

**Route 1 South Housing Affordability Strategy
Charrette Day 2
2-27-18 Core Team Meeting**

Summary:

Common Themes

- Improvements for pedestrians along and across Route 1
- More data needed related to existing and potential redevelopment scenarios
- More information needed about infrastructure capacity and planned capital improvements
- Congestion/traffic flow
- Resources for potentially impacted residents so that they can return
- Precedents/best practices
- More data/explanation of the affordable housing development economics assumptions

Bring back options for streetscape/pedestrian improvements (Route 1):

- Wider sidewalks, building setbacks
- Double row of trees
- Improve Route 1 crossing
- Buildings - courtyards, open space, gateway

Bring back scenario options with accompanying data:

- Existing development
- Potential max development under existing zoning
- Potential development with rezoning to accommodate affordable housing
- Superimpose timeline on the different scenarios
- Data to include under the different scenarios:
 - Units (market and affordable), population, student generation, FAR, height

Provide more information about infrastructure capacity and potential impacts

- Stormwater/sewer
- Schools
- Transportation

Verbatim Core Team Notes:

- Existing height – potential height/density
- Existing sidewalk – 7'
 - Would like to see increased sidewalk width (30') and double row of trees
- Lack of refuge in the middle of Route 1
- Consider more of a boulevard with trees/landscape in median (Dolores Street – SanFran precedent)
- Existing lane widths should be narrowed
- Consider people with disabilities (width of crossing, curbs) - Accessibility compliance is important

- Tradeoff between “boulevard” feel (potential higher speeds) and the more urban feel after Duke (which has parking on both sides, narrower travel lanes)
- Use “S. Patrick St.” instead of Route 1 South
- Would like to see increased space on sidewalk, narrow the street
- Row of parking north of Duke creates good friction to slow people down
- If rezoning, rezone in such that will help with improving connectivity and open space.
 - More consolidated/more useable open space
 - 40% required on level
- Balancing act – some zones are 35% open space / or private backyard
- Consider setting aside space for pocket parks
- Wilkes St right of way is perfect for pocket parks – currently doesn’t feel public
- Big issue is a lot of non-residential traffic
 - Need to readjust traffic flow or consider burying Route 1 or charging a toll
 - Benefits of improved streetscaping may be shortsighted and overcome by the larger and worsening problem of traffic volume
- Alternative pedestrian solutions? Such as Under or over Route 1?
- Won’t additional density increase the traffic volume
- Support recommendation for improved crossings, but how is increased ped volume going to make pedestrians safer? Need to consider seniors, people with babies, disabled
- Very dangerous blind curve on Route 1 southbound (south of Duke)
 - Crossing at the light feels dangerous because cars don’t see you in time.
- Refuge/Median – needs to be solid/substantial to protect people
- Speed of traffic is very problematic - Narrowing the lanes will help
- Route 1 has identity crisis – two distinct characters:
 - Route 1 from Duke north
 - Route 1 from Duke south
- Reference to Washington St as a good precedent to look at
- Live on Franklin – NEVER cross Route 1 on foot
 - Speed, density keeps me isolated
 - Drive car to get to Lee Center
 - Same with Gibbon
- Wilkes St is behind curve/dangerous
- North part of Patrick/Henry are more comfortable because they are consistent/repeat the grid
- Only 10 seconds for peds to cross Route 1. NUTS!
- Look at other great examples
 - Massachusetts Ave in Capitol Hill
 - Connecticut Ave NW
 - Copy ways to design street that increase ped traffic because they Slow cars down, but still handle volume
- We haven’t studied the traffic flow yet.
 - City will provide that information tomorrow morning (Data, studies, ASBC)
- Height/density – come back tomorrow with options for review by group then refine
- Tradeoffs between height and open space
- Are the other commercial sites on the table for redevelopment? YES

- Currently CSL – different zoning (clean-up) could incentivize
 - Can look at options to incentivize redevelopment
 - options for how to improve gateway (Signature building, Setback)
- How many people (population) associated with the different height options? (theoretical)
 - Units/population
 - Current, current theoretical max, future theoretical max
- City Schools Master Plan
 - Won't exist in a vacuum
 - Will look at projects in existing 1-10 CIP
 - Future capacity planning outside of 1-10 CIP
 - Schools and all other infrastructure improvements
- Student generation / school facilities capacity
 - Will report back on this
 - Historic and projected
- Explanation from City Staff:
 - 2008 school enrollment started dramatic increases. LREFP 1 – causes – connection to housing stock. Majority of students come from existing Single Family housing and older garden style apartments – market affordable
 - Data back to 2000.
- Isn't the fundamental question about affordable housing and the tradeoffs? Do we want affordable housing or not?
- Disconnect between the community's language on this and the City's. To the community, "preserving" units means keeping the current units and families, not future families. National studies show only 20% of people come back to redeveloped affordable housing
- The issue is the existing (and potentially expiring) HUD contracts are very rare – we are trying to create a situation where the same level of affordability remains.
 - HAP contracts 30% Area Median Income (AMI)
 - Looking to achieve the same level of affordability
 - ARES - Year to year contract renewal – developer will look to max land value. Trying to be proactive about this.
 - True desire on part of landowners to preserve the asset
 - From a school capacity perspective will be the same # of affordable units (not more)
- City assistance with relocation process; Families don't pay for any relocation costs, and are transported to new home and schools during temporary relocation
 - There are some cases where individuals are over income and can't come back – but – Alexandria still helps them with their move
 - Without this plan the change will happen regardless. Individuals will get a small payment and have no unit.
- Tomorrow will provide Briefing on relocation planning. City's policy in place.
- Residents need valid statistics to make decision.
- Lego exercise had only one option replace all 215 affordable units and additional density (total of 645 units); Not in favor of additional density
- We need to know how many units and people we are talking about.
- Explanation of lego exercise - In order to preserve affordable units, we need additional density to support it.

- Superimpose timeline on the different scenarios (do nothing and different scenarios)
- Puzzled by the idea of a grandiose gateway – in the past community feedback was not heeded. Should focus on safety not fancy. We don't want more housing.
- Process seems rushed.
- Concern about current neighbors in the affordable housing and want to keep them, but don't want new density.
- It's being taken for granted that we need more density in order to preserve affordable housing. Consider other options like City grants, in kind contributions
- I'm against dumb development before we solve existing problem
- We need models / scenarios to test (model)
- Test student generation, and all others
- This planning process is challenging – rapid process for decision making. Need to still be open to comments later on in process.