



**WALSH COLUCCI  
LUBELEY & WALSH PC**

M. Catharine Puskar  
(703) 528-4700 Ext. 5413  
[cpuskar@thelandlawyers.com](mailto:cpuskar@thelandlawyers.com)

July 21, 2017

**Via Email Only**

Maya Contreras  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
[maya.contreras@alexandriava.gov](mailto:maya.contreras@alexandriava.gov)

Re: DSUP#2016-0044  
Church of the Resurrection – Concept III Review

Dear Ms. Contreras,

Thank you for forwarding staff's comments regarding review of the Concept III submission for the AHC/Church of the Resurrection development proposal. Once again, Goodwin House appreciates the thorough review of the Concept III submission by staff. However, Goodwin House remains concerned about many of the same items discussed in its prior letter, dated June 9, 2017 and has some additional feedback based on resident concerns raised in response to the Applicant team's presentation to the residents at Goodwin House on July 19<sup>th</sup>:

- **ACCESS TO PRIVATE ROADWAY:** The Applicant's Concept III plan reflects a grasscrete (or similar) area and mountable curb at the entrance to the upper parking lot, with improvements on Goodwin House's property, and retention of emergency vehicle access from Goodwin House's private road. A mountable curb is not a sufficient barrier to preclude vehicles from entering the parking lot at this location. In addition, Goodwin House requests that emergency vehicles serving the Applicant's property access the existing church parking lot via the new proposed drive aisle consistent with staff Comment 52. Finally, Goodwin House has not authorized any construction or temporary construction easements by the Applicant on Goodwin House property.
- **PARKING:** Consistent with its comments regarding the Concept II submission, Goodwin House remains very concerned about the amount of parking provided, as well as the operational details and circulation associated with the proposed parking. Unfortunately, none of these concerns were addressed in Concept III.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

703 528 4700 ■ [WWW.THELANDLAWYERS.COM](http://WWW.THELANDLAWYERS.COM)  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD. ■ SUITE 1300 ■ ARLINGTON, VA 22201-3359

LOUDOUN 703 737 3633 ■ WOODBRIDGE 703 680 4664

- **CHURCH PARKING:** Instead of reducing the amount of seats in the church or increasing the amount of parking serving the church to address Goodwin House concerns, the Applicant has further exacerbated the issue by increasing the number of potential seats in the church from 105 to 140 and is requesting a parking reduction for tandem spaces in the church parking lot. In response to questions at the Goodwin House resident meeting, Ms. Belser stated that there are currently 80-100 attendees at their Sunday services, that they are towing Goodwin House cars to maintain parking for the needs of the church, and that they “can make provisions for offsite parking” in the future. Based on this information and Goodwin House’s observations, Goodwin House maintains that the proposed parking is not sufficient to meet the current demand, let alone allow for future growth. The proposed parking plan does not account for overlap of parishioners in between services, with some enjoying coffee hour, Sunday school or adult education, while others are arriving for the next service. It does not explain where the proposed offsite parking will be located or how it will be managed. It does not explain why the 81 space parking lot is necessary to accommodate church needs today, but 22 spaces will be sufficient for the same or greater number of parishioners in the future. (Goodwin House does not count the tandem spaces as no information has been provided regarding how those spaces will be managed and utilized). Goodwin House looks forward to reviewing the additional information requested by staff in Comment 21 and requests that additional parking be provided to serve the church or that the number of seats within the church be reduced.

The layout of the church parking lot remains very tight and the functionality of the on street spaces and upper parking lot has not been proven. Goodwin House looks forward to reviewing the information provided in response to staff Comment 25, but repeats the questions included in its June 9th letter responding to Concept II, as those questions were not addressed in the Concept III Plan: How will cars maneuver in and out of the tandem spaces at the end of the parking lot or from the spaces adjacent to Goodwin House’s private roadway with no area provided to facilitate pulling out of the spaces? (In fact, the turning movements provided in Concept III show the vehicle encroaching into the space across the aisle when backing out of the opposite parking space.) How do cars parked on the parallel roadway turn around and get back to Fillmore Ave, especially when the upper lot is full? How do the tandem spaces work from an operational standpoint to ensure use of the innermost space and ability to get out of the space when the driver is ready to leave if blocked in?

- **RESIDENTIAL PARKING:** The Concept III submission included the required parking layout, but the turning movements provided with that

submission reveal that the proposed layout of the garage is not adequate as turning movements are tight in the garage. At the Goodwin House resident meeting, AHC indicated that it anticipated between 113-117 units with 250 – 275 residents in those units and also discussed partnerships and programs they have provided at other properties in their portfolio as a community benefit. Goodwin House maintains that 82 parking spaces are not sufficient to meet the demand for residents, employees and their visitors. In addition, Goodwin House would like to know what programs are proposed for this building, as they will require additional staffing beyond property management/maintenance, which will further compound anticipated parking problems.

- **ARCHITECTURE:** The staff report for the recently opened Goodwin House Center for Excellence/new Health Care Center (DSUP 2014-0012) states “the applicant has worked closely with staff to develop the exterior architecture of this project into a high quality, well-detailed building that fits comfortably in its space, relates well to surrounding structures in both scale and material, and yet includes strong contemporary features and details....The materials: two colors of brick, cast stone, dark metal and glass, are simple and durable, as is appropriate for this project.” Unfortunately, Goodwin House does not see any evidence in the architectural design submitted with Concept III that the Applicant intends to adhere to the same standards. The design and materials of the proposed residential building are not high quality or well detailed and the building neither fits comfortably in its space nor relates well to surrounding structures in either scale or material. Goodwin House requests that the same attention to building design and materials requested by staff in its Comments 3-15 relating to North Beauregard, the corner of Fillmore, and general architecture be extended and incorporated into the facades facing Goodwin House along Fillmore Avenue as well.

AHC and its architect presented a number of projects and award winning designs at the Goodwin House resident meeting as evidence of their focus on “design excellence” and ability to produce a high quality product. This project does not represent the design excellence and quality exhibited in AHC’s other projects constructed over the last 10 years, which include a significant amount of masonry and attention to architectural detail. Instead, the proposed project includes a significant amount of fiber cement, blank walls and garage vents at the pedestrian level, brightly colored panels that have no relationship to their surroundings and does not represent the attention to detail reflected in the Applicant’s other award winning projects.

This building will be the front door to Goodwin House and will be very prominent from N. Beauregard Street, Fillmore Avenue and Goodwin House. Goodwin House expects the City to hold the Applicant to the same high standards to which it held Goodwin House in its recent approvals and reiterates the need for significant

revisions to ensure the compatibility and durability of the building, which stands to be in place for over 60 years.

- **INFRASTRUCTURE:**

- **8” Waterline Relocation:** As stated in a prior email, Goodwin House has no obligation nor does it intend to relocate the existing 8” waterline that has been in place and serving Goodwin House since the 1960’s. To the extent that the waterline needs to be relocated, the Applicant will need to do so. The current note on the plan, which states “potential 8” waterline relocation (final disposition to be determined at the time of final site plan)” should be removed and the relocation should be shown as just that, a relocation, as is typically done, when necessary, during new construction.
- **Undergrounding:** Concept III continues to show the overhead utilities remaining along N. Beauregard Street, despite staff comments and CDD Condition #16 requiring undergrounding. While Goodwin House appreciates staff’s repeated comments that these utilities need to be undergrounded, Goodwin House wants to be on record that, to the extent that the Applicant is afforded relief from this requirement, Goodwin House will expect the same relief when it moves forward with Phase II of its project along N. Beauregard Street.

While Goodwin House appreciates the need for affordable housing in the City and acknowledges the development of an affordable housing project on the Church of the Resurrection property, Goodwin House, and many of its residents, questions the size of the project, the design of the project, the number of residents that will be located in the building, the amount of parking provided and the resultant traffic impacts. A resident, summing up the comments of many, stated that the building is “too dense, has too many people, and too little parking” and asked whether the project could be reduced from the stated 113 – 117 units to less than 100 units to address concerns while still achieving the mission for affordable housing. Unfortunately, the immediate response from the Applicant team was “no, because the project wouldn’t throw off enough money to pay for the new church.”

According to AHC’s website, no other new construction project developed by AHC in Virginia within the last 10 years has more than 94 units. A similarly sized project would be appropriate in this location. Goodwin House requests that the number of units within the building be reduced to less than 100 units and that the existing amount of parking be increased to accurately reflect anticipated demand.

As acknowledged by the Applicant’s response at the resident meeting, the size and design of this project is being driven by economics, not good planning or design. As a result, Goodwin House is being asked to accept an oversized project on an undersized and

difficult site because the Applicant did not have a realistic pro forma entering into the deal. While Goodwin House understands that the City is a financial partner in this project (as mentioned more than once by the Applicant at the resident meeting) and has a commitment to create more dedicated affordable units, the City cannot, and should not, accept an affordable housing project that falls far short of the standards expected of any other development in the City. The proposed project, in its current state, is not acceptable. Unless the Applicant makes some meaningful changes to address the repeated concerns stated by Goodwin House over the last two years, as well as staff comments contained in their most recent July 7<sup>th</sup> Concept review letter, Goodwin House will not be in a position to support the project and cannot commit to granting construction easements associated with the proposed development.

Very truly yours,

WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY & WALSH, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "M. Catharine Puskar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

M. Catharine Puskar

cc: Mark Jinks  
Rob Kerns  
Sara Brandt-Vorel  
Helen McIlvaine  
Shanna Austin  
Beauregard Design Advisory Committee  
The Reverend Jo Belser  
Kat Turner  
Duncan Blair  
John Welsh  
The Rev. Deacon Edward Jones  
Kathy Anderson  
Chip Calloway