communities (Wilton Woods, houses on Poag, School and Shaffer Streets). Like the look of the Spicer tract townhouse exterior.
- Fewer units, ownership preferred, with retail. Comments – Don't support as written but I do support redevelopment with proper traffic redesign and retail is better than apartments.
- Lower population density, includes more resident ownership than rental. Comments – The current plans seem to be a hodgepodge, not an aesthetically pleasing solution. Traffic is bad enough and will get worse with no development. We don't need the traffic of 700+ more residential units. These plans are incompatible with the type and intensity that is needed. Revitalize with more consideration of this.
- 350-400 units with 50% townhouses. The current retail plan is too small. Comments – The proposed plan is way too large and car/road impact will be extreme. We have seen this before. The developer presented 3 plans before and followed through with the biggest plan which the previous meeting rejected. Why again?
- Donate the site to Fairfax County Park Authority or build low density townhomes. Comments – There is too much negative spillover on the existing community – overcrowded schools and slammed roads. It seems far out that only 20,000 square feet of retail can be supported here.
- Increase FAR at King's Garden. Rezone Fast Eddies Center for high density residential accessed by Route 1. Rezone or rethink the strip from Applebee's to Krispy Kreme to high density residential with some first floor commercial. Fix North and South Kings Hwy with eminent

domain. Open up Penn Daw Center, redevelop with residential condos and first floor commercial and townhomes.

- Green, walkable shopping center with higher end grocery store. Comments – Shops and restaurants at Shirlington is a great example of what we want. Would like a Trader Joes or Starbucks. The Walmart store is low end and has made things worse.
- A better mix of higher end retail and less residential. Comments – Afraid that unrented apartments will turn into Section 8 housing.
- Low-density townhomes or single-family homes. Comments – The community supports low intensity retail. We will use low density townhomes or single family homes. We do not want multi-family units. Please stop wasting our time. We do not want 750+ units in the community. Stop trying to destroy our safety and livelihoods. Please do not condemn our community and our children.
- More retail, less residential. Comments – Sidewalks on School Street ASAP.
- Single-family homes, townhouses, and retail. Comments – Need to do a property value study.
- Single-family homes, townhouses, and retail. Comments – Disagree with proposed plan.
- Build a school, library, firehouse, or police station. Comments – I prefer more retail.
- More retail, less residential. Comments – Open Poag Street for thru traffic. Make School Street a cul-de-sac.
- Increase retail and reduce residential. Improve Penn Daw retail rather than reduce it. Comments – Penn Daw can be improved without adding 750+ residential units. The traffic problem is huge.
- More retail, less housing. Comments – Where are open spaces? Traffic must be addressed before anything is done. The right retail will be supported. The current plan does not bring anything to the neighborhood. No one is listening to the community. We want retail and a walkable community.
- Less residential, more high end retail. Comments – Anchor stores will bring more retail stores despite Walmart being nearby. The more residential units, the more traffic. Open up Poag and Shaffer.
- Given that the Yellow Line tunnel extends almost to this location, consider a one-station Metrorail extension with associated park-and-ride and retail/apartments onsite. Comments – Because of the tunnel, an extension could be done for less cost than one would otherwise expect, and would greatly enhance transportation in the area.

No without alternative

- Don't have a different recommendation at this time, but that does not mean I accept the Comprehensive Plan as it currently exists.
- Poll the community for what they need in regard to retail.
- The request was previously rejected twice by the residents, why are we being bothered again and again?
- Do not believe the market study. It makes assumptions that do not seem valid or realistic. I don't think all the reasonable options have been considered here. Instead of rushing to an ugly redevelopment with consequences we all regret, we should consider all of the options. The

traffic analysis for the project seems designed to result in the desired outcome yielding the most favorable traffic patterns. For example, no traffic analysis was performed on the weekend. The transportation planner indicated that it is because traffic on weekdays is worse. That may be true for short periods of time on weekdays. However, over a period of hours traffic on Route 1 becomes and stays horrible for hours at a time. Failure to take this into account leads to a rosier predicted result than will likely occur. Something needs to be done, but traffic analysis has not convinced me that the county has figured out how to do this. The reluctance of the planner to share all the information and assumptions made makes me suspicious that the people living here will be subject to an unpleasant surprise while county government will respond that this result is so unexpected.

- Do not support plan as drafted. Where is the infrastructure? That must be #1. Low intensity retail should be retained. Route 1 access to Walmart needs to be fixed. School Street should go straight to Route 1 with only one traffic signal at Kings Highway. School Street is a major problem, especially for emergency vehicle access from Route 1 to Huntington Forest.
- Do not support Plan amendment, we need high end or quality retail stores.
- Do not support plan. There are enough apartment complexes (Huntington Court is new and empty) around. We need more quality retail. If we cannot agree on quality and quantity of retail then the center should remain as is.
- Why is current Comprehensive Plan recommendation being ignored? Too many apartments and too little retail proposed. Disagree with market study and want proof and information about study process. Assumptions in transportation plan are faulty. Traffic plan should also include change between proposed development and what currently exists in neighborhood, which traffic study does not reflect. Should include sustainable, green development like Arlington County. We will not vote for Supervisor McKay again if he shows us so little care and concern. Why is developers' proposal moving forward from the task force if ½ is opposed? The county has not considered neighborhood opinion which has been consistently opposed to this overdevelopment and has not offered any modifications. High rise apartments have been opposed for 2 years. Residents will not own, should be condos, townhouses, and single family. Retail should increase. What has the county done to attract retail in the former Shoppers space? County should perform an analysis of how property values would be impacted with any proposed development. The current developer has shown that they will not work with the community and modify their plans.
- I live in immediate area and do not support high density housing. Need a good mixture of housing and retail, more retail than current proposal. Need a grocery store that people can walk to so traffic is reduced. Need to keep a drugstore and add a non-chain restaurant or a coffee shop for a walkable community. Support redevelopment but only with more retail options. Also, must have a sidewalk on School Street with any new development, since it is currently too dangerous for pedestrians.

No without comment – 2