Summary of Comments made at TOD Meetings (compiled from Meeting Minutes and Presentations—please see original documents for a more detailed description)

Public Comments and Presentations-TOD Meetings and Citizen Panels
**Compiled from Meeting Minutes and Presentations posted on TOD website*

May 24, 2006

- Clarification of definition of 'transit'-Metro, heavy rail, light rail, bus
- Flexible guidelines to acknowledge differences at existing Metro stations
- People-mover could be used if station not easily accessible by pedestrians
- Bicycle access to stations should be encouraged
- VDOT requirements/view of transportation focused on roads vs. desirability of narrow streets for pedestrians
- Needs of automobiles should be considered in TOD along with needs of mass transit users
- Importance of feeder bus systems
- No one method of transportation should be encouraged over another; important to have choice
- Checklist for guidelines to ensure that no group is excluded (seniors, disabled)
- Parking needs should be considered; more parking at end of line stations
- Pedestrian access
- Boundaries for redevelopment around stations (such as Arlington County)
- Flexibility needed due to change of use over time, end-of-the line station could be middle of line in future
- Encourage developers to invest in infrastructure improvements
- Proffers for TOD should be clear
- Simulations and models should be used to determine impacts (watersheds, traffic)
- Guidelines regarding community outreach

June 8, 2006

- See TOD website for copy of presentation by Stewart Schwartz
- Less traffic and air pollution
- Balanced jobs and housing
- Arlington County successful example of TOD
- Density concentrated around stations, adjacent neighborhoods preserved
- Demand for mixed-use-empty-nesters, singles, retirees, etc.
- Parking controls
- TDM-street design, connectivity, market incentives to encourage walking, biking and use of mass transit
- Performance based definition—location efficiency, range of housing options, value capture, place making, node and place (from *New Transit Town*)
- Traffic modeling needs to account for mixed use
- Bicycling to stations—need for lockers, shelter
- Most contentious issues often: density, traffic, connectivity, parking, design, keeping small business; can be addressed by appropriate density, TDM, mix of uses, community design to allow for walking and biking, maximization of on-

street parking, neighborhood parking permit programs, ground floor condos for retailers

- Most Important elements of TOD: Street design, pedestrian-friendliness and connectivity, parking and TDM, and great public spaces
- Publicly maintained and privately maintained public spaces
- Complete streets
- Design and parking policy important elements
- Car sharing (Zipcar, Flexcar)
- Coordination between WMATA and VDOT
- Incentives for developers to create TOD-tax incentives
- ITE design guidelines for streets
- Importance of street grid, narrow streets, wide sidewalks, bike paths
- Air rights
- Form-based code
- Capacity of Metro
- Recommendations from Stewart Schwartz presentation (Calthorpe's The Next American Metropolis)
    - Moderate and high-density housing, public uses, jobs, retail and services concentrated in mixed-use developments in a walkable environment
    - Pedestrian friendly street networks
    - Mix of housing types, densities, costs
    - Preserve sensitive habitat, riparian zones and high quality open space
    - Public spaces as the focus of building orientation and neighborhood activity
    - Encourage infill and redevelopment along transit corridors within existing neighborhoods
    - Range of transportation choices
    - TDM-Manage parking
    - Design streets with pedestrian as highest priority; integrate street grids
    - Market incentives to manage parking
    - Bay Area MTC Policy-3 key elements-1) corridor based performance measures, 2) plans for jobs, housing, access, design, parking, 3)corridor working groups

July 6, 2006

- Jeff Speck presentation (see TOD website for full presentation)
    - Walkability key to successful TOD—4 components: 1) reason to walk (balance of uses), 2) safe walk (reality and perception), 3) comfortable walk (space and orientation), 4) interesting walk (signs of humanity)
    - Passive and active recreation spaces important to encourage walking
    - Wider streets (requirements-fire departments)
    - Most important elements: walkability, grid street pattern, narrow streets, parallel parking, street trees, safe enclosed spaces, no exposed parking lots, use of form-based codes

Summary of Comments made at TOD Meetings (compiled from Meeting Minutes and Presentations—please see original documents for a more detailed description)

- John Carter, Montgomery County, MD (MNCPPC) (full presentation on TOD website)
    - Denser development outside agricultural reserve
    - Principles for TOD: mixed-use development with affordable housing, focus communities towards transit, safe and attractive streets, public open spaces, design for livability, plan for in-fill development, encourage revitalization, improve community outreach, range of employment options
    - Locate most dense development at primary transit stop
    - Plan for the pedestrian, street design
    - Address parking-underground, beside or behind buildings
    - Augment and reinforce existing neighborhoods, emphasize community design
    - Eyes on the street
    - Incentive zoning, encourage public/private partnerships, provide for market flexibility, actively support affordable housing
    - One-half mile generally considered walkable distance to stations

- Jim Snyder, Arlington County, VA (full presentation on TOD website)
    - Rosslyn-Ballston corridor: 50-50 tax base of residential and commercial within ¼ mile was major policy goal; 5 unique sector plans—distinct urban villages; reviewed Arlington County process
    - Special districts should be created with incentives to push density in areas with transit
    - Fairfax should determine potential in commercial corridors
    - Challenge in educating residents about higher density development
    - Recommending clustering development around stations
    - Address parking
    - High cost of housing
    - Presentation includes data re: Metro ridership, jobs, choice in modes, Census Journey to Work
    - Build community consensus, do planning at sector area, integration of transit with development, pedestrian environment, public-private partnerships, station areas must satisfy daily needs of users, invest in infrastructure, reduce parking requirements, subsidize transit
    - Parking, quality retail, urban design/quality architecture, pedestrian improvements, conservation of urban fabric, affordable housing

- Patricia Nicoson, Dulles Corridor Rail Association (full presentation on website)
    - Job growth outpacing housing growth in Dulles Corridor
    - TOD can address affordable and workforce housing
    - Challenges include community education and involvement, affordable housing, infrastructure, traffic, station access, parking, TDM
    - TOD Principles: Mix of uses, range of housing styles, higher densities to support transit investment, design guidelines that support placemaking, proximity to transit, walkable community, enhanced public realm, protect adjacent neighborhoods, enhance mode choice-trails, bikes, feeder transit

- TOD Strategies: Community education and outreach, transit-oriented zoning and design guidelines, specific transit area plans, preferential public investment, financing, programs and incentives, innovative partnerships, dedicated funding for transit area planning and implementation (DC TOD Task Force)
- Information on studies of housing and transit costs, congestion
- Implementation-financing, parking
- Amend Reston covenants to permit housing

July 26, 2006

- Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA (full presentation on TOD website)
- Process-oriented approach, partnership approach
- Characteristics of TOD: walkability, pedestrian-orientation, transit areas not dominated by cars, reduced parking, traffic calming, elevation of pedestrian walkways and bikeways, safety, attractiveness, consistent with character of surrounding neighborhood, mix of uses
- Smart growth development in suburban fringes
- Mediation of different interests
- West Hyattsville example—village concept, charrette process, environment, open space, form-based code
- TOD-increase ridership in non-peak periods
- TOD Checklist: process based with stakeholder involvement, tradeoffs explicitly addressed, planning and implementation tools used to solve problems, view the transit area as a system, stakeholder contribution to outcome, community 'walk-arounds' to determine likes and dislikes of residents, balance pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile needs, problem-solving addresses needs of group as a whole, economic analysis, green elements

July 27, 2006

- Mariia Zimmerman, Reconnecting America/Center for TOD (full presentation on TOD website)
- TOD goals: improve mobility of people and goods, catalyst for economic development and redevelopment, link housing with economic and community opportunities, create a sense of place
- Transportation costs, ridership increases in TODs, offer transportation choice (bike, car-sharing, transit, walking); network should be reliable, transportation costs can affect the affordability of housing
- Demographics changing, housing preferences changing
- TOD guidelines for ½ mile around transit stations: increase 'location efficiency' so people can walk, bike, and take transit, boost transit ridership and minimize traffic, provide rich mix of housing, shopping and recreation choices, provide value for public and private sectors, new and existing residents, create a sense of place
- TOD development should be within a 5-minute walk from station with town center; and joint development on publicly owned land with rail systems

- Capture value created by TOD to support communities: increased land values, investment in community services and infrastructure, lower household costs for transportation, decreased tax rate burden, create mixed-income neighborhoods
- Examples of TOD: Evanston, IL, Plano, TX, Pleasant Hill and Fruitdale, CA, Ohlone-Chynoweth, CA, Engelwood, CO
- Success of TOD requires common goals, definitions and expectations, a balance between placemaking and transit system needs, a clear framework to reduce complexity, time, uncertainty and costs, and community, private and public partnerships
- ½ mile radius based on comfortable 10-minute walk to station but could vary based on quality of walk and availability of other modes
- Affordable housing-units can be indistinguishable from market rate units
- Demand for housing near transit often from couples without children and single persons, increase in demand as 'baby-boomers' age
- Quality of walk as important as distance
- Quality of transit, car-sharing, walkability, parking requirements
- Benefits of TOD: Economic, redevelopment, transit, environmental, community and household benefits

<u>August 2, 2006-Citzens Panel #1</u>

- TOD as tool to make growth and development in the County smarter, stronger, and more creative
- Walkability—difficulty in accessing Metro, importance of safety and walkability
- TDM commitments
- TOD elusive—needs boundaries and parameters
- Importance of workforce housing and affordable housing
- TOD definition needed with rules, quantifiable goals, and measurable performance standards
- Importance of protection of existing neighborhoods
- TOD should fit in with residential, employment, transportation and open space networks
- Increase ridership, improve air quality, protect open space, provide housing choices
- Vision for TOD that includes county-wide planning
- Impacts on traffic, schools, environment need to be analyzed
- Provide diversity in housing choices
- Walkability affected by physical barriers and topography
- Environmental protection
- Needs of resident surrounding transit hubs-recreation, services, access, affordable housing
- Private roads-narrow roads cannot be used by buses and are not safe for both bikes and cars
- Satellite parking-bus service to station
- Homeowners associations-difficulties with structure of associations and cost sharing proffers

- Community consensus and input and infrastructure needed for TOD to be successful
- Importance of mode choice
- Criteria for TOD needs to be established and implemented/enforced
- Impervious surface-implications of wider roads on the environment
- Street width should accommodate emergency vehicles and buses
- Pedestrian access to stations
- Need to measure transit capacity and impacts and coordinate transit, traffic and land use
- Metro overcrowded and over capacity
- Need for bus service to stations
- Parking and density
- Contingency plan if infrastructure improvements cannot be made
- Need for flexibility in guidelines to address uniqueness of stations and developments
- Process needs predictability with community involvement guaranteed
- Metro viewed as part of the community and as a resource to provide safety and walkability-work with developers to ensure pedestrian access; lowered speed limit, shuttle service, video surveillance of parking garages, stormwater management
- Opportunities to cluster development and reduce impervious surface
- Protection of lower density areas adjacent to higher density TOD is needed
- Importance of community taking an active role in planning to ensure a balance of uses
- Air rights
- Transfer of density rights (TDR) tools
- Noise
- Security
- High-end and affordable units should be indistinguishable
- Importance of community input, balance density with public infrastructure
- Impacts on schools, parks, recreation, environment, cumulative impacts on road networks, transit impacts should be evaluated
- Stakeholder-centered
- Smart growth as a process
- Regional scope
- Seek optimal mix of uses along transit line as a whole
- Community vision first, then development proposals
- Guidelines should have strong language that established the framework for the vision of transit-oriented development in the county
- Guidelines should include need for affirmative studies, including a process to gather and evaluate data, address needs of disabled people, protect open space, and prevent density creep
- Important to designate boundaries
- Need for adequate public facilities

September 7, 2006—Citizen's Panel #2

- Concerns regarding implementation of TOD
- Importance of community involvement, pedestrian access, creating a sense of place
- Success of TOD in Arlington due to years of community involvement and creation of TOD boundaries
- Need for clear rules related to boundaries
- Proximity to stations is one of the most important principles, and should be measured in distance, not walking time
- Community involvement crucial
- Transit area should be planned before a development is proposed
- Developers should view themselves as partners with the community
- Boundary does not need to be a full circle around a station
- Development around a bus hub considered TOD?
- Definition should be based on transit use, perhaps first around rail and then decided on case-by-case basis for other types of transit
- Arlington-community vision for each station before proposals made
- Fairfax does not have a grid street system as Arlington does—accessibility and reasonable walk
- Concept of TOD as high density at transit nodes leveling off to more typical suburban single-family development
- How users get to Metro—walk/drive
- County needs proactive approach to BRAC and impacts on communities like Kingstowne
- Importance of shuttle service to stations
- Lighting should be provided to address safety issues with walking to and from stations
- Access to stations via trails
- Block size important in determining how long it will take to reach a station
- Walk should be direct and safe, pedestrian connections should be provided
- Services should be available within walking distance (i.e. lunch hour errands)
- Bicycling—boundaries further out from station for bicycle access
- Community outreach important-citizens have good ideas and want to participate constructively (referring to Tysons)
- Place of bicycles—not wanted on road or sidewalks, need bicycle trails
- Need for safe, covered, bicycle parking and safe access (major road barriers/pedestrian overpasses and safety concern)
- TDM strategies and road improvements also important strategies
- TOD should be an integrated mixed use development with a high density urban character with a variety of uses
- Important to have different types of housing
- Retail, personal service, public facilities
- Attractive landscaping and green space
- High quality design with an architectural review system

- Public input about vision for the future
- TOD should include pedestrian-friendly amenities, a walkable, safe and well-lighted environment, benches
- Balance between uses and the transportation network
- Traffic problems will not be eliminated with TOD but TOD offers an opportunity to have a positive impact through improvements to roadway network, TDM strategies and parking management
- Objectives for land use changes should include accessibility, maximization of ridership of heavy rail, reduced roadway traffic, maximization of bicycle and pedestrian access, appropriate vehicular access, compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act, and interparcel access
- Important to consolidate small parcels of land and offer incentives to achieve superior development
- Height limitations should be addressed
- Detailed transportation analysis for each land use should be made
- Developers should be required to provide feeder or shuttle bus services
- Employers should support carpooling and transit use
- Employers should provide bicycle and pedestrian connections
- Road network around stations should not be designed in such a way that would preclude those outside of ½ mile area from using rail transit
- Public input process-very often low citizen attendance, involvement requires effort on part of citizens
- Citizen outreach has improved but more effort needed by staff to engage community; HOA list kept by county is outdated
- Importance of including bus transportation in transit areas
- Emphasis on circulation, safe interaction of pedestrian, bicycles and automobiles, in that order
- Timely and thorough public involvement (before a development is proposed)
- Station areas treated as unique planning areas
- Areas should not be limited to ¼ or ½ mile boundaries but extended 1-2 miles where congestion choke points can occur
- Conventional measures such as FAR should be used less than measures like building form and shading
- Be creative with open space
- Emphasize consistency in building form, mix of uses and circulation rather than parcel consolidation
- Redevelopment should foster a sense of place and create a neighborhood focal point
- Demographics are shifting, residents will become more familiar with denser, urban environments
- Consider modifications to traditional approval process for TOD, perhaps joining the plan amendment and rezoning process, or regulating station areas with form-based code
- Safety as important as the distance of the walk to the station. Lighting does not increase safety if there is only one person walking on the path

Summary of Comments made at TOD Meetings (compiled from Meeting Minutes and Presentations—please see original documents for a more detailed description)

- Role of community in planning and visioning of TOD should be on the strawman list (referencing August 2, 2006 draft)
- Strawman should recognize that people arrive at stations other than by foot or bicycle
- Criteria should not be too rigid; framework is good, Vision of the Community principle recognizes collaboration and flexibility are necessary
- Interactive process would create trust-internet is a valuable tool
- How to address neighborhood consolidation, parcels left out of redevelopment?
- Need for active community associations
- Need for clear demarcation of boundaries while not imposing rigid rules
- Broader transportation issues need to be addressed, not just TOD