

Survey Comments

1(A) - ELEMENTS I LIKE IN CONCEPT 1 INCLUDE:

Streetcar comments –

- Streetcar/light rail
- Consider making a loop for the streetcar
- Connecting Seminary Road to Columbia Pike
- The streetcar facility between Leesburg Pike and Seminary Road
- Streetcar on South Jefferson
- There is some consideration to the transit/living needs of those who might live in this area – transit stop
- Improved transit

Development comments -

- Lower density/intensity
- Proximity of Town Center to Goodwin House
- Light industrial location
- More residences
- Planning for big box retail (i.e. supermarket) to serve a growing residential population
- Greater spread of density across the region
- Retail area closer to Goodwin House
- The urban centers
- Look and feel
- Mixture of retail/office and homes
- Town Center emphasis
- Urban design is good – strong elements
- Home/small-town feel is nice
- Being able to walk to shopping
- The Community Center or Arts Center mentioned in a verbal presentation (I don't see it explicitly in the map)
- More streetscape
- The town center is a tidy way to integrate community and local businesses.
- Concentration of Urban Core Residential/Neighborhood Retail, though I think it should not front a major arterial
- The plan overall has a cozier feel, appears more balanced and has a central or common area. It has more mixed residential and retail which would lend to an area that resembles Courthouse, Ballston or Clarendon. It would be nice to have a lot of foot traffic and ease of accessibility to retail by foot. I like that there might be transportation to include the Leesburg Pike portion extending to West past Columbia Pike.

Open Space comments -

- The larger park space along Seminary Road
- The design having more of a buffer zone of smaller height residential along Seminary Road
- The possibility of the large park area along the realigned Seminary Road
- Green spaces
- Increase in green spaces
- Open stream to daylight!
- Somewhat more green space (need more)
- More greenspace

Transportation comments -

- Connecting Seminary Road to Columbia Pike
- Improve the walking paths
- Soon the new street would open Goodwin House to central town activities
- Realigned Seminary Road is a good idea

Other comments/questions -

- Not clear if any provisions for affordable housing have been made in significant percentages
- Do you perceive that housing will exist above the 2-3 storied retailers?
- Don't like
- Massing plan is good
- It seems that the density related to Skyline, both residential and office, is not integrated into either concept
- The term "Town Center" is so 90s; drop it and use something authentic instead
- Why is the "old age" lane the center?
- Generally, an update to the area is very much needed and welcome if done correctly. Details of the chosen concept need to be worked out with the residents of the area. This is a good start but please listen to what we have to say.
- The residents of the Baileys area certainly do welcome an update to our neighborhood

1(B) - ELEMENTS I AM CONCERNED ABOUT IN CONCEPT 1 INCLUDE:**Streetcar comments -**

- Take away the transit operations maintenance building and build a recreation center
- Light rail is not a mass transit solution, especially in light of added high density housing. Commuters now travel suburb to suburb and not just into town. So a light rail line toward the Pentagon only serves a small portion of residents and will add to driving gridlock.
- The shift of mass transit away from Columbia Pike and down Jefferson St.
- I have major concerns that the transit line will not come to Bailey's Crossroads but instead will terminate at Jefferson Street

Development comments –

- Lack of an arts center (mentioned many times)
- Enough affordable housing
- There are already many big box stores in the area. Is there a real need for two more?
- Need more residential
- Allow 2-3 story buildings on the far side of the park with walk-way for pedestrians
- What specific plans are there for our special needs groups in the area (Baileys Shelter, Culmore workers, etc)?
- Integrate the two shopping centers across Columbia Pike
- There is a very dramatic increase in population
- Enclosed parking = more cost
- The large industrial area is near our housing area
- Too much high rise – Skyline is enough
- Connection to outside the concept
- Buildings should not be up to sidewalk
- Hat the transit repair facility! Change the industrial flex to a mixed-use area. This is a prime Route 7 and Seminary Road frontage – we need redevelopment not reinforcement of this poor use
- How do you develop fragmented property ownership? Also, the density needs to be higher to encourage a property owner to replace a revenue generating use with a redevelopment
- I am very concerned about the initial plan being revised so that it is now not centered at Bailey's Crossroads but at Skyline. This diverts it from a general Bailey's community center to a few buildings who already have a center, but not available to Bailey's Crossroads. I live at Lake Barcroft and we are very unhappy about this plan.
- The lack of a "Clarendon" type town center feel to the plan along Columbia Pike
- Replacing the Arts center with ground-floor public space (by reservation) open to community groups, arts groups and non-profit organizations, similar to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Administration public space near Ballston Metro. We don't need a theater or museum, etc - too close to Shirlington and Schlessinger Hall at NOVA-Alexandria.

- I have major concerns that the Bailey's Crossroads (South Quadrant) along Columbia Pike will not be redeveloped or have a village center concept.
- Skyline seems to be reaping all of the benefits of the plan, while Baileys Crossroads and the Columbia Pike sections become utility areas. The neighborhoods need to be better integrated in the plan.
- CONCEPT ONE FAILS TO RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OVERALL DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD INCLUDE TRANSIT PATHS THROUGH BAILEY'S CROSSROADS TO CULMORE AND BEYOND, AS WELL AS TYING INTO THE EXISTING METRO STATION. IT ALSO FAILS TO PLAN FOR TRANSIT ON COLUMBIA PIKE TOWARD ANNANDALE. NOT SINCE THE 1970s WHEN MARTHA PENNINO AND JACK HERRITY RECOGNIZED THE NEED FOR INCREASED COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE TYSONS CORNER AREA HAVE WE SEEN ANYONE IN FAIRFAX UNDERSTAND WHAT DRIVES DEVELOPMENT. IT SEEMS THAT ARLINGTON UNDERSTANDS IT AND IS PUTTING THINGS IN PLACE...FOR ARLINGTON. UNFORTUNATELY, THE SHEER LACK OF PLANNING ON FAIRFAX COUNTY OFFICIALS PART IS LEAVING BAILEY'S CROSSROADS AN ORPHAN CHILD. TO RESCIND THE BAILEY'S CROSSROADS VILLAGE CONCEPT AFTER THE HOURS AND HOURS AND HUNDREDS OF AREA RESIDENTS PARTICIPATING IN MEETINGS AND THE CHARRETTE IS UNCONSCIOUSABLE. IT IS ALSO DELETERIOUS TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH OF BAILEY'S, OF WHICH THE SOUTH QUADRANT HAS BECOME AN EMBARRASSING EYESORE. TO TURN IT INTO A PARKING LOT FOR ARLINGTON'S TRANSIT SYSTEM AND A MISHMASH OF LIGHT INDUSTRY DOES NOTHING TO IMPROVE THE LIVABILITY AND ENJOYMENT OF THIS AREA. WHAT MAKES YOU THINK THAT DOING THE SAME THING THAT HAS ALWAYS BEEN DONE THERE WILL GET DIFFERENT RESULTS? GO BACK TO THE PLAN OFFERED BY THE URBAN LAND INSTITUTE. THEY RECOGNIZED THE VALUE THAT BAILEY'S CROSSROADS HAS TO OFFER. WHY DOESN'T FAIRFAX COUNTY RECOGNIZE THIS?
- We don't need more Big Box stores – we have them at Baileys Xroads and across Rt 7 at the Skyline Target.

Open Space comments –

- Sufficient streetscaping/greenspace
- Need more green “buffers” between existing residential and new commercial area
- Provide green space buffer all along extended Seminary Road
- The greenspace on Seminary Road is poorly located – make it linear
- There are no recreational and sport areas for use by residents - fields, courts, etc.
- No details were provided on the buffer zones to existing communities
- No ample green space, walking/bike paths, sports fields, or recreational parks for our children (How about a Mason District Park # 2)?
- No noise "buffers" for communities already established along the perimeter (e.g. Virginia Heights.)

Transportation comments –

- Pedestrian safety
- Possible impacts from Mark Center traffic?
- Increasing residential numbers means much more traffic
- Not nearly enough parking spaces
- Consider alternative or rerouting Route 7 at the south end
- Route 7 traffic is already a nightmare
- Congestion of new roads and widening of new roads in area
- Congestion of pedestrian path near the Goodwin House
- The transportation plan is unacceptable and appears to need much more thought and motivation
- The Concept did not seem to incorporate bicycle lanes throughout the redevelopment area; it should allow for safe, alternative means of transportation

- Egress over Leesburg Pike does not appear to be planned well
- No "plan" for a Metro from the King Street Metro to the Falls Church Metro. This must be done before any high density project can be initiated.
- No bike lanes (Arlington County is a good example)
- Planners need to work with Metro, to get a Metrorail line between Alexandria and Falls Church. The Purple Line is being discussed in MD. And, in other parts of Fairfax County an extended Metrorail is becoming reality all the way out to Tysons/Reston/Dulles. Saying "It can't be done" or "no money" is unacceptable and will lead to failure. It obviously can be done as it is being done elsewhere, including elsewhere in Fairfax County.
- Both concepts seem to not connect the rte 7 streetcar with the Columbia Pike streetcar. Why? And why not link the streetcars common stop with bus traffic on Columbia Pike west of Bailey's X-Roads? Furthermore, the entire Rte 7 – CP corner should be redeveloped, not just the S half.

Other comments/questions –

- Cost vs. Benefit
- Both plans assume desirability of urbanization???
- Don't like
- This utterly fails to consider any of the work previously done in the Southeast Quadrant (Public-Private partnership) and turns areas into eye sores and difficult pedestrian utilization, especially from the west or north
- Neither of these plans addresses the needs of Baileys Crossroads
- No information was provided with regard to environmental impact of this Concept: What additional infrastructure is required for sewer/water and what will it do to resident taxes?
- Can the existing sewage treatment facilities handle the added development and flows?
- Will a fire department be located closer than the current station? Will there be an expanded department to handle the larger infrastructure? What will this do to resident taxes?
- This "Town Center" design is hardly located at the "center" of Bailey's Interchange area. Its design ignores the 2 out of 4 quadrants of this interchange. The design also fails to incorporate those establishments being embraced currently as "town center" facilities by local residents in those neglected quadrants. The designers need to keep in mind that they are merely beautifying an existing "town center" to add human and modern elements in order to enhance its sense of place, functionality and attractiveness. To physically redefine the "Town Center" to the southern quadrants seems to miss the point of this project.
- I WANT TO KNOW IF FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS APPLIED FOR STIMULUS MONEY. I THINK NOT AND MY CONCERN IS THAT FAIRFAX COUNTY HAS NO STIMULUS PLAN AND HAS NO PLAN TO ENCOURAGE APPROPRIATE AND HEALTHFUL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THIS REGION OF THE COUNTY.

2(A) - ELEMENTS I LIKE IN CONCEPT 2 INCLUDE:

Streetcar comments –

- Streetcar/light rail
- Consider making a loop for the streetcar
- Streetcar on South Jefferson

Development comments –

- Arts center (mentioned multiple times)
- Light industrial location
- The Town Center design with mixed retail along the small park and Arts Center
- More concentrated density around the transportation hubs
- Easier to shop and leave via public transportation
- Hub idea to link different transit nodes
- Less dependence on big box – small retail is more viable for pedestrians
- Density and FAR is good
- Includes some consideration for the arts and commercial space

- The light rail; structures with rooms and apartments above ground-level shops and/or business offices
- Concentration of office near the transit center.

Open Space comments –

- Green spaces

Transportation comments –

- Connecting Seminary Road to Columbia Pike
- Connections for pedestrians
- Realigning Seminary Road is a good idea
- It has one area that would appear to be a little bit wider for green space than in concept 1. I also like that there might be transportation to include the Leesburg Pike portion extending to West past Columbia Pike.

Other comments/questions -

- How affordable is the transit concept system for users?
- Less high rise
- Bring density closer to transit; 2-3 story townhouses
- Don't like
- What are the proportions? Is there a catalytic project other than the transit alignment?

2(B) - ELEMENTS I AM CONCERNED ABOUT IN CONCEPT 2 INCLUDE:

Streetcar comments –

- Placing the streetcar operations facility behind Sunset Manor! Move it to the far side of Seminary Road – may need to relocate the curve of Seminary Road
- Why are the street car operations backing directly onto existing residential properties? It is unacceptable for professional planners to propose such a plan. It's as though they have no regard for the welfare of the existing neighborhood community. Please don't respond with the "buffer" solution. From personal experience living in Fairfax County, "buffers" are a joke in Mason District. Please redesign the plan and place street car operations in or backing up to commercial properties.
- The streetcar facility being between the open space and townhouses
- Take away the transit operations facility and build a recreation center
- Move streetcar options away from residential units
- Streetcar operations facility is too big – need smaller size
- Streetcar doesn't serve 7 Corners
- The car repair barns are in a poor location; move the transit in "phase II" to follow Seminary Road and loop around to Columbia Pike
- Transit line should go down Seminary Road to Columbia Pike
- Transit storage needs to be "encapsulated" by commercial/"industrial" business which hides the mess and transit issues
- Large streetcar parking lot, too vertical

Development comments –

- Increased intensity in a smaller area
- Centering the Arts Center in high-level mixed-use seems inappropriate
- Too densely compacted
- Do not like townhouses so close to the Goodwin House
- How to expand residential and business parking on the streets under this concept?
- Integrate the two shopping centers across Columbia Pike
- The large industrial area is near our housing area
- Arts Center is an integral element in this design
- Too much density

- I don't like the industrial flex; the Air Hanger should be the cornerstone of mixed-use office/retail/residential area – we need to get rid of the auto-oriented junk on Seminary Road and Rt. 7 frontage
- I am very concerned about the initial plan being revised so that it is now not centered at Bailey's Crossroads but at Skyline. This diverts general Bailey's community transportation to a few Skyline buildings who already have transportation conveniences not available to Bailey's Crossroads. I live at Lake Barcroft and we are very unhappy about this plan.
- This plan doesn't have any common or central area. It seems a bit disjointed and there are not as many open, green areas as in concept 1. Foot traffic might have to cross more streets.
- I am very concerned that Arlington County is dominating this planning and that what was once truly a Bailey's Crossroads Revitalization Plan is now a Skyline Revitalization Plan. Bailey's is being treated as an ugly step sister. To ignore the value of Bailey's as an area with a vital commercial future is a slap in the face of the area residents and taxpayers. The Urban Land Institute provided a well thought out plan for Bailey's future that has been ignored, much to the areas detriment. Bailey's deserves much more respect and should be treated with dignity. If Fairfax County doesn't see or understand the value of this area, how about working out a deal with Arlington County to take us over? Arlington has done a magnificent job revitalizing its eyesore areas. Why can't Fairfax do the same? It does take insight and comprehensive planning. Why shy away from that? We need transportation through Bailey's to Culmore and Seven Corners on to the Metro, just as the ULI so clearly explained. And, their concept to upgrade Bailey's with a Village Center lifted the morale of area residents. That morale has been slammed in the gut by Fairfax County's desertion and acquiescent to Arlington County. I understand that this is a good deal for Skyline. I don't understand why Bailey's was cut out. Why can't we have a comprehensive plan that includes both. Obviously funding is an issue. But, did Fairfax apply for any stimulus money? I saw other nearby areas listed as having applied, but not Fairfax. Regardless, why has Bailey's been cut from such a futuristic plan? Is Fairfax always to be in the catch up mode? Comprehensive planning is a must. Our area residents of the future deserve better than this. As for the imminent development of the area that was to be the Village Center, our current residents deserve better than the plans show. This is a travesty.
- The concept needs another slide - where could one ride from the transit center? Showing bus stops is useful, but we need to see where we can ride without transferring from the transit center. The Transit Center concept needs explanation - especially since the nearest ones are at Ballston Metro and East Falls Church Metro. A transit center is not a parking lot, although that can be included (not here though). A Transit Center is a facility designed to ease transferring between bus routes and in this case between bus routes and the Columbia Pike streetcar. It should include a commuter store to sell transit fare media, lights, shelter, perhaps a pay phone and restroom facility. A coffee shop across the street would be nice - maybe Murky Coffee? Dry cleaner nearby, perhaps a preschool - places to drop off necessities! Community bulletin board would be good too. Office and retail, commanding more pricey environs and needing more visibility, should front the transit center and Rt. 7.

Open Space comments –

- Sufficient streetscaping/greenspace
- It seems like there is less open space
- More greenspace buffer
- Too little green space

Transportation comments –

- Pedestrian safety
- Not nearly enough parking spaces
- Need to extend more transportation options to Culmore/Glen Carlyn/7 Corners area
- Can the older population really walk to shopping?
- Transportation in this area always focuses on the Pentagon and DC – many of us live and work in the area and rarely travel to DC

- Use Wiki Buses to move people around (and extend service area to streetcars)
- The concept needs another slide - where could one ride from the transit center? Showing bus stops is useful, but we need to see where we can ride without transferring from the transit center.
- Eliminations of the pedestrian skywalks due to “visual intrusion” is not a good enough excuse. Have the design team considered underground crosswalks then? Town Center or not, without making the pedestrians to feel at ease walking around, the project may not be able to bring the desired “urban” feel to Bailey’s Crossroads. In order to ensure the maximum utilization of the streetcar stops, they need to be located in a more central and more accessible location of the interchange. Again, the both concepts ignore the northern quadrants and their residents. The proposed designed is not only lacking consideration for the immediate neighborhoods in northern Bailey’s, but also make the future transit extension along Rt. 7 towards 7 Corners and along 244 toward Annandale difficult.

Other comments/questions –

- All Columbia Pike residences/businesses are ignored
- Don’t like
- Is there enough affordable housing?
- If I am working at a business in the Carlin Springs area but living down Columbia Pike, I have to scramble through sidewalks and broken streets
- How will the streetcar facility impact the residential area nearby? How will these areas be buffered?
- With increased density, will there be a short-term aisle of business that is roadside?
- How do these concepts relate to the demographic trends in this area? These concepts seem rooted in the 90s, not the next 20 years

3 - WHICH OF THE TWO CONCEPTS DO YOU PREFER AND WHY?

Concept 1 -

- #1 – better integration of the various uses (retail, office, residential)
- Concept 1 – just add the Arts Center and greenspace buffer
- Concept 1 – more green space; seems to have higher living-space-ratio than Concept 2
- Concept 1 is my preference because it uses about 4 acres and major improvements can be accomplished with lower expenditures – expansion could be controlled better; either choice, be mindful of congestion as the County doesn’t have a good track record where expansion has occurred
- I prefer concept 1 because it would appear to bring more retail, big and small, to the area. We do not have nearly as much variety as those areas outside of the beltway, like Fair Lakes or Fairfax Corner. However, I realize that we live in a very dense area that doesn’t allow for such large retail spaces. But if Courthouse and Clarendon can have nice high end stores for retail, a Whole Foods as well as family owned and non-franchise stores, why can’t we. It would appear that almost every area of the region to the west of us and to the east of us has “upgraded”. We seem to have been left behind with our strip malls from the past. Progress should include the Bailey’s Crossroads area!

Concept 2 –

- If I had to choose, I’d choose the option with the art center.
- The second, but overall, very similar
- Concept 2 – if you place a linear pedestrian walkway/park along Seminary Road
- I like Concept 2 with the transit-oriented development
- Generally, Concept 2, but I would like to see a larger open space area and move the streetcar facility next to the industrial flex zoning
- Concept 2 because it clusters the higher density development closer to the public transit
- 2 – less density
- Concept 2 seems to have a larger residential area between the planned retail and the Virginia Heights neighborhood. The most preferred Concept will have an adequate buffer

between this new development and Virginia Heights. It will also include aggressive provisions for noise/light buffering for the Virginia Heights properties. Ingress/egress to Virginia Heights will also be vital to any concept I may support. Planners should be wary of these issues with regard to pleasing the people in Virginia Heights as well as other existing residential areas.

- Concept 2 - I like the layout of the buildings much better in the Transit-Oriented Development model, particularly south of Goodwin House. Transportation is the bane of NoVA; make it easily available and they shall come (look at the Ballston corridor). One of the factors causing increased demand for housing and, therefore, transportation, is the Army's contract to have 6,000 people working behind Mark Center (Beauregard and Seminary and 395) – office buildings have not started being built.
- This product is very impressive. I favor Concept 2, with modifications. While both concepts are friendlier to people who wish to reduce car use, the 2nd concept is superior. More people will be living, shopping or working near the transit center than in Concept 1. Transit Oriented Development has proven its effectiveness in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor and can be replicated here.
- I favor Concept 2, with modifications. While both concepts are friendlier to people who wish to reduce car use, the 2nd concept is superior. More people will be living, shopping or working near the transit center than in Concept 1. Transit Oriented Development has proven its effectiveness in the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor and can be replicated here. A narrative describing Transit-Oriented Development would be good for those of us who aren't very very visual. Actually, the best advice I can give to the curious is to walk the Ballston/Virginia Square neighborhood between Wilson Blvd. & Fairfax Dr. from Glebe to Nelson. You'll see office/retail fronting the main streets and residential/retail in the interior. No reason why high-density residential shouldn't be a block away from the transit center and Rt 7.

Neither -

- Neither, although I like aspects of both and each
- None – overcrowding, less green and more development
- They both have good elements and bad – I do not prefer either one over the other except the car repair barns are a bad use of a prime parcel on Rt. 7
- I do not like either one
- Both plans are a clear insult to the people who spent time in planning the 32 acre-tract in the Southeast Quadrant. You should be ashamed of Fairfax County and what you are doing to extend and exacerbate poverty in the Baileys Crossroads area
- NEITHER, BECAUSE BAILEY'S HAS BEEN GIVEN THE SHORT END OF THE STICK.
- Neither one has the transit line or South Quadrant development that is needed
- Don't like the streetcar parking lot...why not create a nice streetscape, park there?
- Neither. The team might want to consider re-examine the Urban Land Institute's recommendations, as its content is most relevant and appropriate for this development project. Concept 2 is a modified version of Concept 1. They are more like 2 versions of one similar idea, not 2 distinctive concepts. The contrasting qualities and competing design elements are minimum.
- NEITHER. THIS DOESN'T MEAN SOMETHING SHOULDN'T BE DONE. I MEAN THAT WE NEED TO GO BACK AND BUILD A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN THAT INCLUDES BAILEY'S CROSSROADS, RT. 7 THROUGH CULMORE AND SEVEN CORNERS TO THE METRO AND COLUMBIA PIKE TOWARD ANNANDALE.
- Neither, because they ignore Bailey's Crossroads, its residents and taxpayers deserve so much more consideration.
- Neither concept is adequate. The choice presented reflects a predetermined decision which does not reflect community input and does not satisfy planning requirements to do so.

Other comments/questions -

- I am relieved to learn that the development of the Weissberg property and County acreage would occur soon to "jump-start" the plan

- I would like a combination of the two concepts with a large park along Seminary Road and an Arts Center
- Need to mend and add more community ideas
- Parking in buildings mitigates against pedestrian traffic – I go to Target for Target, I don't wander
- Need a movie theater
- A Metro rail between the King Street station and the Falls Church station must be done first, along with infrastructure, on Leesburg Pike. After that is done, a new Concept, possibly #3, should be done using both #1 and #2 as examples and adding bike lanes, parks, sports fields, recreational parks, ingress/egress to already established areas, and noise buffers for existing neighborhoods like Virginia Heights.
- I prefer a Bailey's Crossroads Centered plan
- I am very concerned that neither concept reflects the previous community input
- The concepts are fine in theory, but do not come across as complete in the least
- I urge the county to revise concepts one and two for the area east of Baileys Crossroads so that the central Baileys Crossroads area can benefit from the Columbia Pike Transit initiative that Arlington County and Fairfax County are about to fund. The Columbia Pike Transit Initiative should include stops next to the actual Crossroads, either on Columbia Pike or on Leesburg Pike. To do this, the Initiative should continue past Skyline west to Baileys Crossroads, forming a loop back to Columbia Pike. This route will better connect Skyline to the surrounding area. A stop at the actual crossroads emerging at Seminary Road south of Leesburg Pike and continuing north on Columbia Pike will connect the Pike initiative with already existing public transportation routes along Columbia Pike and Leesburg Pike as well. The plan should also include a clear commitment by the County to connect the areas on both sides of the actual Crossroads area with the Falls Church metro. In addition, the village center concept for the quadrant east of Columbia Pike (which includes Center Lane and the Weissberg project) should be clearly stated in the plan. The village center concept for this quadrant was enthusiastically supported by ULI and the community both in public meetings and in county run charrettes which should not be discounted.
- I AM DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT BOTH PLANS. THERE IS NO TRANSIT SERVICE PAST ROUTE 7 INTO FAIRFAX COUNTY. THE BAILEY'S PLAN HAS TURNED INTO A SKYLINE PLAN. THE BUS SERVICE ON COLUMBIA PIKE IN FAIRFAX IS DREADFUL AS IT IS, AND NOW WE ARE TO BE GIVEN A CAR BARN BUT NO STREET CARS. HOW DID ARLINGTON HIGHJACK THIS PLAN?

4 – Other comments

Streetcar comments –

- Why is the Streetcar Operations Facility 6 acres in Concept 2 but 4 acres in Concept 1?
- Lack of use for streetcar – lots of cost for use
- Use ¼-mile circles to the streetcar
- I feel strongly that the streetcar should travel straight down Columbia Pike rather than turning onto South Jefferson Street
- Extend the streetcar to where most people live, near Culmore and 7 Corners
- Add a "phase II" to transit and have it follow new Seminary Road to Columbia Pike in a loop
- I have an issue with the rail car route - it needs to travel along Columbia Pike and Leesburg Pike, past the roundabouts
- Increase the rail car routes
- I heartily endorse Supervisor Gross's plans to begin with light rail only as far as now proposed, with reaching out to other areas to be delayed until feasibility is proven.
- I am distressed that neither of these plans even attempts to improve mass transit along Columbia Pike (beyond Jefferson St.) or in Culmore. I frequently rely on public transportation in these locations, as do many, many others. I urge you to extend the Columbia Pike rail line AT LEAST to Columbia Pike and Blair Rd.
- MY HUSBAND AND I ATTENDED THE FIRST FEW MEETINGS AT MASON DISTRICT. WE ARE DISAPPOINTED TO LEARN THAT THE RAIL IS NOT GOING INTO BAILEYS

CROSSROAD. YOU ARE DOING A GREAT DISSERVICE TO BAILEY'S HOMEOWNERS AND THE CULMORE COMMUNITY AS WELL AS. IT APPEARS THAT THE "FIX WAS IN FROM THE BEGINNING." THAT IS DISHONEST. THIS APPLIES TO THE ELIMINATION OF THE BAILEYS VILLAGE CENTER, AS WELL. THIS WAS PROMISED FROM THE BEGINNING.

- In either concept, would the parking requirements be reduced for the new developments and tenants as their proximity to the Streetcar and transit center increases?

Development comments –

- Projected growth of retail SF seems disproportionate to growth of residential units.
- Baileys Crossroads is being ignored. This is a Skyline project. The citizen's working groups designed the 32-acre SE section as an urban center with theaters, shops, restaurants, a bicycle path, government buildings, and apartments. What has been presented ignores the work of the citizens. The 32 acres does nothing to lift up Baileys Crossroads. In fact, just the reverse. Once again my taxes are being used for someone else's benefit while Baileys crumbles. Stop trashing Baileys Crossroads. Stop making it a dumping ground for streetcars, buses and poverty. Baileys needs transportation and a reason for being.
- More Big Boxes aren't needed - we have some already at Columbia Pike & Leesburg Pike. Concept 2 needs more grey - mixed residential/ retail in the brown area where the Arts Center is depicted - move the brown to front on Leesburg Pike.
- I really can't figure out the two maps, but what I want is the transit going down Columbia Pike to Bailey's and onto skyline. All the pre planning has agreed with improving the Bailey's into a welcoming urban "spot" and an upgrade to the tawdry buildings and run down environment that's there now. I hope that you truly believe your title.
- How this project is being paid for is clearly a component that hasn't been discussed much, if at all. Only by planning in progressive ways can you begin to see the tax base that's needed to provide for these types of plans. Intelligent comprehensive planning creates a go-to place for business investment and a desirable locale for homebuilders.
- The two options appear to share one unfortunate characteristic: neither develops Baileys. Both options appear to focus on Skyline while essentially leaving Baileys unimproved. Traffic and congestion at Baileys is horrendous. Commercial development has been allowed to expand with little understanding of the traffic impact. Beautification projects have focused on sidewalks to nowhere and a few cosmetic trees with no regard for the ability of people to walk ride or bike to and from shopping. The only change in the Baileys area appears to be a storage facility for the new transportation equipment to service Skyline.

Open Space comments –

- In either concept, it would be nice to have access to the large park/open space from Paul Street
- More open and green space
- We need more open and park areas – a linear park to separate residential development from high density development – this will increase our property taxes
- No plans seem to have been made for recreational space. Ball fields, courts, and other outdoor recreation zones need to be created. Bicycle transportation lanes need to be incorporated into the overall plans, as well as bike and walking paths.
- More details are needed on buffer space between existing residential communities and new development. This transition must be acceptable to the residents.

Transportation comments –

- As zoning is changed, required parking for a development needs to be adjusted accordingly, taking into account less trips by car from out of area (if public transportation options are increased)
- It looks like the bike lanes end at South Jefferson and Columbia Pike – it would be nice to connect this to the off-street bike trails in Arlington
- I would like to know if there are plans for connecting the new bike lanes to existing bike paths/trails in the region

- I'd like to be sure that there are plans to create a light or other method of safely crossing Columbia Pike where it will intersect with Seminary Road
- No consideration for 7 Corners traffic
- I raised the question of pedestrians crossing Leesburg Pike and am satisfied with the concept outlined at this meeting.
- I did not feel the transportation presentation was good at all. I used to drive from the Skyline area to JEB Stuart High School in the early/mid 1980s. I could make the drive in 7 minutes during rush hour in the morning. That would never happen now. The presenter's words stating current conditions are acceptable, and expect to remain acceptable through 2030, are totally off base. Current transportation and traffic conditions are not acceptable and will get more unacceptable as housing/retail/business density increases. For example, currently, traffic is gridlocked for blocks when the traffic light at Target turns red, causing residents on side streets and George Mason Drive to not be able to get onto Leesburg Pike. Additional retail and housing density will compound the already existing problem. Light rail does not help enough, even with the full blown light rail plan proposed. The examples provided in this meeting of other development areas, such as Clarendon and Bethesda Row, all have one thing these Plans do not: Metrorail. Long term regional transportation planning needs to seriously consider Metrorail. Otherwise, any transportation solution will be sub-par and will fall short of needs. If you are going to cite other Metrorail communities as examples of what this one will become, then you need to provide Metrorail. Otherwise, the comparison is not a fair representation to the residents of what the area will be, and reality will fall short of promises and expectations.
- The transportation presentation was very disappointing. The needs of the community are not being addressed for the present much less to handle such high density in the future. A small trolley (Are these trolley's environmentally friendly like NGV ART buses run by Arlington County?) running along Columbia Pike and onto South Jefferson Street will not give those living in the area an ability to leave their home/community and get to work in a reasonable amount of time. We need the Metro NOW!
- The Columbia Pike revitalization and transportation is very important for commuters and others in general to have access to Arlington and the District. Skyline already has adequate public transportation. Right now the plan gives Bailey's a bus lot but NO TRANSPORTATION!!!
- The traffic plan would include curb-space management, ZipCar, bus stop design, and accessible pathways including crossings of major arterials, of course.
- The whole issue of affordable housing and accessible housing was not discussed. Fairfax County needs to require set-asides in each high-density residential development for both. The affordable housing units should be dispersed. The accessible housing units actually should be concentrated somewhat - in case some residents need supportive services, concentration will reduce the cost.

Other comments/questions –

- Great ideas – we NEED to redevelop this area
- Elaborate
- I'm glad we're talking about some mix of the two plans
- I believe that the studies are moving the development in positive ways; however, more outreach is needed to the larger community – possibly through civic associations, churches and schools
- What is the current make-up of shoppers coming into the study area?
- How will people with fixed incomes live here?
- More like Ballston and less like Rosslyn
- Fairfax County is committed to affordable housing – that should be incorporated into the concept planning
- Just sorry I probably will not live long enough to enjoy it
- Thank you for the thoughtful ideas
- Need to keep the diverse and economic flavor, which mitigates against big box and towards boutique and walkable “quays” (European model)

- I appreciate the opportunity to hear about the studies that have been done – keep up the good work – thank you!
- Promote “green” projects
- I am concerned that you are making Columbia Pike a barrier
- I am very disappointed in the process and in what you are calling a “concept” that soon will become feat accompli
- I’d like to see the environmental impact study presented to residents.
- More information on the environmental impact of these concepts, including water/sewer, noise buffers, would have been appreciated. So little green space means more water runoff.
- Are new fire stations, police stations, water treatment plants being planned or are those already in existence going to handle the additional density?
- HAVE YOU APPLIED FOR ANY STIMULUS MONEY FOR BAILEYS REVITALIZATION? IF NOT, WHY NOT? IF NOT, THIS IS UNFORGIVEABLE.
- The name of this study is Bailey’s Crossroads, and I fail to see where that area will gain anything. It’s more a Skyline revitalization study.
- Will the environment impact study be posted on the website? Has it been incorporated into the designs?
- If we do not have enough funds to roll out the complete plan — serving all in the area equally, can we not wait or create a plan which has clearly defined stages/target dates? Such a plan would hopefully serve the Skyline area as well as the Baileys Crossroads area. Both current plans are misnomers. They should be dubbed SKYLINE PLANNING STUDY.
- The majority of my daily shopping needs are met in the immediate Bailey’s Crossroads and Seven Corners area. I appreciate the ethnic diversity and the ability to find foods that reflect these flavors. Having said this, I find myself leaving the area to go to Whole Foods, finer dining and certain retail. I would very much like to support my local economy and community. Bringing bigger and more competitive retail to this area would be ideal. Having the area accessible by mass transit would alleviate the glut of cars that choke Columbia Pike and Leesburg Pike at the Crossroads intersections. Having more pedestrian friendly areas would also be a big plus.
- A BIG CONCERN IS THAT THIS SEEMS TO BE A SYSTEMIC PROBLEM THAT EXTENDS BEYOND BAILEY’S. TYSON’S HAS BEEN BOTCHED AND NOW BAILEY’S IS BECOMING SECONDARY TO ARLINGTON COUNTY’S NEEDS. ARLINGTON HAS BEEN DOING A BEAUTIFUL JOB WITH ITS REDEVELOPMENT/REVITALIZATION. CAN’T WE LEARN FROM THEM AND TAKE SIMILAR ACTION ON BEHALF OF BAILEY’S CROSSROADS AND ALL FAIRFAX COUNTY? THIS IS A HORRIBLE TREND, WHICH OUR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND OFFICIALS HAVE CHOSEN TO TAKE BY HIDING FROM THE REAL ISSUES AND FAILING TO TAKE A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH FOR FAIRFAX COUNTY CITIZENS.
- I think either of the two concepts will be a significant improvement. Overall my preference is the town center-concept 1. I think that there is a significant need for improvements for the seven corners. I am very disappointed that this area was not included in the process.