



**North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan Update**  
**Advisory Group Meeting #3 June 6, 2016**  
**Verbal Comments on Concept Options (AG and Public)**  
**Draft 6.10.16**

**Monday, June 6, 2016 | 7:00-9:30PM | Charles Houston Recreation Center**

*After members of the Advisory Group and community participated in the dot/post-it note exercise, they returned to the larger group to give additional feedback, summarized below.*

**Advisory Group**

Harris: BRT is a good separation for the park; likes the BRT closer to the metro plaza. Also likes the idea of the larger park, but is concerned about who will maintain it. She is also concerned about whether there will be parking next to the park for visitors. She likes the metro landing closer to the station even if it means crossing Potomac Avenue because the path to the Metro is clearer. She likes the differently sized blocks but does not like the retail street ending in the parking garage on the northern end as she thinks it will be a safety issue.

Jones: Likes the medians in Potomac Avenue for pedestrian refuge. He wants the opportunity to close the retail street for events. He thinks that a lot can be done to Potomac Avenue to make it more pedestrian friendly, as Arlington has done at S. Hayes Street next to Pentagon City Mall.

Appleby: Prefers Study Area C Option 2 generally with the addition of the street through the north building. She does not particularly like the idea of Potomac Avenue on the east side of the project, nor does she like the Metro landing located to the east of Potomac Avenue, she wants it to land in the middle of the project. She thinks that Metro will create a good place for ridership as well as fostering office tenants/rents. She is not particularly fond of the straight Potomac Avenue and does not think that the angle at the south will slow traffic. She thinks that additional open space in the park is a good thing.

Jones: Does not think that the above grade parking structure should be located next to metro – cars do not pay rent – garage should be more centrally located within Phase I.

Hendrickson: In favor of keeping Potomac Avenue in its existing location (to the west of Phase I). He said that in 1999 when they were first thinking about Potomac Avenue, they were thinking about it as a way to push traffic through the City, not as a pedestrian-oriented street. He thinks that locating the BRT in a more central location within NPY is good and that Potomac Avenue was always intended to be a sort of “in-between” transit system. He thinks that the 2010 Plan for the Metro Square Park was good and that he does not feel that the proposals have provided any clarity on how the Metro Plaza will be treated or how the landing will be solved. He thinks that the metro landing should be located north of the office building and that they should continue to look at the southern end of the project. He likes

the definition of the plaza in Option 1 but thinks that definition should be applied to locating the landing between the buildings in Option 2.

Stover: Thinks the angled street through the north building is important. She wants to keep Potomac Avenue along the park because she is a driver and likes the ability to drive through as a nice alternative to Route 1 and she does not see people speeding. However she sees how Option 2 provides better circulation for the school site and better access to the park. She said that regardless the park road should be 2-way and have parking. She likes the width of the park in Option 2 and that she understands the thoroughfare concept Koenig mentioned earlier but thinks that it should be more than just a bike path. She thinks it will be beneficial for Phase I to have the Metro landing north of the office building, for tenants and riders to arrive in a “place,” not a parking garage.

Frederick: The fundamental issue of this plan is solving the Metro landing. He thinks that Option 1 Potomac Avenue is more suburban and that Option 2 Potomac Avenue will have tall buildings lining it eventually, which will naturally slow traffic down. He agrees with many of the comments made and likes the angled street in Study Area A, but that getting Metro in the right location is the primary issue.

Peter: Thinks that this portion of the park should be different from the portion in South Potomac Yard. He said the small park road is a buffer but allows for good integration between Phase I and the park. He said the key is to get the Metro landing right and that the north building needs the angled road and the south building should include the underground parking configuration.

Juster: Thinks the Option 2 Potomac Avenue configuration is better, there is better access for the school, a larger park, and that the overall variable width of the park is good. He said he thinks the current complaint with Potomac Yard Park is the lack of variety in activities. He also thinks the north building needs the angled road.

Erdle: The Metro landing should be in a plaza and that he does not think the north end parking deck needs to be wrapped.

Koenig: Thinks Option 1 is better for Metro arrival and for the park delineation. He thinks that the Option 1 Potomac Avenue does not preclude the school site from having adequate access to parks as it would be closer to Crescent Park, which was the park the 2010 Plan originally intended for school use.

#### **Community Members:**

1. Option 2 creates a more intimate setting for Phase I. There are few occasions to preserve green space in urban environments; Option 2 does a better job of preserving open space.
2. Prefer the Metro landing north of the office building; Potomac Avenue in Option 1 on the east side of the development feels suburban. The 2010 Plan anticipated Four Mile Run Park would serve as the major open space. She likes the angled road with

retail at the end of the street. She thinks the Metro landing should include kiss-and-ride.



## AGENDA

North Potomac Yard Small Area Plan Update

Advisory Group Meeting #3

Monday, June 6, 2016 | 7:00-9:00PM | Charles Houston Recreation Center

- |   |   |        |
|---|---|--------|
| 1 | Advisory Group Comments from May 16 <sup>th</sup> Meeting & May 17 <sup>th</sup> Workshop | 7:00pm |
| 2 | Concept Options from Workshop   | 7:15pm |
| 3 | Questions/Discussion  | 7:45pm |
| 4 | Group Exercise  | 8:05pm |
| 5 | Public Comment  | 8:30pm |
| 6 | Schedule, Process & Wrap Up   | 8:45pm |

---

### Upcoming Meetings

- Advisory Group Meeting #4: Monday, June 27, 7-9PM, Charles Houston Rec Center. Concept Options Refinement
- TENTATIVE Advisory Group Meeting #5: Tuesday, July 19<sup>th</sup> or 25<sup>th</sup>, 7-9PM, TBD

1) Opt for 2 variations.

2) Less or emphasis on edge road.

3) No above ground parking.

4) move metro

Please remember to fill out a meeting evaluation.

Your feedback will inform planning and preparation for future meetings.

North to drop ppl. in middle of activity, not at edge near BWP pond.

To be informed of future North Potomac Yard meetings, please sign up for eNews at [enews.alexandriava.gov](http://enews.alexandriava.gov).

For more information about the project, visit the project webpage at [alexandriava.gov/potomacyardplan](http://alexandriava.gov/potomacyardplan) or contact Richard Lawrence, Project Manager, City of Alexandria, at 703-746-3849 or email [richard.lawrence@alexandriava.gov](mailto:richard.lawrence@alexandriava.gov).

5) Compress width of Potomac Ave; or give more width to peds.

6) Cut up big blocks.

7) Relationship to Four Mile Run Park

8) Put BRT on Potomac Ave with devlop. (not at edge)



## MEETING EVALUATION

Date: June 6, 2016

Event: North Potomac Yard AG Meeting #3

Please take a moment to answer the following questions in order to help us make the best use of your time, support each participant, learn from you, and facilitate the most productive outcome.

1. Which category best represents you? *Please check all that apply.*

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident        | <input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: <u>LIBRARY</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Business Owner             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interested Community Member |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Board or Commission Member |   |   |

2. How did you hear about this meeting? *Please check all that apply.*

- |                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper    | <input type="checkbox"/> eNews              | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Media           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City Website | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Friends | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify: |

3. Were the meeting time and location convenient?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No             |   |

4. Was the information provided sufficient and clearly presented?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No             |   |

5. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No             |   |

6. Do you feel the group exercise captured your comments?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No             |   |

7. Was there an opportunity for public participation?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Comments: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No             |   |

8. Do you feel your comments were heard?

9. What are your concerns about this event/project?

10. What worked well during the meeting and why? What could have been done better during the meeting and why?

11. Other thoughts?