



Shirlington Road Revitalization Study

Prepared by Matta Architects / The Lukmine Partnership, Inc.

For Arlington County Office of Economic Development

SHIRLINGTON ROAD REVITALIZATION STUDY

VISION REPORT

February 3, 2003

**Developed for the Arlington County Economic Development Department (AED)
By Matta Architects / The Lukmire Partnership, Inc.**

Shirlington Road Revitalization Study

Preface to the Attached Report

Preface prepared by:

- Shirlington Road Advisory Board;
- Arlington Economic Development; and the
- Department of Community Planning and Housing Development, Arlington County,
 - Office of Neighborhood Services and
 - Long Range Planning Division

The attached report “Shirlington Road Revitalization Study” summarizes the “Nauck Visioning” process undertaken by and in the local community in 2002. The report was written by Matta Architects/The Lukmire Partnership, Inc. and represents their compilation and best recollection of the activities, products and outcomes of the series of community planning workshops (“charrettes”) conducted during the course of 2002. As such, it is merely documentation of a community planning process.

This report should be viewed as a “point in time” diary and summary of the community’s activities and thinking about Shirlington Road and the architect’s interpretation of what happened. As such, it is neither a policy prescription nor a County “plan”. Instead, it should be viewed by local residents, property owners, businesses, County officials and staff, and other parties more as a background, memory “file” available for reference and context when reviewing and moving forward on refining and implementing the community’s vision for the future of Shirlington Road. It is a precedent to a full “plan”.

On Monday, April 7, 2003 the Nauck community, as represented by the Shirlington Road Revitalization Advisory Board and about 40 local citizens formally supported, by unanimous raised hand vote, a 10 point “Vision Framework” growing out of the earlier proceedings and activities described in the attached report. This “Vision Framework”, as approved by the community, is shown on the fold-out map immediately following.

Individual participants at one or more of the various charrettes described in this report may believe that in a particular sentence, paragraph, drawing or sketch, the architects may not have accurately and fully “captured” the subtlety or nuance of a particular comment or viewpoint expressed by such participant or even several together. The Shirlington Road Revitalization Advisory Board and the County have prepared a List of Comments/Questions which will be provided as an addendum to the Shirlington Road Revitalization Study. Any further comments can be incorporated into the “Nauck Village Center Action Plan” which will utilize the goals and objectives identified in the Shirlington Road Revitalization Study. The Nauck Village Center Action Plan process will involve the community in defining implementation strategies for revitalization of the Nauck Village Center and Shirlington Road area. A community forums webpage will also be established to provide opportunity for further citizen input.

<http://www.co.arlington.va.us/cphd/planning>

Reference	Advisory Board: General comments or suggested revisions to original text in quotes (“ ”), (original text in <i>italics</i>)	Staff Response
1. Page 5 Introduction	“Introduction is more of an Executive summary”	Editorial
2. Page 5	“Shirlington Road is a thoroughfare or boulevard, town square or main street. Mixed use of terminology confusing.”	Terminology is used here to describe the many different viewpoints of the character of Shirlington Road as it exists today and the potential for what it can be in the future.
3. Page 5 paragraph 2	<i>The history of Shirlington Road as the community is long and evolving:</i> “This sentence is confusing”	Typographical error, the statement should read – <i>The history of Shirlington Road <u>in</u> the community is long and evolving.</i>
4. Page 5 pph 2	<i>The street’s reputation as an outdoor drug market.</i> Suggested: “The street’s reputation as a place to hangout with drug trafficking” <i>remains an obstacle to...</i>	Editorial
5. Page 6 pph 1	<i>including family medical facilities :</i> Suggested “or social services to meet the needs of families”	The intent of family medical facilities is general and would include general services.
6. Page 6 pph 3 line 3	<i>Retail should be in support of the surrounding community</i> Suggested: “Retail should reflect services utilized by the surrounding community but attractive to bring in outside customers.”	Staff agrees that retail should be in support of the immediate and surrounding communities.
7. Page 7 pph 1 line 2	<i>Or a fierce desire to define their community as distinct and identifiable on its own merits</i> Suggested: “Or a fierce desire to preserve its rich and distinct history”	Editorial
8. Page 7 pph 1 line 4	<i>Without dominating the low scale character of this still healthy residential neighborhood.</i> Suggested: “Without dominating the neighborhood character of the existing neighborhood but preserving the history and improving the retail base”	Editorial

Reference	Advisory Board: General comments or suggested revisions to original text in quotes (“ ”), (original text in italics)	Staff Response
9. Page 7 pph 2	<i>A walking community Street</i> – “should be discussing what is on Shirlington Road.”	The intent is that Shirlington Road should provide safe pedestrian links to public and private facilities and residences in the area.
10. Page 8	“Interpretation of community aspirations should have been presented to the community for validation.”	The report is a documentation of the charrette process as it occurred and interpreted by it’s authors.
11. Page 9	“Study goals and objectives need more insight.”	On April 7, 2003 the Nauck Civic Association voted to accept revised Goals and Objectives of the Shirlington Road Revitalization Study.
12. Page 12	“Add the following to the list of Shirlington Road Existing Conditions community expressed issues: No community school Small community center Inadequate programs to meet the needs Failure to reach out to the community Use of school facility and fee for civic matters No policy or consistent guidelines”	These issues were not directly tied to this charrette process.
13. Page 13	“The community is not disinterested in retaining sources of employment in the current industrial use areas.”	Noted, this can be reflected in the final development plan.
14. Page 14	“Are we describing Nauck or Shirlington Road existing conditions?”	Describing Shirlington Road housing requires a discussion of the housing in that portion of Nauck.
15. Page 14	<i>The challenge will be to successfully introduce new and likely higher density development:</i> “Higher density is not the goal of the community.”	Likely does not mean it will definitely happen. Density is implied in the building heights and uses as reflected in the approved vision.
16. Page 15	“Can answers and more detail be found in affordable housing report?”	Census data and the County Consolidated Plan are the best resources for any additional information on affordable housing.

Reference	Advisory Board: General comments or suggested revisions to original text in quotes (“ ”), (original text in italics)	Staff Response
17. Page 17	“No bus transportation within Nauck via bus, buses on Glebe Road, Walter Reed?”	Statement of existing bus lines. Further study on accessing more of the Nauck Community is being conducted by the Department of Public Works Transportation Section.
18. Page 18	“The need for garages was discussed and the community provided what they would accept – Garages at the end of heavy commercial areas for parking designed to fit in. This does not describe what is in the scheme.”	The three original schemes may treat parking differently but maintain the central concept of a community garage.
19. Page 18	“Macedonia and Mount Zion parking issues discussed – overflow impacts”	The church parking is a good example for potential dual use of future parking facilities to serve different uses at different times.
20. Page 19	“Instead of Black History Museum annex and ice skating rink these should be referred to as community/public facilities”	Agreed, those are two examples of potential community/public facilities.
21. Page 19	“Drew Park should be included.”	Agreed, there is now a park design for the Drew School frontage along Kenmore including a tot lot and multi-purpose play area.
22. Page 20	“Something should identify (picture or diagram) with quadrants labeled.”	Future documents will illustrate the four quadrants and associated building heights discussed.
23. Page 21	“How do townhouses increase the housing density over a four story apartment building?”	It is conceivable that a form of townhouse development with structured parking may have a higher density than the existing building.
24. Page 21	“Detail the discussion about different types of retail and residential units: retail/residential, townhouse, single family, possible examples; Avalon Bay, Bowmans Hill, Kentlands.”	This paragraph synthesizes the discussion held on different types of housing including those mentioned.
25. Page 22	“This is set aside by the County as a proposed park.”	Plans have been developed by PRCR for a park along the Drew School Kenmore Street frontage

Reference	Advisory Board: General comments or suggested revisions to original text in quotes (“ ”), (original text in italics)	Staff Response
26. Page 23	“Why doesn’t this discussion of Shirlington Road refer to the Transportation Study, proposed new road, or the Renaissance Center Project .”	At the time of the charrette, the Transportation Study was not ready for distribution to the public. The Renaissance Center Project was still under review as a development proposal.
27. Page 23	“What does term “Land takes” mean?”	Would require acquisition of several properties.
28. Page 28	“What is impact of rezoning of C-2 land?”	The primary impact of the proposed C-2 changes is exclusion of residential uses.
29. Page 38	<i>This study recommends:</i> “Is this the developers recommendation? Should this be consensus of the community?”	This infers the results of the charrette process indicate the community preference for a new town square.
30. Page 38	<i>Annex to the Black History Museum –</i> “What is reference here?”	This is mentioned as a potential use, circumstances may or may not lend themselves to this exact use on this site.
31. Page 38	<i>Development of the Drew School lower site for building rather than park, transferring the active park space to the Town Square –</i> “What is this based on?”	Based on the idea of a Town Square with active recreation would serve more of a focal point surrounded by buildings to frame it.
32. Page 40	8-12 ft sidewalks each side. Page 23 recommends 20’ sidewalks.”	A 20’ sidewalk width was considered in one of the potential schemes. The 8-12 ft. is the Final Recommendation.
33. Page 54	<i>Designation as a Revitalization Area:</i> “Why, what are the advantages and disadvantages”	Designation as a Revitalization Area would allow certain land use incentives to be applied to the area as a whole. It also gives a boundary and identity to the area that is being emphasized for revitalization.
34. Page 55	<i>Potential Economic Incentives/Tools:</i> “Would like more incentives for existing businesses; renovation money, organizing and support, education.”	There are a number of incentives available. These will be identified as potential implementation strategies are defined.
35. Page 56	<i>IX. Transportation and Traffic Study:</i> “Why hasn’t the community had a chance to review?”	Subsequent to the compilation of the Revitalization Study, the Transportation Study was released for community review.

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction**
- II. Executive Summary**
- III. Shirlington Road - Existing Conditions**
 - Street Network**
 - Community Facilities**
 - Industrial**
 - Housing Types**
 - 2000 Census - Tract 1030**
 - Transportation**
- IV. Description of Initial Schemes**
 - Off-street Parking**
 - Four Corner Scheme 1**
 - Scheme 2**
 - Scheme 3**
 - Conclusions**
- V. Description of Refined Schemes**
 - Refined Scheme 1**
 - Refined Scheme 2**
 - Refined Scheme 3**
 - Conclusions on the Refined Schemes**
- VI. Final Recommendations**
 - A New Town Square**
 - Scale Of The Street**

**Building Density
Boulevard On Shirlington Road
Future Of Industrial Sites
Description Of A Street**

Color Illustrations (figures 1 through 9, plus overall site plan)

**VII. Economic / Demographic Analysis
(prepared by Arlington Economic Development Department)**

**VIII. Appendix A
Notes from Charrette #1
Notes from Charrette #2
Notes from Charrette #4**

Credits

This report was developed on contract for Arlington County Economic Development Department by Matta Architects and The Lukmire Partnership, Inc. Arlington County's Office of Neighborhood Planning (Department of Community Planning and Housing Development) played an important role in helping organize local community input and participation.

Design Team: Charles Matta, AIA, William E. Evans, AIA, Daniel R. Bairley, AIA, Omeima Khidir & Benjamin Rosales

This report and illustrations copyright by The Lukmire Partnership, Inc., 2002
Cover illustration copyright Daniel R. Bairley, AIA, 2002

Acknowledgements

Thanks are extended to all of the people who participated in the success of the community charrettes: Jesse Bannes, Gladys Barnes, Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Beidleman, Gene Befit, Dana M. Bell, Bettie & Thomas Bellomy, Patricia Brown, Earling Bynum, Robert E. Capper, Sharon Christopher, Portia Clark, Audrey Coachman, Jacqueline Coachman, Grace Collins, Sandra Corder, H.W. Corley, Dan Cruz, Andi Cullins, Millie Estes, Annie Frye, Brigid Gillespie, William H. Gray, Carolyn Hairston, Permus Hall, Yvonne Hawkins, Pat Hennigham, Cornelia B. Hill, Donnie Hill, Jacqueline Hill, C.C. Jenkins, Gail Kohn, Georgette Knuckles, Steve Larson, Lurt Lazor, Robert McGregor Jr., Robert L. Reed, Wanda Richardson, Cathy A. Robinson, John Robinson, Frances Sellers, Renee Siclberry, Denise Smith, Thomas Stewart, Mary Still, Alphres O. Taylor Jr., Delores Taylor, Beatrice Thompson, Marie Tillander, Linda Turner, Ben Walker Jr., Kevin Welch, Katie Whiltensburg, Joshua Whittenburg, Bob Winkler, Janis Wood and Eugene Young

Thanks and appreciation are also extended to the leaders and community members who graciously invited us into their community and in several instances into their homes to gain insight into the aspirations and goals of the Nauck community.