

Planning District: McLean

ID# 38 *Theme:* Natural Resource Stewardship
Topic: Salona

Park: Salona
Planning District: McLean

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Comment: My suggestion involves a strategy specifically to address threatened cultural/natural resources. I think great care should be taken to ensure that park planning be appropriate to each site. There is a danger when 'County-wide' strategies are used to guide land use decisions, namely, that local resource and community needs could be trampled on. A good example of this are the draft plans for Salona. Contrary to what County citizens have said they want-- building athletic fields grouped together in a complex--there is a top-down effort to bring rectangular athletic fields to what should be a cultural/environmental education oriented historical park with low impact leisure activities, such as multi-use courts and a nature center. As far as I have seen, there has been no local effort to ask McLean residents what they'd like to see at Salona.

Response: Park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy.
See also ID#79

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 43 *Theme:* Service Delivery
Topic: Nottoway

Park: Nottoway
Planning District: McLean

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Comment: I understand that a new rectangular field is planned for Nottoway Park. This would impact the fitness and walking trails and require the bulldozing of trees. My neighbors and I use the park primarily for recreation and exercise. The construction of a new field would detract from our ability to use and enjoy the park. I would ask the FCPA to reconsider the construction of an additional field. Several of the five existing fields are infrequently used. To destroy green areas to construct an unnecessary field seems like a poor use of taxpayer money. I would take greater advantage of the green areas of the park and the invasive management area by promoting nature programs at the historic house, the creation of a native plant garden, and some labeling or description of the native plants found in the park.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.
See also ID#69, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 55 *Theme:* Connectivity
Topic: Trails

Park: Pimmit Run
Planning District: McLean

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

Comment: Please consider completing the Pimmit Run trail.

Response: Work on the Pimmit Run trail is an existing, on-going project. Pimmit Run Stream Valley is also shown as a connection on the McLean connectivity map.
Share with Trails.

Action: No further action required.

ID# 76 *Theme:* Connectivity

Park:

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: Tysons Corner

Planning District: McLean

Comment: Connectivity The W&OD Trail serves as a superhighway for bicycle transportation. FCPA should look for connections along its length to neighborhoods, especially as it approaches Reston Town Center and Tysons Corner Metrorail Stations. Connections to the Tysons stations which can be made through FCPA parkland include:

- oConnecting both sections of Abbotsford Drive through parkland near Clarks Crossing Park. This connects streets southwest of Vienna with streets northwest of Vienna for pedestrians and cyclists.
- oThe Cross County Trail is another safe way bike travelers can reach the new Metrorail stations in Tysons Corner. Creating a bikeway from Brittenford Drive to Squaw Valley Drive and Days Farm Drive will connect cyclists along Lawyers and Hunter Mill Roads along Difficult Run with Reston to the west and Tysons to the east. This requires a bridge over Difficult Run. A paved trail should be placed next to the current natural surface trail.
- oA safe pedestrian and bicycle connection and crossing is needed between Wolf Trails Park and Waverly Park across Old Courthouse Road. (See Natural Resource Stewardship below)
- oAshgrove Lane from Bartholomew Court to Northern Neck Drive is a critical connection to the Tysons West Metro station. This can become a beautiful, safe cycle track and make the neighborhood a very desirable location, which also enhances another goal: Community Building.
- oAnother important connection via parkland to Tysons Metro is via Higdon Road to Ragland Road through Ragland Road Park. This connects Tysons Green to Ragland Road and Old Courthouse Road to reach points east of Route 123. Special parking restrictions must be utilized to prevent Metro parking in order for this connection to be acceptable to nearby neighbors.
- oFreedom Hill Park is adjacent to an important on-road bike route into the heart of Tysons Corner, but there is not enough existing roadway to create a bike lane. FCPA should work with FC Dept. of Transportation to come create safe bicycle access along Old Courthouse Road by allowing right of way for a bicycle lane and possibly an associated pedestrian path through the park.

Transit Connectivity Not only should transit hours on routes serving Vienna parks be extended to mid-days and weekends, but bus routes should be extended to reach regional and federal parks such as Wolf Trap National Park and Meadowlark Botanical Gardens. FCPA could consider operating a special getting-kids-to-nature park access bus could run from central Tysons corner to nearby parks on afternoons weekends.

Response: Add appropriate strategy, updates to connectivity map if needed. Compare to DOT's draft bike plan map for the Tysons area.

Action: Add new connectivity strategy, "Work with other public agencies and private partners to improve connectivity in the Tysons Corner area as that area redevelops."

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

ID# 77 *Theme:* Land Acquisition *Park:* Appropriate for
Topic: Tysons Corner *Planning District:* McLean GPGC Action?

Comment: Land Acquisition FCPA should work with The Trails Owners Association which is interested in ceding their common land to the FCPA along the stream valley adjacent to Wolf Trails Park. Acquiring the land would allow a continuous piece of parkland along the stream valley which could be used by pedestrians and cyclist to travel to the Tysons West and Central Metro stations.

Response: [LAMB] The land described is preserved as open space (as a result of the rezoning, development process) and has an existing trail easement. FCPA has been approached in the past regarding this HOA land, but has declined the offer to take it as it does not offer an added value to FCPA. Goals of preservation of open space are being met already. Until such time that a pedestrian bridge crossing the Dulles Toll Road exists, or the funds required to construct similar are available, goals of connectivity are not assisted by this land nor the existing trail easement. See also ID#87.

Action: No further action required.

ID# 79 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Salona Appropriate for
Topic: Salona *Planning District:* McLean GPGC Action?

Comment: HOW CAN YOU ASSUME THAT RECTANGULAR FIELDS WILL BE PART OF THE SALONA CONSERVATION EASEMENT WHEN THAT PROCESS WILL NOT BE COMPLETED UNTIL AFTER YOU FINALIZE THIS PLAN. THE MCLEAN COMMUNITY DOES NOT WANT ATTHLETIC FIELDS ON THIS HISTORIC AND VOLATILE PROPERTY! WHEN WILL THE PARK AUTHORITY BEGIN TO PLAN PARKS FROM THE BOTTOM UP -- AS ALL OTHER JURISDICTIONS DO -- AND NOT FROM THE TOP DOWN. THIS IS NOT YOUR FIEFDOM! THESE PARKS BELONG TO TAX-PAYING PUBLIC THAT PAY FOR THEM. YES! MEET WITH RESIDENTS BEFORE YOU UNDERTAKE PROJECTS THAT WILL DEEPLY AFFECT THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITIES. THE PROCESS SHOULD REFLECT WHAT THE RESIDENTS WANT AND NEED, NOT WHAT THE PARK AUTHORITY DEEMS APPROPRIATE.

Response: Park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy.

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 80 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Salona Appropriate for
Topic: Salona *Planning District:* McLean GPGC Action?

Comment: "The following comments relate to the McLean Planning District Plan, with specific reference to the 41-acre Salona Park

easement. Page number references are to the pages in the McLean District Plan. P. 4A future park at Salona would meet the definition of a “Resource Based Park” (as set forth in the adopted “Park Classification System”) due to its “significant cultural and natural resources.” The definition listed on page 4 does not limit “Resource Based Parks” only to stream valley parks. Salona has been identified in the extensive “Salona Cultural Landscape Report,” dated July 2008 and prepared by John Milner Associates, Inc., as having a significant and sensitive historic and natural landscape worthy of protection. Any future park facilities planned on this historic property, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and Virginia Landmarks Register and which is specifically identified as a heritage resource in the adopted Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, must reflect the context of the site and be distinguished from other local parks. P. 10 Garden plots are specifically identified under the Park Authority’s theme of Community Building as a place “where people can interact and build community”. Garden plots also rank very high in the 2004 Needs Assessment Final Report. It should be noted that the “reservable community garden plot area” at Lewinsville Park referred to on page 10 is, in fact, oversubscribed. There are no plots available and the waiting list is closed. We have been informed by a Park Authority staff member that at the present time there are no garden plots actually available for reservation in any Park Authority park in Fairfax County, and that there are no spaces available on any waiting list except for one park that is well outside the McLean area. P. 10 The 41-acre conservation easement on the Salona property offers an excellent opportunity for community building activities and, as page 10 suggests, such parks should be well-designed and promote social interaction. Given the unique status of this property, park uses on the site must not adversely impact the surrounding neighborhoods and should reflect the unique historic context of the site. Regarding the identified need for a dog park, referenced on page 10, a dog park is not identified as a permitted use under the terms of the Salona conservation easement and, therefore, should not be considered for the Salona Park Master Plan. PP. 12-13 The stated strategy to “develop one or two rectangular athletic fields at Salona Park”, besides being inappropriate for the reasons stated in the comment below, appears to be a strategy to address the anticipated population growth generated predominantly by new high-rise residential development in the Tysons Corner Urban Center. The facility needs engendered by the development at Tysons Corner should not dictate the facilities to be developed for the McLean community at the Salona Park. P. 13 Since the Salona Park Master Plan process is on-going, the first sentence on page 13 should be rewritten to read as follows: “If shown on the final adopted Park Master Plan, then one or two rectangular, natural turf athletic fields without lights, may be developed at Salona Park.” Substantive dialogue with the McLean community about the future use of the meadows and wetlands surrounding the Salona House is scheduled to commence on November 17 (after the November 15 deadline for comments on the “Great Parks, Great Communities” document). Therefore, it would be premature and inappropriate to include the sentence as currently written in the draft document. Furthermore, as noted below, the draft “Great Parks, Great Communities” plan states that “the meadow complex on the Salona Property on Route 123 contains several high quality eastern meadow stands that are some of the best in Fairfax County,” which, given the Park Authority’s stated theme of Resource Stewardship and its finding (page 19) that “meadow and upland habitats are especially scarce,” should be protected by the Park Authority, not considered for conversion to athletic fields and a large parking lot. P. 15 It should be noted that this draft plan states that “The McLean District is well served by local parks, except along the Potomac River and in the Tysons Corner area.” This is another

reason why a different type of "Resource Based Park" should be considered at Salona. P. 16Salona and the surrounding 41-acre conservation easement area should be added to the list of known historic structures (in the third bullet) as a unique place deemed worthy of protection for "preservation for future generations" given its designation as a national and state historic landmark (as reflected on the "Inventory of Historic Sites" in the McLean section of the adopted Comprehensive Plan). P. 17Salona's conservation easement area is conspicuously absent from the list of cultural resources worthy of "resource interpretation" and "stewardship" as described on page 17. While Salona is not a County-designated historic district and the 51 acres associated with the historic farm will remain in private ownership, clearly the 41-acre conservation easement area should be planned in accordance with the many laudable guidelines found through-out pages 16-20 of the draft "Great Parks, Great Communities" document. Based upon the significant and detailed findings of the "Salona Cultural Landscape Report" (prepared in 2008 for the Park Authority by John Milner Associates, Inc.), page 17 should be revised to include Salona, and the Salona Park master planning process should carefully consider and reflect the report's findings about this significant and sensitive historic landscape. P. 18"Issues" and "Strategies" listed on page 18 pertain directly to possible construction of active recreation facilities and a parking lot on the 41-acre agricultural complex of the Salona historic house and farmland. Given the extraordinarily unique War of 1812 and Civil War context of Salona, archaeological surveys listed on page 18 should be completed prior to adoption of any master plan for the future park at Salona. County and privately-funded archaeologists, historic preservation planners and naturalists should be actively involved in community dialogue about the future Salona Master Plan, given the "Strategies" described on page 18 of the draft "Great Parks, Great Communities" report. P. 19The draft "Great Parks, Great Communities" plan recognizes that meadow and upland habitat are especially scarce in the McLean Planning District, and across Fairfax County, stating: "The meadow complex on the Salona Property on Route 123 contains several high quality eastern meadow stands that are some of the best in Fairfax County." Accordingly, future parkland at Salona should maximize this unique resource and make it available for interpretative and educational use by McLean residents and school children, many of whom would be able to access the site on foot. P. 20Three "Strategies" listed on page 20 of the McLean District Plan state: "Ensure that natural resources are assessed prior to any park development...; Use design principles that minimize natural resource impacts...; and Conduct natural resource inventories...." Given the significance of Salona, all three strategies should be implemented prior to completion of a master plan for the 41-acre Salona conservation easement area."

Response: Park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy. See also ID#79

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 82 Theme: Service Delivery Park: Salona Appropriate for GPGC Action?
Topic: Salona Planning District: McLean

Comment: I am very concerned about the references to the Salona Park property in the Plan. The Plan as now drafted does not

sufficiently account for the unique natural and historic nature of the Salona Property. In addition to having one of the best few remaining examples of native meadowland still existing in McLean, its historic relevance -- having played a documented role in both the War of 1812 and the Civil War -- is without par. The Plan should specifically emphasize these features of the Salona property, and any future use of the land should be directed toward preserving and enhancing these features. Use of the property for athletic fields and a parking lot would be a waste of this property's unique qualities, which cannot be duplicated elsewhere; athletic fields, on the other hand, can be located anywhere. Moreover, the McLean Planning District has ample athletic fields, but very few park resources of the historical and natural relevance of the Salona property. The Salona property offers a unique opportunity to satisfy the Great Parks, Great Communities Plan's stated goals of preserving historic and meadowland spaces and making them available for educational and community-building purposes; the Plan should be specific in recognizing and dedicating the Salona property to such important community purposes. The Salona property easily meets the definition of a "Resource Based Park" due to its "significant cultural and natural resources," which should be protected for generations to come. At a minimum, the unique natural resources offered by the Salona property should be thoroughly assessed, and full opportunity be given for public review of alternative uses for these important resources (besides athletic fields and a parking lot) before any decision is made about the use for this property.

Response: Park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy.
See also ID#79, 80

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 83	<i>Theme:</i> Service Delivery	<i>Park:</i> Nottoway	<i>Appropriate for GPGC Action?</i> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Topic:</i> Nottoway	<i>Planning District:</i> McLean	

Comment: I oppose construction of any new fields at Nottoway Park and would like this opinion to be considered by the GREAT PARKS, GREAT COMMUNITIES 2010-2020 COMPREHENSIVE PARK SYSTEM PLAN on 15 November 2010.
The wooded area in Nottoway Park provides solace and retreat to the local community in an otherwise sprawling suburban environment wrought with congestion. Fairfax County's need for additional sports fields would tip the delicate balance which has already been achieved with numerous baseball, softball, soccer, tennis and picnic facilities. Additional development would hamper the park authority's mission to minimize Human Impact. Wildlife abounds in this small preserve which is home to fox, woodpecker and numerous species of song-bird. Invasive plants have been successfully controlled through the efforts of local volunteers. These volunteers include community schools and youth development programs such as the Boys Scouts of America. Youth participation in the maintenance of this wooded area further serves to educate the community about the local environment; this education is a critical need as we consider our future economy. Please remove Field #7 (rectangular) at Nottoway Park from the Fairfax County Park development plan.(Re: new strategy) Human Impact, Natural Species Preservation, Local needs vs. Fairfax Strategy.

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also ID#43, 69, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 85	<i>Theme:</i> Service Delivery	<i>Park:</i> Salona	Appropriate for GPGC Action? <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Topic:</i> Salona	<i>Planning District:</i> McLean	

Comment: I am very concerned about the implications of the Plan for the Salona property, and in particular that the Plan as now drafted does not account for the unique historical and environmental nature of the property. The property has significant historical importance. Moreover, it is one of the few remaining examples of native meadowland still existing in McLean. The Plan should explicitly address these unique attributes, and plan for use of the property in a way that emphasizes those features. It would be a terrible waste to build athletic fields and a parking lot on this property. Athletic fields can be located on most any open space area. Salona is a unique property that presents an opportunity to address the Plan's stated goals of preserving historic and meadowland spaces and making them available for educational and community-building activities. I am also concerned about what appears to be a rush to judgment as to how the property should be used, and in particular toward building athletic fields and a parking lot. That result would be a grave mistake in my view, and one that cannot be undone once the fields and parking lot are built. If the alternative of building athletic fields is not rejected at the outset as plainly inconsistent with the overall goals and priorities of the Plan, at an absolute minimum there should be substantially more opportunity for public review and discussion of the alternatives before a decision is made. Thank you for your consideration.

Response: Park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy. See ID#79, 80, 82

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 89	<i>Theme:</i> Service Delivery	<i>Park:</i> Salona	Appropriate for GPGC Action? <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Topic:</i> Tysons	<i>Planning District:</i> McLean	

Comment: The plan should not be phrased as if Fairfax County will ask the Tysons developers if maybe, out of the goodness of their hearts, might they perhaps help deal with the aftermath of the mega-highrise living they stand to make millions on. On page 13, the last item that is proposed to address just that is to "encourage" the developers to do what they should be MADE TO DO for overbuilding in relation to our schools, roads, communities, and environment. It is disgusting that the elected officials are either so deeply funded by pro-development interests or too frightened to take a principled stand. Or to

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

bring this debate into the public arena --- Instead, there was considerable sneakiness and failure to follow public posting process surrounding the plan to convert the historic Salona property into pavement and soccer fields. Hey -- officials --- that plan supposedly HAS NOT BEEN APPROVED YET -- but the plan already phrases it as a given ... and as the top significant thing that will be done to mitigate the effects of Tysons development. Thus, the developers get the Tysons \$\$ proceeds and we get to permanently alter the largest remaining meadow in Fairfax County, put a blemish on an historic site, and fail to follow the stewardship goals of PRESERVING AND PROTECTING history and the environment ... all while ignoring what appears to be the NUMBER ONE issue in recreation ... that people want unique and adult things to do at parks, not just more soccer fields. This is crazy, in my view, but people can differ in what they would prefer for the property. But a plan that assumes a given outcome (accompanied by a lack of notice and comment on the Salona master plan) is not any sort of appropriate process for such a momentous decision. Tell us the truth in your plans. And follow your own rules. I am submitting a FOIA request with the hope of casting some sunshine (as is permitted by law) on the flawed process ... but And instead, You have overlooked that destruction of Salona will cost more in open space and history than finding an alternative site for 2 soccer fields and some parking. You have overlooked that the public, including the McLean Citizens Association and the McLean Chamber of Commerce, take issue with the pretenses surrounding a process that assumes a given (and very wrong) outcome. And someone needs to stand up to the developers.

Response: Acknowledged. Regarding Salona, park is currently undergoing the master planning process. Comment forwarded to MP planner. Recommend removing reference to rectangle fields from strategy. See also #79, 80, 82, 85.

Action: Remove reference to rectangle fields from strategy. Forward to MP planner.

ID# 96 *Theme:* Service Delivery

Park: Nottoway

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: Nottoway

Planning District: McLean

Comment: I'm writing to support Resource Stewardship through protection of Nottoway Woods in Nottoway Park. I've run along paths in the woods almost every day for 28 years now. It is a natural treasure surrounded by an increasingly urbanized area. Several years ago during modification of the master plan for Nottoway Park, I participated in gathering thousands of signatures to protect the woods from a proposal to place an FCPA vehicle and equipment maintenance facility in Nottoway Woods. We were successful, but after all opportunity for public testimony to influence the plan was past, a lighted rectangular Field 7 suddenly was inserted in the final version right in the middle of the largest patch of Nottoway Woods. The FCPA needs assessment found that walking trails were the highest rated of all park facilities. There are other, less highly used, places in Nottoway Park to place a rectangular field that would not involve destruction of the largest patch of woods in the park. Lights and artificial turf are planned for rectangular fields at OakMarr, which should increase their availability significantly. The Great Parks, Great Communities effort is an opportunity to correct a past bureaucratic overruling of public input by removing Field 7 from the middle of Nottoway Woods in the master plan in fidelity to Resource Stewardship.

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available.
Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.
See also #43, 69, 83, 98, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 98	<i>Theme:</i> Service Delivery	<i>Park:</i> Nottoway	Appropriate for GPGC Action? <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Topic:</i> Nottoway	<i>Planning District:</i> McLean	

Comment: To Whom It May Concern:

I believe that sporting activities are already catered to more than adequately in Nottoway Park without cutting down the beautiful trees that would have to be destroyed to add Field #7, as the draft plan suggests. For park walkers and runners, of whom there are many, that section of trees marks one of the few places in this small park where you can lose yourself for a few moments and imagine that you are out in the country, and not in a rapidly urbanizing town.

The park already has five baseball diamonds, one soccer pitch, two basketball courts, eight tennis courts, and two volleyball courts. I think that sports people ought to be willing to leave just a little bit of nature to be appreciated by the rest of us. I recognize that parks have to serve a variety of uses in a resource-scarce world, but balance and fairness would suggest that sports are well served already, and that Field #7 be removed from the plan.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available.
Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.
See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 99, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 99	<i>Theme:</i> Service Delivery	<i>Park:</i> Nottoway	Appropriate for GPGC Action? <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Topic:</i> Nottoway	<i>Planning District:</i> McLean	

Comment: To Whom It May Concern:

My wife and I reside in Marywood Oaks adjacent to the Nottoway Park. We are opposed to adding another ballfield to the complex.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available.
Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.
See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 111

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 101 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Nottoway *Appropriate for*
Topic: Nottoway *Planning District:* McLean *GPGC Action?*

Comment: I am writing to voice opposition to including in the master plan for Nottoway Park another rectangular field in what is now a wooded area. As much as my family has enjoyed soccer, I also enjoy being able to walk through the woods in the park. People of all ages, including tots and the elderly, walk through the fitness trail area of the park.

The existing rectangular field in Nottoway Park is in very poor condition. Within two weeks of the start of soccer season the grass is gone from the center of the field. It's not likely that a second field will be in any better condition. It would make more sense to put artificial turf on the existing field, so it can withstand more play including adult leagues at night, than to build a second field next to it.

It's hard to see how clearing one of the few treed areas in the Vienna district is consistent with the county's stated goal of expanding tree canopy. The tree stand in Nottoway Park is the only wooded area within walking distance of my Vienna Oaks home.

I urge you to reconsider the proposed rectangular field #7 in Nottoway Park.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 102 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Nottoway *Appropriate for*
Topic: Nottoway *Planning District:* McLean *GPGC Action?*

Comment: I am writing to put my name on the list of citizens who wants to preserve Nottoway woodlands. I live across the street from Nottoway, a home we purchased in 2006 in large part because of Nottoway. We are working very hard as citizens to remove invasive species and we use the trails extensively. Nottoway park is a treasure that we give to our children, but we cannot let the woods shrink. As it is, we barely have enough woodlands to walk for even a few minutes without seeing houses or fields. We should be converting more space to woodlands, not the other way around. With extra lighting at Oak Marr we can have all the athletic fields we need.

Please let me know if there's anything I can do to support you and the Supervisor in making this decision correctly

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 103 *Theme:* Service Delivery

Park: Nottoway

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: Nottoway

Planning District: McLean

Comment: To Whom It May Concern:

I write to oppose the addition of Field #7 to Nottoway Park as part of the proposed Comprehensive Park System Plan. My family chose our home on Apple Blossom Court in large part due to its proximity to Nottoway Park and its beautiful woodland trails. My husband, daughter, dog, and I visit the park on a daily basis and value the beauty of the wooded areas as an escape from the hustle and bustle of traffic and nearby commercial areas. We constantly encounter others using the trail - walking their dogs, jogging, exercising, etc.

I understand and appreciate the need for field space in our district, and I applaud the addition of lighting to the fields at Oak Marr as a way to increase field availability of field space to meet the demands of the many sports teams in our area.

However, I strongly feel that Nottoway Park already does its part to provide field space, with six current sports fields and adequate parking to support them. The addition of another field (and proposed additional parking), particularly in an area that is currently enjoyed by many as a natural respite, is unnecessary and would be a real loss to our community.

Thank you for your consideration, and for your continued efforts to improve the wonderful park system in our County.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available.

Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan.

See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 104 *Theme:* Service Delivery

Park: Nottoway

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: Nottoway

Planning District: McLean

Comment: Comments on Great Parks, Great Communities: Nottoway Park, Vienna Planning District

Acquire land adjacent to the park.

Although there are few undeveloped parcels of land next to the park, MetroWest will add thousands of residents within walking distance of Nottoway and new park users.

Remove planned Athletic Field #7 from the Master Plan.

Balanced parks offer opportunities for all age groups, socio-economic populations, physical abilities and interests.

Developed as a district, drive-to park prior to the dense urbanization of the surrounding neighborhoods, Nottoway's dominant feature is athletic fields and courts. Now more people walk, jog and bike than drive to our local park. The trail that runs through the woodlands is heavily used by walkers, runners, bikers and people using the exercise stations and the picnic tables, in addition to the track and cross country teams of local middle and high schools. This form of exercise and relaxation is free to all and very important to the surrounding neighborhoods, including our own townhouse community. [Park Authority research has shown that trails are the most desirable feature in Fairfax County parks.] Natural areas give us an opportunity to connect with nature, as well as providing wildlife habitat.

The Park Authority should protect natural resources. Contribute to the Chesapeake Bay cleanup, help the county meet its goal to expand tree canopy and protect permanent and intermittent streams to help reduce stormwater runoff in the Accotink watershed. Add trees, not remove them.

Upgrading the two rectangular fields at nearby OakMarr will substantially increase playing time for several team sports without reducing tree canopy.

Expand invasive plant management and habitat restoration at Nottoway. Invasive plant species cover most of the vegetated areas in the park. While Invasive Management Area volunteers are removing invasives and restoring habitat in part of the woodlands next to the planned athletic field, this is just a small project in a huge challenge. More funding for natural resource management is crucial to avoiding further tree and wildlife habitat loss.

Repair and maintain existing facilities and amenities.

These include natural surface trails in/to parks (reduce erosion, as well); fitness stations; basketball court surface; clear garden plots that have been taken over by invasive shrubs and are no longer rentable, etc.

Make small improvements such as signage, bicycle racks, benches in shady places in the woodlands/other areas of the park and more water spigots for the community gardens.

Do not build parking between the garden plots and the tennis courts.

Tennis players can park at the Hunter House or the big lot across from the courts, and anyone who plays tennis can walk from the lot by Field #4. Some players walk or bike to the park, not drive. If you must fill this space, add garden plots or offer local elementary schools (Marshall Road and Mosby Woods) an opportunity to have school gardens.

There are many excellent strategies in the proposed plan for Nottoway such as: link Hunter House to interpretive trail, link garden plots to gardening interpretative theme, replace athletic field/tennis court lights (and basketball court?) and cultural

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

resource interpretive facilities.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 107 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* McLean Central *Appropriate for GPGC Action?*
Topic: Skate park *Planning District:* McLean

Comment: As I was reading through your strategic highlights, I was shocked at the mention of a proposed skate park at McLean Central Park. The idea of mixing teens (hanging out with friends on skateboards) and tots (hanging out with nannies and parents at the tot lot) is simply ill advised. Can you give me more information about this proposed plan and where it stands?

Response: Consider changing strategy so that skatepark is not planned for McLean Central, but look for another suitable location within the district, perhaps closer to McLean High School.

Action: Change strategy as described above, skatepark in the area. Remove specific reference to McLean Central.

ID# 108 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Nottoway *Appropriate for GPGC Action?*
Topic: Nottoway *Planning District:* McLean

Comment: Please leave the natural areas in Nottoway and put the ballfield elsewhere. The woods are irreplaceable.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also #43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 110 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Nottoway *Appropriate for GPGC Action?*
Topic: Nottoway *Planning District:* McLean

Comment: I am writing today to ask you to reconsider creating additional playing fields in Nottoway Park. My understanding is creating more fields would take away acres of walking trails. One of the things my family loves most about the park is being able to walk the trails thru the forest with our dog. It's an escape and makes us feel that we are no longer in a busy Metro area, but

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

rather on a nature trail in the mountains or some quiet place. It's great exercise and allows us to explore without worrying about walking among traffic. Nottoway already has plenty of soccer, baseball, tennis, volleyball and basketball courts. I don't think one more is going to make a difference, whereas the lose of these woods and trails would.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also ID#43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 108, 111

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 111 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Nottoway *Appropriate for*
Topic: Nottoway *Planning District:* McLean *GPGC Action?*

Comment: I am a resident of Marywood Oaks, a community that borders Nottoway Park. Our community recently learned that the Park Authority is planning to build another ball field at Nottoway Park (Ball Field #7 on the Great Parks plan). Construction of this ball field will require the bulldozing of a natural area including part of the Invasive Management Area, which has been the focus of significant county-wide volunteer efforts. We feel strongly that:

- 1) Another ballpark would disturb the reasonable balance between athletic fields and natural areas that now exists at Nottoway
- 2) Construction of another ball field would not be a wise allocation of the Park Authority's resources
- 3) The park should not lose any of its already limited natural areas.
- 4) Construction would upset the wildlife environment.

Please share our concerns with Supervisor Smyth and let us know what steps we might take to retain the park's current natural areas and land use balance. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Response: Acknowledged. Ball field #7 is reflected on the approved Nottoway Master Plan, although no funding is available. Recommend removing GPGC strategy to implement the master plan. See also ID#43, 69, 83, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 108, 110

Action: Remove GPGC strategy to implement MP, but do not change MP.

ID# 112 *Theme:* Service Delivery *Park:* Greenway Heights *Appropriate for*
Topic: Park classification *Planning District:* McLean *GPGC Action?*

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

Comment: Greenway Heights is a community that surrounds the integrated parkland this is Greenway Heights Park and the Old Dominion School Site Park. We strongly support the strategy to reclassify this parkland as a resource protected area as recommended in the draft Plan Master Plan.

Last week the community conducted a door to door survey of homeowners concerning the master plan for this parkland. As a result, 98% of homeowners (104 of 106 of homes contacted) attached their signatures to a letter supporting reclassify the parkland to resource protected area. This letter is sent to you by Michael Selig, President of the Greenway Heights Civic Association.

This parkland must be protected as it has been for the past 40 years since it is important to the Bull Neck Run watershed and the daily life of our community.

Thank you for taking comments from the community.

Response: Update park classifications of Greenway Heights and Old Dominion School Site Park to Resource-Based.

Action: Edit as described above.

ID# 161 *Theme:* Service Delivery

Park: McLean Central

Appropriate for GPGC Action?

Topic: McLean Park

Planning District: McLean

Comment: 1.Important to maintain places to enjoy and interact with nature, such as the McLean Central Park. Keep passive recreation areas and trails.

Response: Acknowledged. The Park Authority seeks a balance in achieving the various elements of its mission, including providing quality facilities and services as well as the protection and enhancement of the County's natural and cultural resources.

Action: No further action required.

ID# 162 *Theme:* Service Delivery

Park: McLean Central

Appropriate for GPGC Action?

Topic: McLean Central

Planning District: McLean

Comment: 2.Some recreation areas, such as the McLean Central Park, should remain only for passive (no active) uses.

Response: Acknowledged. Individual facilities are developed according to MPs, which are product of public process. See also ID#107

Action: No further action required.

ID# 163 *Theme:* Connectivity

Park:

Appropriate for GPGC Action?

Topic: Trails

Planning District: McLean

Comment: 1.Trails are critical to connectivity and access in the County's urbanizing areas, such as Tysons. The W&OD and Cross-

PAB Review: Public Comments and Responses, by Planning District

Friday, May 06, 2011

County (CCT) trails will provide much needed surface connections for Tysons bike commuters. Several FCPA trail areas are included in the Tysons Connectivity study.

Response: Acknowledged. Connectivity is critical for Tysons.

Action: No further action required.

ID# 169 *Theme:* Community Building

Park:

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: McLean dog park

Planning District: McLean

Comment: 4. Unsure of where in McLean a dog park could/should go.

Response: FCPA should seek to find a suitable location for a dog park in the district. Recommend retaining strategy.

Action: No further action required.

ID# 212 *Theme:* Connectivity

Park: Lahey Lost Valley

Appropriate for
GPGC Action?

Topic: Trails, Vienna history

Planning District: McLean

Comment: Cultural Resource Stewardship Lahey Lost Valley Park should be preserved and developed, and connected by trails in all four directions to neighborhoods or adjacent parkland. FCPA could partner with NVRPA to create a "Vienna Trail of History" Loop going from the W&OD Trail near Clarks Crossing to the Lahey Lost Valley Park to Meadowlark Botanical Gardens (with its Spring House and Log Cabin) and back to the trail via the new NVRPA Connector Trail along lower Meadowlark Road. This area is connected historically since it was once owned by the Gunnell Family.

Response: Connections in the area surrounding Lahey Lost Valley, including some described, have been considered. Several considered to date have topographic or access challenges (e.g., fence around Meadowlark Gardens). FCPA will continue to consider ways to connect the park to other nearby parks, the W&OD trail, and neighboring communities. Recommend adding a Connectivity strategy, "Continue to seek opportunities to connect Lahey Lost Valley to area trail networks." Share with Trails and CRMP.
See also ID:159

Action: Add strategy as described.
