

SPEAKER'S FORM

DOCKET ITEM NO. 6

5/14/11

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND GIVE IT TO THE CITY CLERK  
BEFORE YOU SPEAK ON A DOCKET ITEM

PLEASE ANNOUNCE THE INFORMATION SPECIFIED BELOW PRIOR TO SPEAKING.

1. NAME: Harry P. Hart

2. ADDRESS: 300 N. Washington St

TELEPHONE NO. 7/839-5757 E-MAIL ADDRESS: HPH.HC@K@verizon.net

3. WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT, IF OTHER THAN YOURSELF? ODBC

4. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION ON THE ITEM?  
FOR: \_\_\_\_\_ AGAINST: \_\_\_\_\_ OTHER:

5. NATURE OF YOUR INTEREST IN ITEM (PROPERTY OWNER, ATTORNEY, LOBBYIST, CIVIC INTEREST, ETC.):  
Attorney For ODBC

6. ARE YOU RECEIVING COMPENSATION FOR THIS APPEARANCE BEFORE COUNCIL?  
YES  NO \_\_\_\_\_

This form shall be kept as a part of the permanent record in those instances where financial interest or compensation is indicated by the speaker.

A maximum of three minutes will be allowed for your presentation, except that one officer or other designated member speaking on behalf of each *bona fide* neighborhood civic association or unit owners' association desiring to be heard on a docket item shall be allowed five minutes. In order to obtain five minutes, you must identify yourself as a designated speaker, and identify the neighborhood civic association or unit owners' association you represent, at the start of your presentation. If you have a prepared statement, please leave a copy with the Clerk.

Additional time not to exceed 15 minutes may be obtained with the consent of the majority of the council present; provided notice requesting additional time with reasons stated is filed with the City Clerk in writing before 5:00 p.m. of the day preceding the meeting.

The public normally may speak on docket items only at public hearing meetings, and not at regular legislative meetings. Public hearing meetings are usually held on the Saturday following the second Tuesday in each month; regular legislative meetings on the second and fourth Tuesdays in each month. The rule with respect to when a person may speak to a docket item at a legislative meeting can be waived by a majority vote of council members present but such a waiver is not normal practice. When a speaker is recognized, the rules of procedures for speakers at public hearing meetings shall apply. If an item is docketed *for public hearing* at a regular legislative meeting, the public may speak to that item, and the rules of procedures for speakers at public hearing meetings shall apply.

In addition, the public may speak on matters which are not on the docket during the Public Discussion Period at public hearing meetings. The mayor may grant permission to a person, who is unable to participate in public discussion at a public hearing meeting for medical, religious, family emergency or other similarly substantial reasons, to speak at a regular legislative meeting. When such permission is granted, the rules of procedures for public discussion at public hearing meetings shall apply.

Guidelines for the Public Discussion Period

(a) All speaker request forms for the public discussion period must be submitted by the time the item is called by the city clerk.

(b) No speaker will be allowed more than three minutes; except that one officer or other designated member speaking on behalf of each *bona fide* neighborhood civic association or unit owners' association desiring to be heard during the public discussion period shall be allowed five minutes. In order to obtain five minutes, you must identify yourself as a designated speaker, and identify the neighborhood civic association or unit owners' association you represent, at the start of your presentation.

(c) If more speakers are signed up than would be allotted for in 30 minutes, the mayor will organize speaker requests by subject or position, and allocated appropriate times, trying to ensure that speakers on unrelated subjects will also be allowed to speak during the 30 minute public discussion period.

(d) If speakers seeking to address council on the same subject cannot agree on a particular order or method that they would like the speakers to be called on, the speakers shall be called in the chronological order of their request forms' submission.

(e) Any speakers not called during the public discussion period will have the option to speak at the conclusion of the meeting, after all docketed items have been heard.

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** Barbara Pringle <bpringle9@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 4:01 PM  
**To:** William Euille; Frank Fannon; Kerry Donley; Alicia Hughes; Del Pepper; Paul Smedberg; Rose Boyd; Jackie Henderson; Elaine Scott; Linda Owens; Rob Krupicka; Elizabeth Jones  
**Subject:** COA Contact Us: Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan  
**Attachments:** ATT00001..txt

### COA Contact Us: Mayor, Vice-Mayor and Council Members

Time: [Mon Jun 06, 2011 16:00:47] Message ID: [30680]

**Issue Type:** Mayor, Vice-Mayor and Council Members  
**First Name:** Barbara  
**Last Name:** Pringle  
**Street Address:** 216 Wolfe Street  
**City:** Alexandria  
**State:** VA  
**Zip:** 22314  
**Phone:** 703-519-8252  
**Email Address:** bpringle9@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan

216 Wolfe Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
June 5, 2011

Alexandria City

Council  
Alexandria City Planning Board

Dear Sirs/Madam:

As a

resident (though sometimes abroad with my husband, a Foreign Service officer) and property owner in the city since 1970, I believe that the

**Comments:** current, proposed "Alexandria Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan,"

even with the modifications suggested by the planners in May, would make

Old Town Alexandria a less desirable place to live and, therefore, in the longer term, a less desirable place to visit.

Let us take as an

example the "urban renewal" of the 1950's and 1960's, which resulted in large buildings that no one would come to Old Town today especially to see.

Tourists and local visitors put Alexandria on their itinerary because of what is left of early housing and commercial buildings, like the Apothecary Shop and Gadsby's Tavern, and because of the Torpedo Factory Art Center.

They could go anywhere for the numerous restaurants, souvenir and T-shirt

shops that have sprung up to serve them once they come to see Old Town. In

fact, many also patronize the establishments on upper King Street because

they encounter them en route to see what is left of colonial and early federal-era Alexandria.

The document "Supplementary Materials for the Alexandria Waterfront Small Areas Plan" states "[h]otels are the reason that the plan can pay for itself. . . . The types of hotels envisioned for the Waterfront are similar to the Hotel Monaco". Elsewhere, it gives a figure of 250 potential rooms (modified in a later document to fewer than 150 rooms) for the proposed hotel in the south Robinson Terminal area. First, the publicity given in favor of this plan is disingenuous, if not downright dishonest, in calling such a hotel a "boutique hotel". A lovely example of a real boutique hotel, which would probably draw minimal opposition from the surrounding community, is the Morrison House Hotel, with 45 rooms.

More important, the placement of the hotels suggested for the Robinson South and immediately adjacent Cummings-Turner block would funnel all their traffic (both hotel patrons, however they arrived, and service and supply trucks for the hotels and their food service facilities) onto Duke Street and Wolfe Street, with probably major spillover onto Gibbon via Union Street. For all the lovely words in the document about how innocuous the traffic generated by the Monaco is, that hotel is already in the middle of a business district, which is full of non-hotel traffic.

The same is true of the hotels on upper King street, which the planners are now saying the neighbors do not object to. I take them at their word, but the neighbors already lived in a business district. The hotels proposed in the Waterfront Plan would be in the center of a residential district. It

is not farfetched to imagine current residents moving away, and residential values and the maintenance of the properties declining because of the changed character of the neighborhood.

When a major improvement to city facilities is proposed, whether it be development of new roads like Eisenhower Avenue and its beltway connections or an upgrade to the Alexandria school system, like the rebuilt TC Williams High School, the taxes of all residents are used to pay the costs, because all Alexandrians benefit from the improvements, one way or the other. Many residents from all over the city enjoy what parks on the waterfront are accessible to them now; many come to study or shop or just enjoy the Torpedo Factory, and many come to eat at existing restaurants or to enjoy the quality shops on upper King Street. If park area along the Potomac were expanded, and attractive picnic areas and family attractions (say a playground, maybe a merry-go-round, nice walking paths with shade trees and benches and some tasteful, small food stalls) were created, many more would probably come to enjoy the new offerings of an enhanced waterfront, which would be accessible to them all along the river.

There is no reason, therefore, to make changes along the river a project which would pay for itself at the expense of a) altering the character of Old Town in the same destructive way that the "urban renewal" did and b) providing minimal extra access to the waterfront for residents of Alexandria. Put succinctly, whose lives would this plan improve—wealthy tourists who could pay for riverfront hotel rooms, developers who would profit handsomely during construction, or residents of Alexandria?

Yours  
sincerely,

Barbara Pringle

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** robert pringle <rpringle9@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 4:56 PM  
**To:** William Euille; Frank Fannon; Kerry Donley; Alicia Hughes; Del Pepper; Paul Smedberg; Rose Boyd; Jackie Henderson; Elaine Scott; Rob Krupicka; Linda Owens; Elizabeth Jones  
**Subject:** COA Contact Us: waterfront planning - next steps  
**Attachments:** ATT00001..txt

### COA Contact Us: Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Council Members

Time: [Mon Jun 06, 2011 16:55:32] Message ID: [30684]

**Issue Type:** Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Council Members  
**First Name:** robert  
**Last Name:** pringle  
**Street Address:** 216 Wolfe St  
**City:** Alexandria  
**State:** VA  
**Zip:** 22314  
**Phone:** 703 519 8252  
**Email Address:** [rpringle9@comcast.net](mailto:rpringle9@comcast.net)  
**Subject:** waterfront planning - next steps

Dear Members of City Council:

June 6, 2011

We now know, thanks to the Washington Post's Ombudsman, that the City has been heavily engaged in negotiations with the Post for years, and that these negotiations are likely to have more impact on what actually happens than more years of planning.

Perhaps, in the interests

**Comments:** of transparency, City Council should appoint an Ombudsman? In any case it

is devoutly to be hoped that from now on the citizenry is better informed about what is really going on.

A couple of points as we move into the next discussion:

-- The City's definition of "boutique" as up to 150

rooms is absurd. Morrison House, not exactly tiny (with two sizeable buildings) has 47 rooms. So we are talking about six Morrison Houses between Duke and Wolfe Streets, two blocks from where I write.

-- There

is nothing in the plan to compensate aesthetically for the bulking up of the waterfront which will (if current zoning is changed) obstruct views, especially for those living on Union and South Lee Streets, and yes, greatly increase traffic.

-- Nothing thus far presented has made the

case that the latest version of the plan will result in substantial improvements, as opposed to generating revenue and profits for developers.

There is still no long-term vision.

-- Meanwhile it is abundantly

evident that the City cannot even maintain the current waterfront, as witness the flood trash clogging the waterfront now and the pledged but never delivered promise to repair the dangerous mess across from Lee St. Park.

Instead of capitulating to the Post's interest in maximizing its

gain from selling the Robinson Terminal warehouses, the city should suspend

the current planning process and start over again. The first step should be to define a vision for the future based on input from Alexandrians. The second step should be to determine how that vision can be financially supported.

If the Post insists on selling the properties before such a process can be completed, the full force of current zoning requirements should be invoked. But I suspect the Post might be willing to cut the City some slack, especially if the negotiations with them are conducted transparently from now on. The Post (which is a civic organization as well as a profit-making company) probably doesn't relish playing the role of corporate villain obstructing a better future for the home town of George Washington and Robert. E. Lee, in the face of enlightened opposition from its citizens.

Robert Pringle  
216 Wolfe St

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** Cicely Woodrow  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2011 9:11 AM  
**To:** Barbara Pringle  
**Cc:** Graciela Moreno; Jackie Henderson  
**Subject:** RE: COA Contact Us: Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan

Dear Ms. Pringle,

Thank you for submitting comments to the Department of Planning and Zoning. By copy of this email, I'm forwarding your message to Jackie Henderson, City Clerk and Clerk of Council, who will make your comments available as part of the official record.

Best regards,  
Cicely Woodrow

---

Cicely B. Woodrow, PHR  
Management Analyst III  
Department of Planning & Zoning  
301 King Street, Room 2100  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Direct: 703-746-3810  
Fax: 703-838-6393

### ECO-CITY ALEXANDRIA

In keeping with Eco-City Alexandria please consider the environment before printing this e-mail, print on paper certified for sustainability, and save energy by turning off your computer and printer at night.

---

**From:** Barbara Pringle [mailto:bpringle9@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 4:04 PM  
**To:** PnZFeedback; Cicely Woodrow; Graciela Moreno  
**Subject:** COA Contact Us: Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan

## COA Contact Us: Planning and Zoning General Feedback

Time: [Mon Jun 06, 2011 16:03:44] Message ID: [30681]

**Issue Type:** Planning and Zoning General Feedback  
**First Name:** Barbara  
**Last Name:** Pringle  
**Street Address:** 216 wolfe Street  
**City:** Alexandria  
**State:** VA  
**Zip:** 22314  
**Phone:** 703-519-8252  
**Email Address:** [bpringle9@comcast.net](mailto:bpringle9@comcast.net)

**Subject:** Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan

216 Wolfe Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
June 5, 2011

Alexandria City

Council  
Alexandria City Planning Board

Dear Sirs/Madam:

As a

resident (though sometimes abroad with my husband, a Foreign Service officer) and property owner in the city since 1970, I believe that the current, proposed "Alexandria Waterfront Small Areas Development Plan," even with the modifications suggested by the planners in May, would make

Old Town Alexandria a less desirable place to live and, therefore, in the longer term, a less desirable place to visit.

Let us take as an

example the "urban renewal" of the 1950's and 1960's, which resulted in large buildings that no one would come to Old Town today especially to see.

**Comments:** Tourists and local visitors put Alexandria on their itinerary because of what is left of early housing and commercial buildings, like the Apothecary Shop and Gadsby's Tavern, and because of the Torpedo Factory Art Center.

They could go anywhere for the numerous restaurants, souvenir and T-shirt

shops that have sprung up to serve them once they come to see Old Town. In

fact, many also patronize the establishments on upper King Street because

they encounter them en route to see what is left of colonial and early federal-era Alexandria.

The document "Supplementary Materials for the Alexandria Waterfront Small Areas Plan" states "[h]otels are the reason that the plan can pay for itself. . . . The types of hotels envisioned for the Waterfront are similar to the Hotel Monaco". Elsewhere, it gives a figure of 250 potential rooms (modified in a later document to fewer than 150 rooms) for the proposed hotel in the south Robinson Terminal area. First, the publicity given in favor of this plan is disingenuous, if not



downright dishonest, in calling such a hotel a “boutique hotel”. A lovely example of a real boutique hotel, which would probably draw minimal opposition from the surrounding community, is the Morrison House Hotel, with 45 rooms.

More important, the placement of the hotels suggested

for the Robinson South and immediately adjacent Cummings-Turner block would

funnel all their traffic (both hotel patrons, however they arrived, and service and supply trucks for the hotels and their food service facilities) onto Duke Street and Wolfe Street, with probably major spillover onto Gibbon via Union Street. For all the lovely words in the document about how innocuous the traffic generated by the Monaco is, that hotel is already in the middle of a business district, which is full of non-hotel traffic.

The same is true of the hotels on upper King street, which the planners are

now saying the neighbors do not object to. I take them at their word, but the neighbors already lived in a business district. The hotels proposed in the Waterfront Plan would be in the center of a residential district. It is not farfetched to imagine current residents moving away, and residential values and the maintenance of the properties declining because of the changed character of the neighborhood.

When a major improvement to city

facilities is proposed, whether it be development of new roads like Eisenhower Avenue and its beltway connections or an upgrade to the Alexandria school system, like the rebuilt TC Williams High School, the taxes of all residents are used to pay the costs, because all Alexandrians benefit from the improvements, one way or the other. Many residents from all over the city enjoy what parks on the waterfront are accessible to them now; many come to study or shop or just enjoy the Torpedo Factory, and many

come to eat at existing restaurants or to enjoy the quality shops on upper King Street. If park area along the Potomac were expanded, and attractive picnic areas and family attractions (say a playground, maybe a merry-go-round, nice walking paths with shade trees and benches and some

tasteful, small food stalls) were created, many more would probably come

to

enjoy the new offerings of an enhanced waterfront, which would be accessible to them all along the river.

There is no reason,

therefore, to make changes along the river a project which would pay for itself at the expense of a) altering the character of Old Town in the same destructive way that the "urban renewal" did and b) providing minimal extra

access to the waterfront for residents of Alexandria. Put succinctly, whose lives would this plan improve—wealthy tourists who could pay for riverfront hotel rooms, developers who would profit handsomely during construction, or residents of Alexandria?

Yours

sincerely,

Barbara Pringle

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** Nancy Williams  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 5:50 PM  
**To:** Jackie Henderson  
**Subject:** Waterfront SAP Communication - Ms. Freeman FW: Planning Commission Consideration of Waterfront SAP

Jackie,

I am forwarding this communication for the City Council's Waterfront SAP record.

Thank you.

### Nancy

Nancy J. Williams  
Principal Planner  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
301 King Street, Room 2100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.746.3851 – phone  
703.746.4666 – main  
703.838.6393 – fax  
[Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov)

---

**From:** Lauren Freeman [<mailto:lefreeman@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 7:30 AM  
**To:** Nancy Williams; Karl Moritz  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Consideration of Waterfront SAP

I would like the below questions added to the list of Questions posed to the City Counsel. I was not able to attend the meeting. I am particularly interested in an answer to questions 1 and 2 regarding the flood mitigation plan. The water has to go somewhere and it would be irresponsible not to consider the possible negative impacts on other areas. I also would like to know why the private property owners who would benefit from the plan are not being asked to pay for (or contribute to) the plan.

---

**From:** Lauren Freeman <[lefreeman@comcast.net](mailto:lefreeman@comcast.net)>  
**Date:** Mon, 02 May 2011 19:54:48 -0400  
**To:** Nancy Williams <[Nancy.Williams@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Nancy.Williams@alexandriava.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Consideration of Waterfront SAP

I am not able to attend the meeting tomorrow night but I do have some comments/questions:

1. On the proposed flood mitigation plan, I have not been able to find any discussion of impacts of the proposed flood mitigation plan on surrounding areas or areas upstream or downstream. The mitigation plan simply displaces water. How many square feet would be displaced under various flooding scenarios and where do the engineers believe that water will go? Might it result in new flooding or worsen flooding in other areas? Is there the potential for city liability for any such impacts on other private property?

2. On the proposed flood mitigation plan, I have listened to testimony of supporters of the plan suggesting this should be a priority because flooding damages private property. What is the rationale for the City's plan to spend taxpayer dollars to protect the private property of a few? Did the City create or worsen the flooding problem? Why doesn't the City focus instead on identifying uses and zoning that are consistent with the known flooding potential. Won't the mitigation plan simply encourage further development that is not consistent with the flood potential? Eventually a serious flood will occur regardless of the mitigation plan and the adjacent property will be damaged. Will the plan change the availability of flood insurance?

3. If waterfront hotels will be required to provide necessary parking on site, how is that different from the current waterfront parking the City wants so badly to eliminate? Is it just because it won't be as visible or because it is associated with potential revenue? Would the City consider limiting street parking in adjacent streets to residential parking only? People will always choose free street parking over a garage if they have the option. Residents should not be required to resort to paying for garage parking if parking is supposed to be the responsibility of the commercial establishment.

4. If the City views the Hotel Monaco as a model for a waterfront hotel, does the City also assume that any hotel would be required to keep its outdoors uses in the interior (like the Monaco and Lorien do)? Would the City limit the hours of any exterior restaurant/bar space to address neighborhood noise issues, like they do in Del Rey? I am not aware of any outdoor restaurant locations in Old Town within such close proximity to residential areas (the Robinson Terminal South and Cummings Buildings) have residences across the street. The Commission should state its position on this now rather than simply deferring a known issue to the special use permitting process.

I would appreciate if you would forward these question/comments to Karl Moritz as well (I was not able to locate his email). Thank you.

Lauren E. Freeman  
102 Duke Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
703-683-2465

---

**From:** Alexandria eNews <[enews45977@enews.alexandriava.gov](mailto:enews45977@enews.alexandriava.gov)>  
**Date:** Mon, 02 May 2011 18:47:25 -0400  
**To:** eNews Subscribers <[rsan@enews.alexandriava.gov](mailto:rsan@enews.alexandriava.gov)>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Consideration of Waterfront SAP

On Tuesday, May 3, 2011, the Planning Commission's consideration of the Waterfront Small Area Plan will begin at 7:30 PM, Alexandria City Hall, and it will be open to public testimony regarding options for the Old Dominion Boat Club parking lot at the foot of King Street. The public can sign up to speak [online](#) or in person at the meeting.

For questions regarding the Waterfront Small Area Plan, please contact Karl Moritz, Deputy Director, or Nancy Williams, Principal Planner, at the City's Planning and Zoning Department, 703.746.4666.

You are receiving this e-mail message because you are subscribed to one or more of the following groups in the City of Alexandria's free eNews service:  
Waterfront Planning

Click here to change your eNews subscription choices: <http://enews.alexandriava.gov/mygroups.php>  
Click here to remove your eNews account altogether: <http://enews.alexandriava.gov/userpage.php>

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** Nancy Williams  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 5:33 PM  
**To:** Jackie Henderson  
**Subject:** Waterfront SAP Communication - Thompson FW: COA Contact Us: Waterfront Planned Improvements  
**Attachments:** ATT00001..txt

Jackie, for the Waterfront Small Area Plan record.

Thanks

### Nancy

Nancy J. Williams  
Principal Planner  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
301 King Street, Room 2100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.746.3851 – phone  
703.746.4666 – main  
703.838.6393 – fax  
[Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov)

---

**From:** Faroll Hamer  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 4:28 PM  
**To:** Nancy Williams; Karl Moritz  
**Subject:** FW: COA Contact Us: Waterfront Planned Improvements

---

**From:** Sandra Thompson [mailto:sandythompson23@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 12:57 PM  
**To:** Faroll Hamer; Barbara Carter; Graciela Moreno; Cicely Woodrow  
**Subject:** COA Contact Us: Waterfront Planned Improvements

### COA Contact Us: Director Faroll Hamer

Time: [Fri Jun 03, 2011 12:56:58] Message ID: [30606]

**Issue Type:** Faroll Hamer  
**First Name:** Sandra  
**Last Name:** Thompson  
**Street Address:** 5300 Holmes Run Pkwy Apt 909  
**City:** Alexandria  
**State:** VA  
**Zip:** 22304

**Phone:** 703-599-7092

**Email Address:** [sandythompson23@gmail.com](mailto:sandythompson23@gmail.com)

**Subject:** Waterfront Planned Improvements

As a resident of Alexandria's West End I would like to voice my strong support for the wonderful, well planned improvements to North Old Town's waterfront area. Hopefully some of the extra tax revenue generated from

**Comments:** those improvements can be used for some much-needed improvements in the

West End in the near future.

Thank you for all you do for our City.

## Jackie Henderson

---

**From:** Nancy Williams  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 6:21 PM  
**To:** Jackie Henderson  
**Subject:** Communication - Waterfront SAP (Comment Board 5/3 to 6/1)  
**Attachments:** Comment Board post May 3 Planning Commission to June 1, 2011.pdf

Jackie,

Here are comments received on the Waterfront Website's Comment Board as of 6/1 relative the Waterfront Small Area Plan for the CC record.

### Thanks

#### Nancy

Nancy J. Williams  
Principal Planner  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
301 King Street, Room 2100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.746.3851 – phone  
703.746.4666 – main  
703.838.6393 – fax  
[Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov](mailto:Nancy.williams@alexandriava.gov)

## **WATERFRONT COMMENT BOARD**

### **COMMENTS (May 3 – June 1, 2011)**

1. The best resource the city planners and city council have are the citizens of Old town. Their thoughts, opinions, are most valuable since they above anyone else know the heartbeat of Old town, it's strenghts and it's weaknesses. It's soul cannot be understood by any developer unless they spent time there, and who better to listen to than those who live there. If they are fighting to keep it's preservation, and caring enough to oversee any change, they that live there must be listened to.

Audrey Przybylski (200) | User | June 1, 2011 - 11:50 PM



2. SENT after the May 14 Council Hearing

Andrew H. Macdonald  
By email and mail  
May 19, 2011

Mayor Bill Euille and Members of Council  
City Hall  
Alexandria VA 22314

RE: Waterfront Plan – Next Steps

Dear Mr. Mayor and Council Members:

I would like to thank you for holding the recent public hearing on the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan. This was a great opportunity for citizens to provide direct input to Council. The session was clearly a step in the right direction.

The hearing confirmed what many residents have been saying for a long time: that this is not the right plan for the Alexandria waterfront. What is the right plan? We believe that your comments and that of the majority of speakers showed that this question cannot be answered until a number of important issues have been explored further. There are simply too many outstanding issues standing in the way of a waterfront plan that is acceptable to the community. We applaud your decision to delay adoption of the plan, but we believe that the process of approving “a new plan” should proceed carefully and with the full participation of the community.

Residents by and large do not think that the impacts of all this new development on the town has been studied thoroughly enough. We have no way of comparing the pros and cons of various development options either— because only a single plan was presented. Our view is that the current plan does not look at innovative ways to expand public access to the waterfront and river. Indeed, it is too concerned with development and the revenue that things like hotels might generate. It is no wonder that many citizens (voters) want a very different plan, and find it incomprehensible that these choices were not explored earlier on.

The current plan seems to be constantly changing, too. Many issues are not clear. For example, what is the status of the Old Dominion Boat Club? Fitzgerald Square? Flood mitigation? Historic preservation? How about the history plan, the art plan, parking, and the financial cost of implementing the current plan? What will be impact of hotels on neighborhoods? No one knows the answers to these questions, and the plan does not

answer them, either. For this reason, it is hard to even view this plan as a 'plan,' since it lacks critical analysis of important elements like those listed above.

The principle landowner of the largest land parcels also wants more flexibility. The so-called central park, Fitzgerald Square, may not be built. Flood mitigation is supposed to be a top priority of the plan but even that issue is clouded in debate. It is not clear what should happen along the Strand waterfront, where the Dandy will dock, etc. We need a real parking plan. No wonder residents ask: Who really is going to benefit from all this new development? Is it the best public waterfront plan we can create? The answer is, quite clearly, NO. Residents have lost what little confidence they did have in the planning process and the plan's purported public benefits which is why so many attended, spoke, and participated in the Council session last Saturday.

There are a number of key considerations that must be addressed before this planning process can be called a success:

1. How much more development should be allowed along the waterfront and what should it look like? Are hotels really a good choice?
2. What are the economic benefits and costs of various development options?
3. How will this development affect the environment and town? The Potomac?
4. How much of the waterfront should remain public and what uses are acceptable? Should we include more parkland in the plan? Convert a warehouse into a museum?

Our suggestion is to conduct a comprehensive (and easy to compare) impact and cost-benefit analysis of several redevelopment options.

- A) The current plan – 150 room hotels on three sites and the open space defined under the earlier Settlement Agreements.
- B) Assume town homes and offices on the RTW North and South sites and hotels on the Cummins-Turner sites. (Assume land is completely redeveloped for mixed used at these sites.)
- C) Assume public acquisition of the RTW North Site (East of Union) for a museum or open space, commercial uses west of Union at same site And acquisition of all of the RTW South site for parks and Seaport Foundation.
- D) Same as C for RTW North site but assume some town homes along Union at RTW South and larger public parks in that area.
- E) Mixed-use redevelopment of Cummins Turner with hotels, without hotels.

In short, we ask that you give the community some real choices so that together we all might weigh the options and decide on the best plan for Alexandria.

I've listed below other questions that have been raised but not answered fully:

- How will hotels, offices, town homes, parks, museums impact parking, traffic, pedestrian safety, air quality, and the ecology of the river? We don't really know since there is no way to compare their impacts.
- What are the costs associated with acquiring private property for public uses? What are the economic benefits and costs of the different options – hotels, town-homes, offices, parks, museums, etc, to the City? The plan does not answer these questions.
- How might we pay for and or acquire additional land for public uses like parks and museums along the waterfront? Does the City own land elsewhere that might traded for private property along the waterfront? Can we move FAR around in ways that increase our ability to open up the waterfront to public use?
- How are we going to preserve the oldest buildings along the waterfront and prevent new development from negatively impacting the historic character of Alexandria?  
Intermingling new buildings that will have much larger footprints and will be five stories tall will dwarf the historic buildings, such as the 1840 Fowle warehouse. This could well destroy the historic ambience the tourists come to see and residents enjoy. The plan is largely silent on this question.
- We want to understand how hotels and other commercial uses will affect our quality of life? What can we do to retain uses like the Art League? Is a hotel appropriate here?
- How should the shoreline area east of the Strand be redeveloped? The City purchased some of the properties along this shoreline with open space funds. What are the legal, financial and land-use issues associated with acquiring the rest of this waterfront for public use? Should the Beachcomber be converted into a restaurant again? Where will the Dandy dock? We want to see a much clearer plan for this area and a more realistic parking plan to replace the surface parking lot used by several local businesses.
- What can we do to make the waterfront a more accessible and affordable public space? There should be more than just a narrow public easement along the waterfront. The plan should consider the purchase of private land for museums and larger parks.
- How do you control flooding along the waterfront? Flooding is an important issue but the plan raises more questions than it answers. What are we trying to accomplish? Are we trying to reduce flooding along lower King Street or protect the proposed development sites? What are the environmental and aesthetic tradeoffs? Could increasing parkland along the waterfront actually be a less expensive mitigation plan than other options? How will development affect flooding?

There is broad concern about the impact of several hotels on the community, but we should not limit our analysis to hotels alone since offices, and town homes and restaurants are presently permitted uses here. Without a detailed cost-benefit analysis that includes other options such as museums and parks, it will be impossible to evaluate all

the tradeoffs that will be required to create a waterfront that is acceptable to the community, more economically sustainable, and does not adversely impact the quality of life of the immediate neighbors.

Commercial development on the waterfront and the revenue it may produce should not be the sole justification for choosing one option over another. It is first and foremost a great public space. In this context, our maritime history can serve as a bridge between tourism and preservation. Why hasn't this been studied more carefully?

If such questions are answered properly, they should lead to a compromise plan that will accomplish the twin goals of creating a great public waterfront that has a minimal impact on the town's residents and the environment, and showcase our unique historic heritage for which we are all so proud.

We ask the Council to instruct Staff to ensure that the community is notified about the nature of changes to the plan that will hopefully lead to additional public hearings before Mayor and Council. The goal should not be to rush this complex process, but to improve the plan. Many residents clearly feel, as we do, that the current plan needs to be revised significantly. Let us step back, slow down, and work together to make this plan the best possible outcome for our City. We have but one chance to get it right.

Thank you for your time and attention. We sincerely look forward to working with you in partnership to improve this plan.

SIGNED

Andrew Macdonald  
217 N Columbus St  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Mark Mueller  
404 S Royal St  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Andrew Macdonald (220) | User | June 1, 2011 - 11:39 AM

3. Well I am just wondering if new businesses such as hotels are built what guarantee is there that the jobs will go to local people? I seriously doubt there will be any at all. Use this case as an example: A number of years ago, I was residing in Norfolk (VA) when the City decided to build "Nauticus" as a money maker or something to bring in the people. Before it opened myself and other local people were approaching the city trying to find out what type of jobs would be offered there and they would not tell us. Then after the thing opened we found out that people were brought in from out of town to work there. Then later it became a burden or somewhat of a white elephant.

Jerry Foley (233) | User | May 13, 2011 - 10:17 PM

4. Has the planning commission lost it's mind...trying to add high density and further commuter traffic by suggesting hotels for the Robinson Terminals? Those will not benefit the citizens of Alexandria, and certainly not OLD Town...and yet we pay high taxes to get our community destroyed by these planning people!!!! There are many old town residents who would like to see luxury all one floor condos built on these sites, people who would love to stay in OLd Town and who find the stairs in the townhouses getting to be a chore. I can think of 5 such couples , and I know there are many more. They would walk to all the stores as they do now and that would keep many vehicles off the streets. NO HOTELS FOR ROBINSON TERMINALS!!!!!!!!!!

Richard and Rita Molleur (232) | User | May 11, 2011 - 5:07 PM

5. It is this Simple. - The Planning Commission and City Council need to stand up for the residents of Old Town who they serve. The battle to save this historic waterfront should not be about developers needs, but about the needs and desires of those who live there. Has the city forgotten it's purpose is to serve the community and if the residents in overwhelming numbers say "no" to the plan this City Planning Commission and City Council is not representing, the desires, the needs of who they represent.

The Planning Commission and City Council must be accountable to the community not the developers.

Audrey Przybylski (200) | User | May 4, 2011 - 9:08 AM

6. Article on the Alexandria Waterfront Plan in the Washington Post, Sunday May 1

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-right-kind-of-waterfront-for-alexandria/2011/04/27/AFtF8CHF\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-right-kind-of-waterfront-for-alexandria/2011/04/27/AFtF8CHF_story.html)

Andrew Macdonald (220) | User | May 3, 2011 - 3:25 PM

7. April 29, 2011

To: Faroll Hamer, Director of Planning & Zoning, and Members of the Planning Commission

Subject: Response to Good Friday Waterfront Memo from Planning and Zoning Department

From: Anne Peterson and Andrew Macdonald, Citizens for Alternative Alexandria Waterfront Plan (CAAWP)

[www.AlternativeAlexandriaWaterfrontPlan.com](http://www.AlternativeAlexandriaWaterfrontPlan.com)

The current planning memo shows once again that the planning process is an ad hoc one that ignores major community concerns about the waterfront planning process and draft plan. We object to the fact that the public will now have no chance to comment on the changes that have been recommended in the public's name on a variety of issues related to waterfront development. The memo claims to summarize the key issues, when in fact it ignores some of the most important ones.

As reported in the Old Town Patch ("Alexandria residents slam plan, business praises it") and other news outlets, at the April 5 waterfront hearing, residents opposed to the plan greatly outnumbered supporters. With a few exceptions, the comments made by the planning commission members at the conclusion of the hearing illustrated that the Planning Commission had not really listened to the concerns of citizens and in some cases seem not to have even read the plan.

The following is a list of our ongoing concerns about the plan and the planning process:

1) The Planning Commission and Planning Director have never provided a valid explanation for why the plan includes only one redevelopment option for the major development sites. Indeed, the planning director said at the April 5 meeting that other options were unnecessary.

2) Development in this plan is about revenue generation, not about making this a great public space on the waterfront. "Design guidelines" are no substitute for a careful review of alternatives. We believe that other redevelopment options, including parks and

museums should be analyzed and compared to current options in the plan using a thorough cost-benefit approach. The May 3 memo is not a substitute for considering these and other public options in detail. The supplemental documents used to establish the economic basis for this plan, and exclude the museum option (for example) are woefully inadequate.

3) The planning process was not a real dialogue between the City and community. The appearance of this memo and the shutting off of all public debate demonstrates that fact once again. There is one redevelopment option in this plan and that option has existed from the start of this planning process. Hundreds of meetings do not constitute by themselves an effective public process.

4) This is not an environmentally sound plan. There is no discussion of the importance of natural flood plains, and there is no discussion of how the proposed development will affect the water quality on the Potomac; there is no real consideration of the value of parkland vs. development, or of the impact of all this new development on existing parks.

5) History is little more than a prop for over-development, for increasing the FAR. Alexandria's commercial history as a seaport is not an excuse for privatization, making the waterfront a place for only those who can afford it. Just because there were once a series of warehouses and piers along the waterfront does not mean we must now conceptually recreate that "commercial" view of the past to the detriment of the environment.

6) The parking plan is all smoke and mirrors. It mentions vague concepts like the "Parking Implementation Plan," which seems to be a combination of valet parking, parking garages, and empty parking spaces.

7) Impacts of development on local neighborhoods and existing businesses are ignored.

8) Pleasure boat marinas that are affordable only to the highest income bracket do not increase affordable public access to the waterfront or river. These slips are designed to attract transient boaters to dine on a waterfront that would be more private than public.

9) We oppose rezoning the waterfront because it increases allowable density and enables hotels to be built on the waterfront. The proposed public amenities, if we ever get them, do not replace the much more salient public benefits that should be the goal of this plan.

10) We believe that the two Robinson Terminal Warehouse Sites should be purchased as open space, for use as parks and museums. The plan's meager arguments against this



































