



# Site Plan Review Committee

## Community Engagement Comments and Responses

Arva—2201 Arlington Blvd.—SPLN22-00006

### Project Contacts

#### SPRC Chair

Tenley Peterson  
[Tenley.arlington@gmail.com](mailto:Tenley.arlington@gmail.com)

### County Staff Contact

*CPHD Planner*  
Peter Schulz  
703-228-0067  
[pschulz@arlingtonva.us](mailto:pschulz@arlingtonva.us)

*DES Planner*  
Dennis Sellin  
[dsellin@arlingtonva.us](mailto:dsellin@arlingtonva.us)

Applicant Contact  
*Matt Roberts, esq.*  
Hirschler  
[mroberts@hirschlerlaw.com](mailto:mroberts@hirschlerlaw.com)

### Site Plan Project Information

**Project Name:** Arva, 2201 Arlington Blvd. (RPC# 18059020)

**Items Requested:** New Site Plan

**Engagement Session:** November 22- December 5, 2022

**Review Focus Topics:** Land Use, Building Height, Massing, and Architecture; Transportation; Open Space/Landscaping/Biophilia; Community Benefits, Sustainability



### Contents

About this Document ..... 1  
Responses to Common Topics..... 2  
SPRC Member Comments ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**  
Community Member Comments..... 6

### About this Document

This document contains all the comments received as a part of the Site Plan Review Committee’s online engagement for the Arva project between November 22- December 5, 2022. The comments are categorized by the topics that were highlighted in this review; Land Use; Building Massing and Architecture, Transportation, Open Space/Landscaping, etc.). All comments not pertaining to the above topics are categorized as “Other.” Use the table of contents to easily jump to a particular section, or click on the “Return to Table of Contents” link at the bottom of each page to return to the first page of this document.

## Responses to Common Topics

Below are common topics or themes received through the online engagement session that were identified by County staff. The list includes a summary of the topic and responses from County staff and the applicant. Please note that the topics have been summarized in order to provide an overview of the common themes and may not fully capture the concerns expressed by each individual commenter.

### LAND USE

#### 1. Several respondents wanted to see more ground floor retail than is currently proposed.

Staff response: The Special GLUP Study designates the Wayne Street and Pershing Drive frontages as “Gold” streets, which permit either retail or retail-equivalent uses, as defined in the Arlington Retail Plan. There are also recommended interior design standards and exterior transparency and design standards in order to permit visibility into and out of the building. During the public review process, staff recommends the developer explain how they are responding to the recommendations of the Study in this regard.

Applicant Response:

The Applicant has allocated retail/retail equivalent space along Pershing Drive and along the facade facing the designated park space on the western edge of the site adjacent to Wayne Street. The facades of these spaces exhibit transparency, architectural variety, and ground floor activation, per the SGLUP recommendations. These facades are predominantly composed of storefront with glazing to allow for high visibility into the space. Glazing is complemented and framed by brick in a variety of coursing strategies (stacked, running) and brick details that create depth within the facade at the ground level, while establishing a rhythm to the facade that breaks down the overall scale at the pedestrian level. The square footage for this retail/retail equivalent space is a product of the limited market demand for additional retail in this area, and provides an amount appropriate for the location and economic forces. Per the direction provided in the SGLUP, the building corner at Arlington Boulevard is secondary to Pershing Drive (Blue vs Gold designation, respectively), leading the Applicant to program this secondary space for the residential lobby space within the footprint of the historic lobby. The Applicant has reservations with placing retail at the northeast corner in the event a retail space is in transition or in the process of changing tenants, which could create empty space at a gateway to the Lyon Park neighborhood. Given the limited market demands for additional retail in this area, and the demand for residential in this area, residential has been planned along the remainder of the Arlington Boulevard street frontage beyond the lobby. The parking configuration does not change the practical utilization of space along Arlington Boulevard or of practical leasability of retail space on the site.

#### 2. Can the retail be shifted to the northeast corner, or additional retail added there?

Staff response: The developer should demonstrate if they can achieve the goals of the “Gold” street typology at this corner, whether with retail or retail equivalent, and meet the design standards to provide interest at this corner.

Applicant Response:

The northeast corner of the site is predominantly designated blue street frontage, per the SGLUP. The facade design is a product of the re-creation of the historic facade in mullion spacing and overall design. Given the SGLUP height recommendations – including the creation of a “gateway” entrance to Lyon Park – and that the existing lobby and sign are located at this corner, the northeast location is most suitable for the residential building lobby. Given the limited market demands for additional retail in this area, the Applicant has reservations with placing retail at the northeast corner in the event a retail space is in

transition or in the process of changing tenants, which could create empty space at a gateway to the Lyon Park neighborhood. By contrast, the lobby and improvements to Wainwright Road will create consistent activation along this frontage. The parking configuration does not change the practical utilization of space along Arlington Boulevard or of practical leasability of retail space on the site.

**3. Can the developer add family size units?**

Staff Response: For market rate units, that would be up to the developer. However, family size units are given preference by the County for on-site committed affordable dwelling units.

Applicant Response:

Current design drawings have been developed with consideration for current market trends and demands for specific unit types, resulting in a higher number of units on site, and in turn delivering a more substantial community benefits package. The building allows for future adaptability, and in the event that market trends change, accommodating different unit sizes within the building can be accomplished.

**BUILDING FORM AND ARCHITECTURE**

**1. Preservation of the original sign and lobby are important.**

Staff Reponse: Preservation of the historic sign and original lobby elements were identified as major Guiding Principles of the Special Land Use Study. The developer will need to explain from an independent source that the structures are not able to be preserved.

Applicant Response:

The Applicant conducted an independent structural review of the original sign and lobby to assess if the original building components were feasible to be preserved. The resulting report was submitted as part of the initial project submission and is available on the project webpage. It recommends replacement of these elements if they are to be part of the final design. In the resulting report, it was noted that the existing curtain wall mullions do not meet current Building Code wind load requirements. Additionally, there are stress cracks in the existing curtain wall glass most likely caused by temperature differentials and/or lateral movements of the frame under wind loads. Ultimately, the Applicant's expert found this space to be unsafe to reintegrate into the future project design, and recommended replacing the lobby elements in-kind. Similarly, the existing sign was evaluated to ensure adequate resistance of current wind load requirements, and was found to contain an interior steel angle frame that has buckled out of plane most likely due to overstress of compression load due to wind loads. As noted in the report, the sign's current form and shape cannot be maintained due to the existing structural conditions, which have naturally occurred with time. Ultimately, the independent structural assessment report recommended replacement in lieu of restoration. The building elements are to be replaced while maintaining the historic character and matching scale, proportion, and layout where possible. The existing sign and lobby are beyond their designed and useful lifespans, and are not suitable to be utilized successfully in the new development for an additional 75 years. The design team also notes that many of the community responses expressed disagreement with the goal to preserve the sign and lobby elements.

**2. The proposed building does not incorporate the principles of biophilia enough.**

Staff Reponse: The developer should explain how they will intergate the biophilic recommendations of the Special Study.

Applicant Response:

The principles of biophilia, per the recommendation of the SGLUP, are being integrated into the project design at the publicly accessible trail and casual use open space located at the corner of North Pershing Drive and North Wayne Street. The site plan has prioritized green areas by means of a) preserving the existing trees along Arlington Boulevard and adding two parallel rows to the entire streetscape frontage, b) decreasing the percentage of paved surfaces along Arlington Boulevard and increasing the amount of greenscape and planting areas, c) adding street trees along North Pershing and North Wayne to deliver complete streets d) providing amenities on rooftops with planted areas, which are a part of the overall sustainable approach of the project e) establishing a curated plant palette throughout the project with the incorporation of native trees, shrubs, grasses and perennials with special focus on sustaining urban pollinators f) attenuating noise with the inclusion of new tree rows along Arlington Boulevard, which is the street with the highest traffic volume and g) incorporating stormwater management via rain gardens and bioretention planters that are integrated into the project design and narrative to support the building's Mid-century Modern / Moderne style. These elements are intentionally located, sized, and oriented in a manner that feels safe and inviting, and "embraced" by nature. The Applicant will continue to work with the community, staff, and the SPRC to consider additional measures to incorporate biophilia into the project.

## **OPEN SPACE**

### **1. There is not enough open space on the plan. Maximize pervious space.**

Staff Response: While the Special Study does not recommend an overall percentage of green space, there are overall goals for "expanding the tree canopy", and transforming Wainwright Road into a greenway, and more specific illustrations and guidance on where there should be major landscaping on the property. The developer should demonstrate how tree canopy is improved on this site (without including the open space to be planned by the County) and how landscaping can be improved all throughout the site. The developer should reduce the hardscape in the areas under the unit entrances facing Arlington Boulevard Trail.

Applicant Response:

Relative to the overall size of the application area, the ARVA application is providing a high-percentage of lot area to open space, and is proposing a very high amount of off-site improvements per the GLUP, pending coordination with VDOT.

### **2. How will the private dog park work at this location? How will access be controlled?**

Staff Response: Staff will let the applicant respond. However, the developer may want to consider relocating it elsewhere on site or on the building.

Applicant Response:

The park will have gates, and resident access will be controlled via signage and electronic fobs.

### **3. Please provide a water fountain at the northeast corner, and other "mobility hub" ideas per the concept for this space in the Special Study.**

Staff Response: The developer should explore with VDOT the ability to make this plaza area fulfill the vision of the Special Study.

Applicant Response:

The Applicant has begun discussions with VDOT and other necessary parties regarding the transformation of the VDOT right of way into a future trail, including the elements that may be permitted within those boundaries. This will continue to be discussed during the SPRC process in coordination with VDOT.

### **4. Improve landscaping in the shared street.**

Staff Response: Staff concurs will let the applicant respond.

Applicant Response:

Acknowledged. The design team will work to maximize the landscape areas in this space throughout the SPRC process.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **1. Eliminate the surface/above ground parking, except for short term or pick up/drop -off.**

Staff Response: The Special Study states “On-site parking should be provided below grade”, and it is long standing practice of the County to require all parking be below grade in site plan developments. Staff believes that the proposed above grade parking creates numerous urban design issues that would be solved by placing all parking underground. Staff agrees that short term spaces on the street or on the property may be provided (the County, not the developer controls whether on-street parking is short or long term and will sign the street parking appropriately based on observed need. The developer has control over on-site spaces and can decide whether they are short or long term).

Applicant Response:

Parking at the P1 level is designed to mitigate multiple site design and environmental issues. On-site parking located at level P1 is as much as 6’-0” below grade, given the proposed grading of the overall site, and is entirely enclosed (i.e. surrounded by building walls/site/other programmed spaces) at the site perimeter facing the surrounding neighborhood and context. It should also be noted that no parking is open to the sky, being similarly enclosed below upper floors and programmed spaces. Parking located on level P1 is dedicated for the adjacent retail spaces, pick up/drop off, and for the residential units located on the immediate floor(s) above, in an effort to provide convenience for ground level uses and to ensure parking is being provided on site to the future residents of the larger ground level units, given neighborhood concerns for overflow. Parking at the P1 level also resolves safety and noise concerns for units that are located at grade along the Arlington Boulevard trail, elevating the exterior entry to these units in a typical urban stoop (accessible means of entry/exit for these units is provided through access at the second level through the main building core). Additionally, locating level P1 partially below grade eliminates potential additional environmental impacts caused by digging two complete levels below grade (e.g., increased site disturbance, additional embodied carbon for additional concrete, etc.). Further, the current parking configuration was designed in an effort to provide free-and-clear site under the public access easement park. Parking below the park will result in additional site disturbance and would compromise the opportunities available for future design of the park. The design team also notes that several community responses highlighted that the current parking configuration encourages access to the ground floor retail in its proposed quantities and opposed reducing/limiting above ground parking.

### **2. Protected bike lanes are encouraged on Pershing Drive. Some suggest concrete curbs.**

Staff Response: Staff takes note of the suggestion.

Applicant Response:

Acknowledged. Concrete curbs are one design solution the Applicant can propose in coordination with the County and Fire Marshal with regard to the standards both parties prefer for implementation, while retaining the designed bike lane location and configuration along Pershing Drive.

### **3. There should be more parking on site.**

Staff Response: Staff will analyze whether the proposed parking ratio is appropriate. Staff will also work with the applicant to develop a Transportation Demand Management strategy appropriate to the level of parking provided (like in all site plans) that includes monetary incentives for transit fares and car share, bike share and micromobility device memberships, to reduce car use. Residents of site plan-controlled buildings do not qualify for Residential Permit Parking. The developer should provide to the SPRC information justifying the requested parking, including information on parking utilization, if available, for the site plan building across the street.

Applicant Response:

The Applicant believes the proposed parking ratio is appropriate given the site's location to multiple alternative transportation modes, as well as current market requirements. The Applicant will work with the County in evaluating the proposed parking ratio and in developing the Transportation Demand Management strategy. The Applicant notes that 0.8 spaces per unit balances the county's goal of reducing surplus parking, encourages multi-model transportation goals, and meets resident demand. 0.8 spaces per unit is a parking ratio typical of outer band urban areas, meets current market demand and research, and is consistent with other comparable projects. The Applicant will work with the County to provide the SPRC information on parking utilization of neighboring properties, as available.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

### **1. Could the applicant do better than LEED Gold?**

Staff Response: Staff will continue to work with the developer on their proposed sustainability program and overall biophilia.

Applicant Response:

LEED Gold is consistent with the recommendations of the SGLUP and provides a balance with other community benefits provided with this application. The Applicant will work with the County in developing a highly sustainable project that meets the County's goals.

## **OTHER**

### **1. Public Open space and on-site affordable housing were mentioned as the highest priorities for on-site features and amenities needed to achieve the proposed density. Protected bike lanes on Pershing Drive extended to Barton Street were the most mentioned off-site amenity.**

Staff Response: Noted.

Applicant Response:

The Applicant's proposed community benefits are consistent with the SGLUP recommendations. Among others, the Applicant is providing for the transformation of Wainwright Road into a public trail, creating an onsite public open space at approximately 10% of the total site area, and will provide for onsite affordable housing consistent with applicable County policies. The Applicant looks forward to working with the community, staff, and the SPRC on the community benefits package for this project.

## **Community Member Comments**

### **Feedback Comments—Land Use**

As you respond, consider the following questions:

- Is the proposed land use consistent with the intent of the Special Land Use Study?
- Are the ground-floor uses consistent with the Special Land Use Study?

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments <sup>1</sup>
CM-1	Chirs Slatt	SPRC Member	Very disappointed that there is not retail space adjacent to the new plaza at the corner of Pershing & Arlington Blvd. The Special Land Use Study anticipated trail-oriented retail here to provide eyes on the trail & activate what could otherwise be a fairly inactive plaza. The Lyon Park Neighborhood Conservation Plan notes a desire for outdoor cafes and this would be the best option to achieve one.
CM-2		SPRC Member	Yes, I think this is consistent with the Special GLUP Study
CM-3		Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	Can some hotel rooms be added back into the plans? Should be some demand for hotel rooms for visitors to the military base. To activate the corner of Pershing and Arl Blvd, try to move the retail closer to the corner - it will also be more visible to drivers on the Blvd
CM-4		Other	I disagreed with the conclusions of the "Special Land Use Study," as it places way too density too far from a Metro stop, lacks a reality-driven site circulation plans that relies almost exclusively on a narrow, neighborhood street to serve an excessive number of housing units, retail, etc. Access into/egress from N. Wayne Street to the already congested intersection of Pershing and Rt. 50 will be a nightmare for all who live or will come to live in this area.
CM-5		Other	Density would be great at this site.
CM-6		Other	Yes
CM-7	Shelly A. Coss	Other	All green spaces should be as large and comprehensive as possible. Trees that are hardy and will grow

<sup>1</sup> Comments on separate lines represent comments from unique visitors (assigned an individual ID number) to the web survey, even if multiple comments have the same wording. Multiple comments on the same topic from the same ID number are consolidated.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments <sup>1</sup>
			to a height of better than 30 feet should be planted in as many numbers as possible (i.e., many more than the developer will want to plant and larger than they will want to plant). A system for watering the green space needs to be part of this plan. A must.
CM-8		Other	Yes, I think this is consistent with the Special GLUP Study
CM-9	Susan English	Other	Land use is appropriate, housing is needed, and more residents will support nearby retail and services. Land use and ground floor uses are consistent with the study and GLUP change.
CM-10		Other	Why are we not putting a much taller building on this site? This is a much better location for a 16 story building than trying to squeeze the Courthouse West building in where it has no room and directly across the street and towers over single family homes. If housing is in such dire need that the Courthouse West project needs to more than double the zoning allowed, why is it wise to limit this project to only 8 stories and zone it "low" use? I am at a loss to understand these decisions.
CM-11	Hannah Follweiler	Other	I think this is a great project.
CM-12	Annie Normand	Other	The retail space is small. and we want retail stores beneficial to the neighborhood.
CM-13		Other	There should be a larger number of multi-bedroom units, especially the townhouse units, to support families. Additionally, ground floor retail should be a benefit for the new residents as well as the neighborhood. The proposed retail space is very small, and there is no plan in place for useful retail (ie. restaurant, coffee shop, etc.)
CM-14		Other	Looks good
CM-15		Other	I am always impressed by the solicitation of feedback and the process, often very contentious, which Arlington county employees carefully follow. Great work, thank you.
CM-16		Other	Where is the parking???
CM-17		Other	overall proposal is appropriate (residential), but ground floor usage is not consistent with the sGLUP. Specifically, the site is not to have surface parking, but this proposal has a significant amount of it (beyond retail). This is not appropriate for a high density building in our community, and negatively impacts the ground floor look and usage. Retail space is abysmally small for such a large complex. Retail may not be as profitable as residential, but it is essential for this site.
CM-18		Other	Move forward with progress! We need to stop catering to our neighbors who won't accept that we are an urban county. Rosslyn, Clarendon, Ballston, Shirlington, etc. Now keep moving forward with



Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments <sup>1</sup>
			Langston and Columbia Pike. Expand expand expand!
CM-19		Other	Retail should be large enough to be meaningful. The proposal is tiny. Owner suggested (at LPCA meeting) that a "golf simulator" might be a good fit. With well over a thousand residents living within two blocks of this building (this building, Sheffield Ct, 2201 Pershing, W&L apts, and many homes), there is sufficient density for businesses that benefit the local community. From daycare to a coffee shop or bar. We need less parking lot and more retail. Even if retail isn't profitable, it's needed
CM-20		Other	It is important that the Retail space is appropriately sized to attract neighborhood-requested retail
CM-21		Other	Retail space must be conducive to attracting high quality neighborhood-friendly shops and restaurants
CM-22		Other	I like it - agree with the plan
CM-23		Other	This seems like an ideal place to address missing middle housing issues. Why not consider making this site affordable housing?
CM-24		Other	Very good proposed land use and ground-floor uses, and appropriate for the area
CM-25		Other	Very good proposed land use/ ground-floor uses, and appropriate for the area
CM-26		Other	The retail should be moved to be adjacent to the corner open space / trail plaza. This would help activate what could otherwise be a pretty dead place.
CM-27		Other	The retail should be moved to be adjacent to the corner open space / trail plaza. This would help activate what could otherwise be a pretty dead place.
CM-28	epotter	Other	The addition of the plaza on the corner is nice-- and would complement the existing plaza on the other side of Pershing. To that end, retail use has been nice to have facing the roadway versus residential properties-- connects the fabric of the place together better instead of feeling like a wall. Could the retail move to face the plaza? Still accessible to residents, but better integrating the community.
CM-29		Other	The development is largely consistent with the study. However, the planned retail space is very limited and thus far, the proposed retail (golf simulator) is not sound consistent with neighborhood needs or desires. In addition, the County is in dire need of more larger-unit housing (e.g., 3 bedroom) and the proposed development will add more 1-2 bedroom units, of which there are well over 5000 available in the County currently as compared to a few hundred 3 bedroom units.
CM-30		Other	Can some hotel rooms be added back into the plans? Should be some demand for hotel rooms for visitors to the military base. To activate the corner of Pershing and Arl Blvd, try to move the retail closer to the corner - it will also be more visible to drivers on the Blvd
CM-31		Other	The retail should be moved to be adjacent to the corner open space / trail plaza. This would help

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments <sup>1</sup>
			activate what could otherwise be a pretty dead place.
CM-32		Other	The retail should be moved to be adjacent to the corner open space / trail plaza. This would help activate what could otherwise be a pretty dead place.
CM-33		Other	Consider moving the retail to be adjacent to the corner of the plaza to make it a more 'active' space.
CM-34		Other	The proposed land use and ground floor uses are not consistent with the Special Land Use study, which recommends biophilia (green roof, living nature walls, native plants).  While there are a few small plant beds on the structure, there is no “green roof”. The structure instead contains much synthetic turf and wood decking, which will create stormwater run-off. No vines or other plants will hang down from the roof and balconies ,climb from the ground, or grow in the lawn east of the building.

## Feedback Comments—Building Form and Architecture

As you respond, consider the following questions:

- Is the proposed architecture consistent with the [Special Land Use Study](#)?
- Is the proposed recreation of historic elements sufficient? Or should the original sign and lobby structures be preserved?

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-1		SPRC Member	I will want to know more about challenges to preserving the lobby and sign. Preservation of those was a major consideration for the Special GLup Study recommendations. The architecture otherwise isn't objectionable. But it could be better. The sawtooth setbacks are good and the horizontal dark, light, dark banding is effective.
CM-2		Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	Please try to keep and incorporate the original signage. It may not be possible to recreate the original lobby - but something similar would be appropriate. Are the immediate neighbors now more comfortable with the proposed layout?
CM-3		Other	I can see no "preservation" of any historic elements under the current plan. Why is that? Does that truly comply with the Special Land Use Study? If not, why not? Preservation of historic architecture is purportedly one of the county's objectives as expressed in the county's Comprehensive Plan, not just in the Special Land Use Study. Why have these objectives if the county has no true interest in meeting them?
CM-4		Other	Tear down everything. Why on earth would we want to preserve that ugly sign. The old building is an eyesore. ANYTHING would be better, as long as it's dense.
CM-5		Other	The building height seems too high. In particular, the top two floors seem out of place in this location. The building height should match the building across the street, especially since this building is on the south side of the street, significantly restricting light to the north side of street (and possibly affecting outdoor dining and other activities).
CM-6	Shelly A Coss	Other	Know that this structure will eliminate most of the sun for the adjacent existing apartments. The Mid Century idea is fine. But this design falls a tad short of that. Like the idea of keeping the lobby and the sign. EVEN IF IT COSTS THE DEVELOPER MORE.
CM-7		Other	it appears the developer has made a serious effort to honor the County Plan. While it is an element of the Plan I suggest that preserving the motel sign and lobby would likely detract from the project. There certainly is a case to be made for preserving significant historical elements when considering the reuse of a property, however the elements chosen in this case are not significant and would detract from the proposed design.
CM-8	Susan English	Other	Don't preserve the original sign and lobby structures; per applicant description, deterioration/warping too far advanced. Other than that, the scale of the proposed new building changes the proportional

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			relationship of those elements, so "preservation" gets lost. What's proposed—reflecting specific mid-century elements—feels a bit token, but I think it's fine, reasonably attractive.
CM-9		Other	It's fine
CM-10	Judith Desplechin	Other	Stay consistent with Special Land Use study
CM-11	Hannah Follweiler	Other	It is much nicer than what is there now.
CM-12	annie normand	Other	the mid century lobby is historic and should be preserved as well as the sign
CM-13		Other	I don't believe the original sign and lobby are worth preserving given the current condition. The new architectural design should evoke the original structure as a homage.
CM-14		Other	Completely brand new lobby.  From the air the building ia going to look very phallic.
CM-15		Other	Every developer says the architectural elements *cannot* be preserved. But obviously profit underlies all these decisions. The important mid-century lobby and sign should be preserved, as specified in the sGLUP unless an objective 3rd party deems it too difficult/impractical. The site is large, and the lobby is on the edge. It isn't impossible to keep it, and keeping it provides a much better anchor and gateway into the community.
CM-16		Other	Beautiful!
CM-17		Other	With such a large building footprint, the only impervious surfaces should be access into and out of the parking area. All other surrounding space should be pervious
CM-18		Other	Like the mixed use with retail on the bottom floor. Agree with the open space and mid-century modern architecture. Don't preserve the original sign and lobby structures.
CM-19		Other	Although it would have been ideal to preserve the facade and signage, it shouldn't hold up the project
CM-20		Other	The corner open space / plaza would be a great location for a water fountain for trail users, as well as seating! An outdoor cafe would be a natural fit if the retail were re-worked to abut the plaza instead of the residential lobby.
CM-21	James Seward	Other	The design looks quite aligned with the development across the street as well as the nearby older apartments. In my own opinion, the Days Inn has no historical value whatsoever and there is no

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			reason to keep any of it. There is an abundance of old roadside motels along route 310 going south in MD if people want to see them. The developers are building in elements that are a nod to the original building, which is more than sufficient.
CM-22		Other	The corner open space / plaza would be a great location for a water fountain for trail users, as well as seating! An outdoor cafe would be a natural fit if the retail were re-worked to abut the plaza instead of the residential lobby.
CM-23		Other	Love the historical throwback to the hotel. Seating, water feature, outdoor cafe for trail users would be a draw if retail was around plaza and not just in lobby.
CM-24		Other	<p>The proposed land use and ground floor uses are not consistent with the Special Land Use study, which recommends biophilia (green roof, living nature walls, native plants).</p> <p>While there are a few small plant beds on the structure, there is no "green roof". The structure instead contains much synthetic turf and wood decking, which will create stormwater run-off. No vines or other plants will hang down from the roof and balconies ,climb from the ground, or grow in the lawn east of the building.</p>
CM-25		Other	<p>No. The Special Land Use Study recommends preservation for existing vintage sign. The applicant will not preserve the sign, but will only replace it. This is unsatisfactory. The sign must be preserved on-site.</p> <p>The Land Use Study states that architecture should honor mid-century and/or adjacent historic Washington- Lee apartments. In contrast, the proposed building form and architecture bear little or no resemblance to mid-century architecture or adjacent apartments. This is unsatisfactory.</p>

## Feedback Comments—Open Space

As you respond, consider the following questions:

- Are there opportunities to improve the site landscaping, especially in regard to fulfilling the intent of the study document for native plants, pollinators, and screening from neighboring properties?
- Does the proposed development sufficiently connect with nature?

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-1	Chris Slatt	SPRC Member	The corner open space would be a great location for a water fountain for trail users!
CM-2		SPRC Member	Minimize turf. The change of 2 plaza to 1 public open space is a positive change.
CM-3		Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	Need more details on the proposed "dog space" noted in the applicant's presentation slides. Will it meet the needs of dog owners in the new buildings; can neighbors also use it? (1) The NE corner park is a nice addition for the site and for the community - please enhance (seating, sculpture/water, etc.) (5) SE Corner: Add features: benches, an attractive drinking fountain for trail users, interesting plants. (6) Trail - width sufficient to prevent bike-ped conflict? expand protection/length
CM-4		Other	It's pretty small space on a very busy and congested road. It's not suitable for pollinators, since they are highly likely to end up splatted on vehicle windshields. It's like setting up a killing zone to attract hapless pollinators. Why wasn't this green space established next to the green space adjacent to the apartment buildings next door? It would be a more sheltered spot away from heavy vehicular traffic. This plan shows that Arlington doesn't value nature, doesn't value real green space.
CM-5		Other	It's pretty small space on a very busy and congested road. It's not suitable for pollinators, since they are highly likely to end up splatted on vehicle windshields. It's like setting up a killing zone to attract hapless pollinators. Why wasn't this green space established next to the green space adjacent to the apartment buildings next door? It would be a more sheltered spot away from heavy vehicular traffic. This plan shows that Arlington doesn't value nature, doesn't value real green space.
CM-6		Other	New trees are good. Why not make the Public Open Space filled with trees?
CM-7		Other	I am concerned that the building is very large and does not allow easy passage from Wayne St to Arlington Blvd on the south side. Additionally because the building is so tall, it is likely that the trees

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			along Pershing may not survive due to insufficient sunlight. Again, it feels the building would better serve the nature component if it was two stories lower.
CM-8	Shelly A Coss	Other	Like this idea. Eliminate the developer's idea of car access from Pershing. It is already a boondoggle there, traffic wise.
CM-9	Susan English	Other	Overall proposed landscaping is an improvement. If possible, add more plantings, biophilic elements at the southern end of the property. Per SUSMO's suggestion, a water fountain, bench, and Fixit station at the corner plaza would be great for trail users. Protect the mature trees in the berm between the trail and Rt. 50 west during construction. Extending trail improvements west would be a good add on.
CM-10	Judith Desplechin	Other	1,6,8
CM-11	Hannah Follweiler	Other	It looks beautiful
CM-12		Other	1 could be a community garden with a plot lottery.  2 should be a cobble or rough brick driveway near the apron to ensure that pedestrians aren't hurt by cars driving too fast into the garage. A steep apron might also encourage proper speed. Speed bumps could work too, but are uglier than brick and cobbles.
CM-13		Other	More than sufficient open space. Great balance.
CM-14		Other	the ratio of concrete to green space is definitely not aligned with the Lyon Park community, but there are several substantial sections of green and trees that (if properly maintained) will be an improvement over the current site.
CM-15	jeanne briskin	Other	More open space , less land coverage needed. More lawn , less paving  Insuffienct connection with nature- there is almost none. Trees in such a paved area doomed to short life.
CM-16		Other	There is far more surface parking on this plan than expected. All parking (except 1-2 Hour Retail spots) should be underground
CM-17		Other	Maximize open space and consider including a pull up bar or some sort of resilient outdoor workout equipment. Maximize use of native plants and pollinators.
CM-18		Other	Love all the green space

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-19		Other	The "shared driveway/plaza" is a joke if considered open space. Woul much prefer to see an increase in the actual public space (item 1) which would benefit residents and the local community more.
CM-20		Other	The corner open space / plaza would be a great location for a water fountain for trail users, as well as seating! An outdoor cafe would be a natural fit if the retail were re-worked to abut the plaza instead of the residential lobby.
CM-21	epotter	Other	Love the idea of the corner space being used as a mobility hub-- would that potentially include a water fountain? This trail improvement here is great, and being at the top of the hill which has quite a few runners and people biking, could be lovely in what's otherwise a sort of deadspace as far as public amenities. And love any big shade trees, of course. The trail along Arlington Blvd looks much improved-- please take a look at the Pershing intersection to make sure connectivity is easy to that road and across 50 to the other side of the trail.
CM-22	James Seward	Other	More open park space and a playground would be ideal. There is no public playground between 10th / Route 50 / Washington Blvd. in Lyon Park and the County missed the opportunity to do that with the 2202 Pershing Drive development. This would be a huge benefit to the community and any residents with children in the ARVA. Otherwise, it seems the developer is planning to include as much green space and trees as possible. That said, the plan if it goes forward should be monitored and enforced.
CM-23		Other	Need more details on the proposed "dog space" noted in the applicant's presentation slides. Will it meet the needs of dog owners in the new buildings; can neighbors also use it? (1) The NE corner park is a nice addition for the site and for the community - please enhance (seating, sculpture/water, etc.) (5) SE Corner: Add features: benches, an attractive drinking fountain for trail users, interesting plants.
CM-24		Other	The corner open space / plaza would be a great location for a water fountain for trail users, as well as seating! An outdoor cafe would be a natural fit if the retail were re-worked to abut the plaza instead of the residential lobby
CM-25		Other	Paint is not protection for trail users - concrete curbs would be best. Consider the various types of bikes - cargo, children's bikes, trailers, etc and how they will turn on and off trail. Bike parking should accommodate various types of bikes for the residents. Consider safe lighting for trail.
CM-26		Other	Does not connect with nature. Structure has a few small plant beds, but no "green roof". Too much synthetic turf and wood decking, creating stormwater run-off. Expand bioretention areas. Add vines hanging down from the roof and balconies and climbing from ground. Replace the lawn between the building and the Arlington Blvd bike trail with shrubs, ground covers and perennials. Plant Common Milkweed ( <i>Asclepias syriaca</i> ) and other native plants that support pollinators on the roof and ground



Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			level.
CM-27		Other	A water-fountain is needed. The nearest water-fountain is very far away: Rocky Run Park and Butter Holmes park.

## Feedback Comments—Transportation and Parking

As you respond, consider the following questions:

- Should above-grade parking be eliminated to improve site design, even though it would likely reduce the number of parking spaces?
- Does the site have enough parking? Too much?
- How can the shared street be improved to better connect it with nature?

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-1	Chris Slatt	SPRC Member	Reduce the provided parking by eliminating the above-grade parking. The protection for the bike lane should be concrete curbs, not painted asphalt & plastic sticks. Paint is not protection.
CM-2		SPRC Member	I want to know more about the above grade parking such as where it is and better renderings of it. The parking ratio seems a bit high but the site isn't particularly transit rich even though it has bus access. The subway is a long uphill walk.
CM-3		Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	If at all possible bring parking underground. Where are PUDO spaces, especially if parking is reduced. Bike rental should be onsite. I support SUSMO recommendations for building bike facilities/trail as well.
CM-4		Other	Given distance from Metro, site is underparked. Unclear how reducing the few above-grade spaces would "improve" site design. If these are retail spaces and you eliminate them, you can forget any retail outlet's being able to make a go of it on this site. Insufficient # of loading/unloading spaces, given the # of units. Unclear whether road/drive geometry will permit retail delivery trucks and large moving vans movement to access site or whether loading dock is adequate in size or positioning.
CM-5		Other	Above grade parking should be minimized, although some spots should be available for quick pick-ups and drop offs. The more shade trees that are planted and taken care of over time so they don't die, the better.
CM-6	Shelly A Coss	Other	0.8 spaces per is as LOW as the parking ought to be. The developer should just dig DEEPER (if reasonable) to create at least one space per residential unit (which should be labeled).
CM-7		Other	The developer has proposed an attractive response to the plan
CM-8		Other	There appears to be the opportunity for more trees along the new alley.
CM-9		Other	Above ground parking would be great for encouraging access to the ground-floor retail - especially for quick trips to drop off/pick up.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-10	Susan English	Other	I'd prefer parking be below grade for building appearance; less parking is generally better if enough residents have other workable modes, but....I don't know how much parking is necessary for the project to be viable. Follow through on details of landscape/plantings for shared street. Maintenance of landscaping is the aspect that will make more difference in the long run.
CM-11	Judith Desplechin	Other	All parking should be below ground
CM-12	Hannah Follweiler	Other	More bike parking please but everything else looks good.
CM-13	annie normand	Other	parking should be underground, and there are not enough parking spaces.
CM-14		Other	Parking needs to be at or above the 1.125 spots/unit called for by the county, not the 0.8 spots/unit proposed and located underground. I live around the corner and there is already too much spillover parking on the street from nearby apts. Every resident has at least one car here since covid. Traffic circulation should only allow turning right when leaving the facility whether from Wayne or Pershing and the mews should only allow auto access to the garage and thru-block road.
CM-15		Other	The only above grade parking spots should be 15min spots for food/package delivery, rideshare, and hotel registration.  Bikeshare is extremely close providing access to nearby metros. Extending the Pershing bike lane to Clarendon would facilitate a multimodal network and prevent the need for most cars.
CM-16		Other	Absolutely do not reduce parking by eliminating above ground parking! Like it or not we ALL have cars.
CM-17		Other	The parking should be located below-grade as specified in the sGLUP. above ground parking is inappropriate and negatively impacts the character of the site.
CM-18		Other	The parking should be located below-grade as specified in the sGLUP. above ground parking is inappropriate and negatively impacts the character of the site.  The total number of parking spaces should be at the 1.125 ratio as specified. This is a mile from the metro and the neighboring apartment complex has substantial overflow parking issues even with 1:1 parking ratio. This project should help ameliorate this problem, not worsen it. Developer profit should not be the driving factor.
CM-19		Other	Eliminate above-grade parking to encourage biking, take buses/public transportation, and lessen congestion. Are you providing any level 2 charging stations for electric cars that are parked on this property? To be ready for the near future, this (and all projects going forward) should have EV

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			charging in parking spaces and also be EV-charging ready so that when the time comes to add more charging, it will not be as expensive since the infrastructure will be in place
CM-20		Other	Residential parking should be entirely underground. We're excited for this development because it's supposed to remove the "old surface parking" complex. There needs to be sufficient parking, but below grade. 1:1 ratio should not be lowered. Our neighborhood near that site is already flooded with overflow cars from apartments. Route 50 adjacent complexes draw car commuters. Be realistic, or provide solid evidence that the parking spaces can't be used if built to sGLUP specifications.
CM-21	jeanne briskin	Other	Reduce occupancy by making the building smaller and move parking underground to have a better ratio of occupants to parking spaces.
CM-22		Other	Parking should meet the county code of 1.25 slots per unit
CM-23		Other	Eliminate above-grade parking and install physically separated bike lanes to encourage bike commuting. Consider closing some streets to traffic entirely.
CM-24		Other	Parking seems ample
CM-25	Eric Larson	Other	I am concerned about parking. Not parking just for the new building but for the residents of Washington & Lee apartments that park in front of the Days Inn along Route 50 (Wainright road). Is the county planning to have a parking area for these cars or are these cars going to parking along N Barton St, N Bryan St, N 3rd St and N Cleveland St in our Lyon Park neighborhood. They will park their cars, truck, limo vans for a week or more in front our houses leaving us or visitors no parking.
CM-26			<p>Parking should be underground, not at ground level. In order to activate the street level at this important entrance to Arlington, we need a lively streetscape. At-grade parking should not be part of the plan except for retail parking and loading spots.</p> <p>Traffic circulation should only turn right upon exit from the building. NOT ENOUGH SPACES, please require the 1.125 or more, this is not metro adjacent. Steer traffic away from residential neighborhood ( e.g., on Wayne, not Barton).</p>
CM-27			This part of Lyon Park has safety issues already on Barton and Bryan from cars coming and going to the W-L apartments. Consider making 3rd St. N one way, or finding another way to force new traffic onto Wayne to prevent cut through.
CM-28			The protection for the bike lane should be concrete curbs, not painted asphalt & plastic sticks. Paint is not protection. Also please ensure an easy transition from the Pershing Dr bike lane to the Arlington Blvd Trail - the current turn looks tight for long-wheel-base bikes and bikes pulling trailers. Trail lighting is needed for safety. Resident bike parking should be able to accommodate all types of bikes -

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			not all bikes can fit in the stacking-style bike racks currently being shown.
CM-29			Above-grade parking should not be limited. The site should have at least one parking space per unit. The surrounding streets are already saturated with on-street parking. The development is at least a 30 minute walk to the metro, not feasible for many. One to two-bedroom units will generally house at least 2 adults, and at least one generally will have a car. Clarendon metro is at least a 30 minute walk for most people. Limited bus routes into DC don't meet many people's needs.
CM-30			The protection for the bike lane should be concrete curbs, not painted asphalt & plastic sticks. Paint is not protection. Also please ensure an easy transition from the Pershing Dr bike lane to the Arlington Blvd Trail - the current turn looks tight for long-wheel-base bikes and bikes pulling trailers. Trail lighting is needed for safety. Resident bike parking should be able to accommodate all types of bikes - not all bikes can fit in the stacking-style bike racks currently being shown for the r
CM-31			If at all possible bring parking underground. Where are PUDO spaces, especially if parking is reduced. Bike rental should be onsite. I support SUSMO recommendations for building bike facilities/trail as well.
CM-32	epotter		I'll always but in a plug for a physical barrier (like concrete or a curb) over plastic bollards-- it feels like the roadway has the space, too?
CM-33	James Seward		It seems the site has too few parking spaces for the number of units. It would be great to eliminate the above ground parking, but this comes with the tradeoff that there are likely too few spaces
CM-34			The site has too much parking. Automobiles will add congestion to Arlington Blvd., Pershing Drive and nearby streets. Replace the above grade parking with green space containing native shrubs, ground covers and perennials that support pollinators. Include Common Milkweed ( <i>Asclepias syrica</i> ), which feeds Monarch butterfly caterpillars. Improve the shared street to better connect with nature by adding these plants.
CM-35			Protected bike lane is needed on both sides of Pershing Ave. Pedestrians and bikes have a hard time traversing Pershing drive with the high speeds cars travel down Pershing Drive. The 25mph limit is not enforced.
CM-36			Too much parking; not enough space for cyclists and pedestrians on the multi-use trail. The trail needs to be protected with concrete Jersey barriers.

## Feedback Comments—Sustainability

As you respond, consider the following questions:

- Is LEED Gold sufficient given the Special Land Use Study's emphasis on connections to nature?
- Are there sustainability strategies the developer should pursue other than LEED Gold?

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-1		Arlington County Board, Commission, or Committee member	Project should apply for current County sustainability guidelines - green buildings! Note that including better bike-ped facilities/trail helps promote sustainability.
CM-2		Other	There is nothing truly "natural" or "sustainable" in this plan. LEED certification program is bogus, giving developers lots more density for doing things they already were likely to do anyway. Redesigning the site to provide a larger, more unified green space sheltered from busy roads would be a step in the right direction.
CM-3		Other	Should be sustainable through its own merits, not through vouchers or offsets. Is that the case?
CM-4		Other	I think this is fine.
CM-5		Other	I do not care about LEED.

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-6	Susan English	Other	LEED Gold is good. Assuming Platinum is not financially possible.
CM-7	Judith Desplechin	Other	Include as much greenery as possible
CM-8		Other	Gold is insufficient. Leed platinum should be the expectation of all new construction to ensure that we do not worsen Arlington's flooding issues with more climate change
CM-9	jeanne briskin	Other	It is very poor. What about solar and green roof? Building need smaller footprint and volume. Will heating and cooling be provided by ground source heat pump? Should be Platinum
CM-10		Other	LEED Gold is more than sufficient. We aren't building skyscrapers. The benefit of Gold vs Platinum is negligible.
CM-11		Other	Pushing for Platinum is of course better for lots of reasons, but sGLUP doesn't mandate this, and handing out extra density to encourage this isn't a "green" solution. More cars, more sewage, more AC units running. That's not more green, nor more connected to nature. More green space, safer "shared street", proper maintenance of green features, etc. are all important. Less impermeable space would be even better.
CM-12		Other	
CM-13		Other	LEED Gold is a good goal.
CM-14		Other	While Platinum would be ideal, Gold is sufficient, this shouldn't hold up the project
CM-15	James Seward	Other	LEED Gold is impressive, but it seems that the County could have all new developments to LEED Platinum now and into the future to align with the County's climate goals. This is especially true given the County is the first LEED Platinum-certified county in the nation. The key strategies follow the LEED process, but also could involve more natural spaces in the design, including parks and increased tree cover. LEED Gold is excellent and the developer is to be commended. However, the County should push for all new developments to be LEED Platinum if it truly wants to meet its climate goals and maintain the LEED Platinum certification at the County level. This could be achieved by at least requiring exploration of the LEED Platinum certification by developers. The ARVA could be enhanced through increasing the park spaces and tree density on the site

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-16		Other	<p>LEED Gold is not sufficient. The project should achieve LEED Platinum to emphasize connections with nature.</p> <p>The project should also comply with the County Board's 2016 "Monarch Pledge" (<a href="https://www.arlingtonva.us/Government/Departments/County-Board/Board-Actions/Proclamations/Monarch-Pledge-Day-2016">https://www.arlingtonva.us/Government/Departments/County-Board/Board-Actions/Proclamations/Monarch-Pledge-Day-2016</a>). The Monarch Pledge recommends plantings of native plants that support pollinator populations. The Monarch Pledge specifies that plantings include milkweed, on which monarch caterpillars feed..</p>

### Feedback Comments—Other

Share any other comments you have about the proposed plan. A topic to consider:

- To build the proposed development, the developer needs to earn additional density by providing additional community benefits – such as public open space, public facilities, transportation improvements, and/or affordable housing. Which would you prioritize for this site?



Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
CM-1	Chris Slatt	SPRC Member	Suggest extending the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of the street and westward to Barton Street as an off-site transportation improvement to earn additional density. The existing median should provide sufficient space for the needed buffer.
CM-2		SPRC Member	On site affordable housing is the top priority
CM-3	Pat Findikoglu	Other	If Affordable units are negotiated for onsite, is it possible to get them to remain affordable for a long period? Maybe even 99 years like Barcrof. Something like 30 years is too short and we'd be better off using financial contributions for building permanent CAFs nearby.
CM-4		Other	Given significant distance from a Metro corridor and its "amenities," the proximity to a heavily traveled, major arterial (Rt. 50), the lack of on-site parking, poor site circulation, and the expensiveness of new construction, it is unlikely that these units will be leased soon — likely to become short-term rentals. Not a wise tradeoff for its significant impact on nearby neighbors or its contribution to the gridlock that will plague this already congested intersection (Rt. 50 & Pershing).
CM-5		Other	Public open space! I think especially with the bike path along Arlington Blvd, and with the increased number of permanent residents at this location, more green space is necessary.
CM-6	Shelly A Coss	Other	I like the idea of affordable. It will be still alot of money given that this is Arlington. I take is these are rentals? Or are they Condos?
CM-7		Other	A new bus stop for the corner of Pershing and Rt. 50 in both directions would be very beneficial.
CM-8	Susan English	Other	Affordable housing!!!! Great location for workforce housing.
CM-9	annie normand	Other	affordable housing should be in the building not at another location. otherwise the developer should not earn additional density. apartments should be for family and have more than one bedroom.
CM-10		Other	There should be a larger number of multi-bedroom units, especially the townhouse units, to support families. There is an over supply of one and two bedroom units in Arlington already.
CM-11		Other	Arlington boulevard would benefit from a street car with connection to Ballston metro via Glebe
CM-12		Other	Approve and move forward now!
CM-13		Other	affordable housing and open space
CM-14		Other	Traffic patterns need to be solidified in the building design. Specifically orienting the entrance on Wayne street (make angled, rather than perpendicular) to force traffic to be left-in and right-out. Funneling to/from Pershing and not to the neighborhood.
CM-15		Other	Traffic circulation is a big concern. This large complex is adjacent to narrow 3rd street and the limited-

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			access streets Barton and Bryan. These three streets have almost no sidewalks so many children bike/play in the street, and people exercise and walk dogs in the street. Building an exceptionally tall/dense building next to this quiet area mandates exceptional measures be taken to safeguard the quality of these streets. (parking AND circulation).
CM-16	jeanne briskin	Other	No additional density. Need to improve permitting and zoning requirements to build in community amenities as requirements rather using density (and reduced quality of life ) as a bribe to get them. Open space is highest priority. But not at the expense of greater density.
CM-17		Other	There needs to be ground level retail. The retail area is very small, especially considering how important and prominent of an entry into Arlington as 50-Pershing is.
CM-18		Other	The "need" for Arlington is family-sized apartments. These have not been addressed in this plan
CM-19		Other	Very glad to see Arlington take the housing shortage seriously
CM-20		Other	Please extend the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of the street and westward to Barton Street as an off-site transportation improvement to earn additional density. The existing median should provide sufficient space for the needed buffer. Also would be a worthy off-site transportation improvement to extend the improved trail further west (both the widening and the improved landscaping / shade trees).
CM-21		Other	Suggest extending the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of the street and westward to Barton Street as an off-site transportation improvement to earn additional density. The existing median should provide sufficient space for the needed buffer. Also would be a worthy off-site transportation improvement to extend the improved trail further west (both the widening and the improved landscaping / shade trees).
CM-22	James Seward	Other	I would strongly prioritize more public open space and public facilities, such as a playground, on the site. It would also be great if the entrance from Route 50 onto Pershing could be beautified (e.g., the median) through to Washington Blvd. This is the gateway to Lyon Park and it is not welcoming or well maintained. As a point to note, I am on the Executive Committee of the Lyon Park Civic Association.
CM-23		Other	Suggest extending the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of the street and westward to Barton Street as an off-site transportation improvement to earn additional density. The existing median should provide sufficient space for the needed buffer. Also would be a worthy off-site transportation improvement to extend the improved trail further west (both the widening and the improved landscaping / shade trees).
CM-24		Other	Suggest extending the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of the street and westward to

Number	Name	Connection to Project	Community Comments
			Barton Street as an off-site transportation improvement to earn additional density. The existing median should provide sufficient space for the needed buffer. Also would be a worthy off-site transportation improvement to extend the improved trail further west (both the widening and the improved landscaping / shade trees).
CM-25		Other	Extend the proposed protected bike lane to both sides of street and westward to Barton Street - provides additional density. Off-site improvements for multi-modal transportation to extend trail further west - widening and improved landscaping/shade trees.
CM-26		Other	Increase the size of the public open space in the northeast corner of the site. Add other public open spaces and green roof. Replace all lawns (including the lawn between the Arlington Blvd. bike trail and the building) with plantings of native shrubs, ground covers and perennials that support pollinators. Revise the Conceptual Landscape Plan in the 4.1 submission by adding lists identifying the species, numbers and locations of all shrubs, ground covers and perennials. The Plan lacks these.
CM-27		Other	Protect the bike lanes