


*City of Alexandria, Virginia*

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: OCTOBER 29, 2003

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: EILEEN P. FOGARTY, DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ZONING 

SUBJECT: DSUP #2002-0048; MPA #2003-0004; REZ #2002-0005  
QUAKER RIDGE, 3517-3551 DUKE STREET

---

At the October 7, 2003, Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to defer the applicant's requests in order to allow staff and the applicant to provide additional information regarding the proposed density, tree preservation/buffer, parking, the marine-clay-soils-geotechnical studies, traffic and the property that is not part of the assembly.

Following the Planning Commission hearing, staff and the applicant met to discuss these issues. A meeting with the residents is scheduled for Tuesday, November 4 to discuss these issues.

**A. Density:**

As discussed in greater detail in the DSUP staff report, staff's concern about the proposed project density stems from site characteristics such as topography, the landscape buffer between the single-family homes and the neighboring Quaker Village townhouse development, and open space. To address these issues, staff recommends a reduction in the number of units from 28 to 25, additional landscape screening between the proposed development and its neighbors, to preserve large trees, and to provide larger, open space and a 10-foot buffer of screening for the adjacent Quaker Village development.

The loss of these units will result in a greater setback between the existing townhomes and the proposed development, and more open space and buffers – all of which will provide greater protection for the adjacent single-family and townhome residents. The applicant proposes a loss of one unit. Staff believes that the loss of a single unit does not provide a sufficient benefit. The recommendation of approval is contingent upon the elimination of three units.

	Colonial Heights	Quaker Village	Quaker Ridge	Staff Recommendation
			Applicant's Proposal	
Site Area	4.44 Acres	4.93 Acres	2.49 Acres	
Number of Units	44	55	28	25
Density	9.90 Units/Acre	11.15 Units/Acre	11.24 Units/Acre	10.04 Units/Acre

The elimination of the three units enables retention of additional trees in the buffer area and additional open space, while providing a transition in density between Quaker Village and Colonial Heights. The elimination of three units as recommended by staff creates a density of 10.04 du/ac that will provide a transition between the lower-density Colonial Heights development (9.90 du/ac) to the west and Quaker Village (11.15 du/ac.) to the north.

***B. Tree Preservation/Buffer :***

In meetings with staff and at the public hearing, Quaker Village residents expressed concern about tree preservation and the provision of adequate buffers at the perimeter of the site. Given the existing elevation of the Quaker Village townhomes above the site and the significant change in topography of the site which slopes downward to Duke Street, the provision of the type of buffer desired by Quaker Village residents is challenging. Nevertheless, staff shares the residents' concerns about tree protection and buffers and has worked closely with the applicant during the review process to ensure the greatest protection of trees and the buffer area. With those concerns in mind, staff recommends that the proposed site plan be modified by shifting the internal private street and removing three units to: increase the setback and buffer area between the existing residences and the proposed development; allow for greater tree protection of the trees in the buffer area adjacent to the northern property line; and create approximately 7,000 additional square feet of open space adjacent to the single-family residence to the east. Following the Planning Commission meeting, staff met with the applicant who provided additional information regarding the number and location of the trees to be protected.

***C. Geo-Technical Studies - Marine Clay Soils:***

An issue raised at the public hearing was the stability of the soil for construction and the potential impacts on the adjoining Quaker Village townhomes and retaining walls. To address this concern, the applicant has submitted a revised letter dated October 9, 2003 from Geo-technical Consulting and Testing Inc., which describes the soil analysis that has been conducted, including soil test borings of various depths and soil laboratory testing. The preliminary study indicates that ground water was not encountered in any of the boring locations, and the engineers expressed the opinion that the "project site is generally suitable for the proposed residential construction of townhouses and associated site improvements." The letter indicates that proposed grading for the site will have an "adequate factor of safety against slope instability." The analysis included existing buildings and adjacent property as well as the existing wall on the northern portion of the site. The engineer indicates that "the proposed preliminary plan will not adversely impact the stability of these properties."

During the final site plan review process, the City will further evaluate the soil stability and site characteristics. The presence of marine clay soils is not unique to this site and has been addressed on many other sites throughout the City.

**D. Parking:**

As depicted in the chart below, the proposed development has a higher parking ratio than the two existing developments. Despite this condition, area residents are concerned that Colonial Heights will create spillover parking. While approximately 1.57 parking spaces per unit were provided for the Colonial Heights development, no additional visitor parking was provided, increasing the likelihood of spillover parking on nearby streets. The applicant proposes to exceed the minimum off-street parking requirements by providing almost twice as much parking as required by the zoning ordinance (64 required spaces required versus 118 proposed spaces), which will greatly reduce the potential for spillover parking onto adjacent streets.

	<i>Colonial Heights</i>	<i>Quaker Village</i>	<i>Quaker Ridge (Proposed)</i>
<b><i>Required Parking</i></b>	<u>44 spaces (1 space per unit)</u>	55 spaces (1 space per unit)+10% visitor parking (6 spaces) <u>61 spaces</u>	56 spaces (2 spaces per unit) + 15% visitor parking (8 spaces) <u>64 spaces</u>
<b><i>Provided Parking</i></b>	69 spaces (19 garages +50 bays) 1.57 spaces/unit + 19 spaces in 10' x 20' driveways <u>88 spaces</u>	110 spaces (2 per unit) + 19 visitor spaces <u>129 total spaces</u>	62 spaces + 48 spaces in driveways +8 visitor spaces <u>118 spaces</u>
<b><i>Parking Ratio  (with visitor parking)</i></b>	2.0 sp/unit	2.35 sp/unit	4.21 sp/unit

**E. Traffic**

The proposed development consists of 28 residential units (townhomes) on a 2.5 acre consolidated parcel previously occupied by six single-family homes. Access to the consolidated site is provided by a single driveway entrance on Duke Street. Based on a traffic impact study submitted by the applicant, this redevelopment will increase the total number of trips generated by 155 per day. During the AM and PM peak hours of traffic flow on Duke Street, the projected driveway volumes are expected to increase by 14 vehicles – 2 entering and 12 exiting (AM), and 10 entering and 4 exiting (PM) – which amounts to an average of 1 additional car every 5 minutes. In the PM peak hour, only 4 additional cars would be exiting Quaker Ridge onto Duke Street.

As concluded in the traffic impact study, these increases in traffic volume represent less than 0.5 percent increase in the existing Duke Street peak hour volumes and will not result in any measurable degradation of existing traffic conditions on Duke Street or any additional traffic impacts. Staff

concur with these conclusions and notes that daily fluctuations in traffic volumes on roadways such as Duke Street typically range from 5 percent to 10 percent – well above the projected 0.5 percent increase projected for the proposed redevelopment.

A specific concern raised by the community was the possible impact of restricting the project entrance on Duke Street to right-in-right-out operation on the Colonial Heights neighborhood to the west. In particular, there was concern that with this staff-proposed restriction – traffic exiting the site and traveling westbound as required by the right-out restriction – would use the entrance to Colonial Heights as a turn-around in order to travel eastbound on Duke Street. Based on that concern, staff agreed to allow full-movement access at the proposed project driveway until such time as an access management plan is implemented in this section of the Duke Street corridor. In recognition of the need for access management in this arterial corridor, the applicant has agreed to proffer additional right-of-way necessary for future implementation.

***F. Property that is not part of the assembly.***

At the last hearing, a concern was raised regarding the uncertainty of whether the remaining single-family home located on the eastern portion of the site would be part of the assembly. Currently, this property is the only one out of the six homes that is not part of the assembly. An early discussion with the applicant was that if homeowner elects not to be part of the assembly, then the development needs to be designed in way that is sensitive to the existing single-family home. In response to these concerns, a 35 ft to 70 ft. setback and landscaping has been provided between the proposed unit and the adjoining home. In addition staff recommends retaining the large 23" caliper tree) on the eastern portion of the site to provide additional screening.

In addition, the conceptual assembly of the properties recommends that the site plan be configured in a way that would accommodate access to the site. The internal street has been designed in a way that would enable a future connection to the site to prevent future curb cuts on Duke Street, if the property is redeveloped in the future. In fact, condition # 4 and condition #16h require a public access easement for the internal street and a disclosure to the future residents of the proposed development that the street will be used by the public, including the possible redevelopment of this property.

From a planning perspective, it clearly makes the most sense to incorporate this property as part of the assembly to achieve a coordinated redevelopment of the properties. Staff has had numerous discussions with the property owner, and although he has indicated a willingness to be included in the assembly, the owner has not reached an agreement with the applicant. While staff has encouraged the applicant to include the owner as part of the assembly, the financial differences between the applicant and the property owner is not a land-use issue.

As previously discussed, it would be preferable to have the property owner as part of the assembly to provide a more comprehensive and unified development. However, the current site plan does provide a physical and landscape buffer for the existing home and the internal street does provide a connection a future vehicle connection.

**G. Conclusion**

Staff recommends approval of the development special use permit request, with site plan with the elimination of three units on the site, for a total of 25. With this modification, the proposed development is: compatible in density with surrounding development; maintains many of the mature trees, which retains the character of the neighborhood; reduces the grading; and retains additional open space and a buffer to the adjacent townhouse developments.

The staff recommendation of approval is predicated upon addressing the site issues of: increasing the buffer on the northern portion of the site, using high-quality building materials, preserving trees and open space, and reducing the number of units through the conditions outlined within the staff report.

Docket Item #11-A and 11-B  
MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT #2003-0004 (11-A)  
REZONING #2002-0005 (11-B)  
QUAKER RIDGE

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 6, 2003

**ISSUE:**

MPA#2003-0004      Consideration of a request for an amendment to the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill small area plan chapter of the Master Plan to change the land use designation of the subject property from Residential Low to Residential Medium and the recommended height limit from 35' to 45'.

REZ#2002-0005      Consideration of a request to rezone the subject property from R-8/Residential to RB/Townhouse with proffers.

**APPLICANT:**      Carrhomes, LLC  
by J. Howard Middleton, Jr., attorney

**LOCATION:**      3517-3551 Duke Street

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, NOVEMBER 6, 2003 (MPA#2003-0004):** On a motion by Mr. Jennings, seconded by Mr. Komoroske, the Planning Commission voted to approve this request subject to compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances and staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. Mr. Wagner was absent.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, NOVEMBER 6, 2003 (REZ#2002-0005):** On a motion by Mr. Jennings, seconded by Mr. Komoroske, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of this request, subject to compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances and staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. Mr. Wagner was absent.


**Reason:** The Commission considered the information contained in the staff memorandum dated October 29, 2003 and the staff report, and determined that the proposed rezoning and Master Plan Amendment were appropriate zoning and land use designations for the subject property. The Commission recommended approval of the development special use permit and site plan request subject to the staff recommendations including a reduction in the total number of units from 28 to 25.

MPA #2003-0004  
REZ #2002-0005  
QUAKER RIDGE

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, OCTOBER 7, 2003 (MPA#2003-0004):** On a motion by Mr. Leibach, seconded by Mr. Dunn, the Planning Commission voted to **defer** this item. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, OCTOBER 7, 2003 (REZ#2002-0005):** On a motion by Mr. Leibach, seconded by Mr. Dunn, the Planning Commission voted to **defer** this item. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**Reason:** The Commission requested staff and the applicant to provide additional analysis on the implications regarding the proposed rezoning and Master Plan amendment.



## **SUMMARY**

The applicant requests a change in the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill small area plan from a general residential low land use category to a residential medium category. The request also requires a change in the recommended heights in the small area plan from 35 feet to 45 feet, and rezoning from single-family (R-8) to townhouse residential zoning (RB). The land use and zoning changes that resulted in the development of Colonial Heights, Quaker Village, ARHA public housing townhomes and adjoining developments have altered the land use and development pattern in this section of Duke Street to the extent that the subject property is almost entirely surrounded either by townhouse uses or by commercial and multi-family zones that permit townhouse uses. Townhouse zoning is appropriate given the surrounding townhouse and multi-family zoning.

The applicant's proposed rezoning includes a proffer that limits development of the site to what is approved in the development special use permit case. Staff has worked with the applicant extensively on the density, design, landscape buffer, and open space in the townhouse proposal, and believes the development, with the conditions outlined in DSUP #2002-00048, including the removal of units, which will essentially be the zoning of the site, is supportable.

The community has expressed concerns about a number of issues, including the proposed use, the density, and the traffic and parking impacts that result, and the concern that the rezoning/land use change will set a precedent for rezoning other single-family zones in the neighborhood. Staff addresses each of these important concerns in this report. However, staff recommends approval of the rezoning and master plan change, because allowing a townhouse development between two other townhouse developments is a rational infill development and is an appropriate land use.

It is important to protect our existing single-family neighborhoods from encroaching commercial, multi-family or townhouse uses. In this case, however, the rezonings and land use changes that began in the 1980s and continued in the 1990s have already changed the character of this portion of Duke Street, and allowing the zoning change at this location will not create precedent for the large single-family areas to the west and the north.

MPA #2003-0004  
REZ #2002-0005  
QUAKER RIDGE

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends **approval** of the master plan amendment, pursuant to the attached resolution.

Staff recommends **approval** of the rezoning request, pursuant to the attached proffer:


*That the property subject to this rezoning application shall be developed in accordance with the Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan approved concurrently with this application for rezoning.*

In conjunction with the rezoning and Master Plan amendment requests, the applicant has also submitted a development special use permit, with site plan, to construct a 28-unit townhouse cluster development that is discussed in more detail in the accompanying development special use permit staff report (DSUP# 2002-0048).

The site is surrounded by the following townhouse, multi-family and commercial zoning:

- The 55-unit Quaker Village townhouse community, north and east of the site, zoned RB/Townhouse.
- A 10-unit ARHA public housing townhouse development, to the east of the subject property at the corner of Duke Street and Arell Court, zoned RB/Townhouse.
- The Sunrise Assisted Living facility, south of the site, zoned CRMU/H-Commercial Residential Mixed Use-High. On the east side of the Sunrise facility is a McDonald's restaurant, zoned CG/Commercial General, and on the west of the Sunrise facility is the Normandy Hill Apartments, zoned RA/Multifamily.
- Immediately adjacent to the site to the west is the Colonial Heights townhouse community, zoned RT/Townhouse.

Townhouse uses are permitted uses in both the CRMU-H and CG zones, and the RA/Multifamily zone.





- ☐ Townhouse Zones (RB, RT)
- ☐ Zones that allow Townhouses (CG, CL, CSL, CRMU/H)

***B. Zoning History***

In this section of Duke Street, over the past 20 years, there has been a series of zoning changes and redevelopment of formerly single-family residentially zoned and developed property with townhouse uses. In addition, recent zoning changes after the adoption of the Master Plan in 1992 have further altered the former zoning and land use pattern from single-family to townhouses and commercial uses.

Quaker Village, the 55-unit cluster townhouse development to the north and east of the subject property, was constructed pursuant to special use permit approved in 1993 (SUP#2181-B). Prior to that, in 1988, part of the site was rezoned from R-8 and R-20 to RB/Townhouse, and a portion of the site zoned R-20 was rezoned to R-12. Proffers were attached to the rezoning approval, which restricted the new development to single-family and townhouse development, set the maximum density at 14.5 du/ac, and designated Duke Street as the access point.

*Quaker Village*



Colonial Heights, another cluster townhouse development, abuts the subject property to the west. In 1980, the property was rezoned from R-8 to RT, with a proffer limiting the number of units to 44 townhouses. In 1984, the special use permit was approved to allow the construction of 39 townhouses in a cluster development (SUP #1699).



*Colonial Heights*

Located on the eastern portion of the subject site is the 10-unit ARHA public housing townhouse development, located on property which was rezoned from R-8 to RB/Townhouse in 1988. Concurrently, a special use permit approved the construction of the 10 unit cluster development (SUP #2102).

Since the adoption of the Master Plan in 1992, several rezonings have occurred on adjoining sites on Duke Street. In 1995, the Sunrise Assisted Living Facility site was rezoned from CL/Commercial Low to CRMU-H/Commercial Residential, with proffers restricting the allowable density to 40 units per acre, a height limitation of 35 feet without a special use permit, and a prohibition on any modification of the 40 % required open space. In addition, in 1994 the property at 3750 Duke Street, west of the subject property, was rezoned from R-8 to RB, with proffers including a limitation on the development consistent with the townhouse development plan provided by the applicant, the provision of a tot lot or a contribution to provide it off-site, and a limitation on the types of allowable modifications.

*Adjoining Commercial Uses On Duke Street*



The land use and zoning changes that resulted in the development of Colonial Heights, Quaker Village, ARHA public housing townhomes, and adjoining developments have significantly altered the land use and development pattern in this section of Duke Street, to the extent that the subject property is almost entirely surrounded either by townhouse uses or by commercial and multi-family zones that permit townhouse uses.

**C. Master Plan**

In 1992, the City adopted a new Master Plan, the primary guide for the future development of the City. Since its adoption, the plan has been updated and periodically amended to more clearly reflect the intended use for a particular area. The plan may be amended either as part of a long-term planning process for a designated area or as an individual request for a specific change.

In 1992, as part of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan, the land use designation for the subject property was changed from residential medium to residential low, in order to reflect both the existing low density, single-family homes and the existing zoning of the subject property. The stated goal of the Plan is to *“preserve the primarily residential...area, to protect the residential neighborhoods from incompatible intensive development of adjacent commercial and industrial parcels...and to keep Duke Street as a major east/west connector through the City while protecting residential sections from non-local traffic.”*

The small area plan describes a 1983 planning study of the Duke Street corridor which recognized that the area “between Wheeler Avenue and Jordan Street was primarily residential and recommended that residential development and rehabilitation be encouraged in this area.” Notably, the study recommended support for the continuation of residential uses and encouraged the redevelopment and rehabilitation of them.

The small area plan also recognized that a number of rezonings occurred in the 1980s, which resulted in the redevelopment of lower-density, single-family zoned properties to medium-density, townhouse communities. It was noted in the small area plan, however, that the rezonings included conditions designed to improve the design and limit the density of the particular developments.

Residents have raised the point that existing single-family homes were zoned R-8, even though the lots were surrounded by the townhouse development, at the time of the preparation of the Master Plan in 1992. While it is true that the property was designated R-8, that designation was a reflection of the existing use and zone, rather than a clear intent for these properties to remain as single-family homes. In preparing the land use designations for the 1992 Master Plan, the site was left in the single-family zoning category because, as a general planning principle applied City-wide, residential land use categories were typically not changed. Zoning changes of residentially zoned parcels would be considered on a case by case basis, as they arose, after a full assessment of the appropriateness and consistency of any potential zoning change with the Master Plan and existing land use and development pattern.

#### **D. Staff Analysis**

##### *Townhouse Use*

The proposed townhouse development is an appropriate use, given the adjoining townhouse developments located on the western portion of the site (Colonial Heights), and northern and eastern portion of the site (ARHA and Quaker Village). In addition, multi-family uses (Normandy Hill Apartments) and commercial uses (McDonald's and Sunrise Assisted Living) are on the southern portion of the site. The site is located in a block with a mix of commercial and residential uses at medium densities. The predominant use surrounding the site is townhomes, while the existing single-family homes represent the least prevalent land use adjoining the site.

*Density*

In addition to the concern regarding the proposed townhouse use and rezoning, nearby residents have also expressed concern regarding the proposed density that would be permitted within the RB zone. The proposed density, F.A.R, lot size, and number of units of the adjoining developments are depicted in the table below.

	Colonial Heights	Quaker Village	Quaker Ridge (proposed)
<b>Zone</b>	RT Cluster	RB Cluster	RB Cluster
<b>Site Acreage</b>	4.44 Acres	4.93 Acres	2.49 Acres
<b>Max. Number of Allowable Units</b>	44 units	79 Units	NA
<b>Number of Units</b>	44	55	28
<b>Project Density</b>	10.0 Units/Acre	11.2 Units/Acre	11.2 Units/Acre
<b>Average FAR Per Lot</b>	1.24	1.40	1.18
<b>Site FAR</b>	0.42	0.59	0.69
<b>Average Lot Size</b>	1,467 sf	1,655 sf	3,002 sf
<b>Unit Size</b>	20' x 32'	22' x 36'	24' x 40' and 24' x 42'
<b>Approval Date</b>	1984	1988	NA

The proposed density (11.2 du/ac) is similar to the adjoining townhouse developments, which range in density from 10.0 du/ac to 11.2 du/ac. As discussed in the accompanying development special use permit report, staff is recommending that the applicant eliminate three units to retain a mature tree and provide an additional buffer on the northern perimeter of the property. The elimination of the units would reduce the density of the development to 10.04 du/ac, making it less dense than the adjoining Quaker Village development, and similar to the density of Colonial Heights. The reduced density as recommended by staff will create an appropriate transition in density between the Colonial Heights and Quaker Village townhomes.

While the RB zone would permit up to 54 units, a proffer of the rezoning is contingent upon the approved development plan. A proffer of less density than the RB zone permits would effectively create a zone with less density than the adjoining RB zone, and slightly more density than the adjoining RT zone, which will serve as an appropriate transition in density between the two townhouse developments.

### *Height*

The Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan recommends that the height limit at the location of the subject property be 35 feet, which is the height limit in the plan for single-family development. However, the same plan allows a 45-foot height at the adjacent Quaker Village development immediately to the east, and a 45-foot height limit has long been permitted on the south side of Duke Street, where the Normandy Apartments are located. When the site immediately to the south was rezoned in 1995, the Master Plan was changed to allow heights of up to 45 feet with a special use permit. Therefore, the proposed height change to the small area plan is consistent with the other townhouse and multi-family properties in the immediate area.

### *Impacts on Adjoining Single-Family Zones*

Several of the adjoining residents and civic groups have raised the concern that a rezoning of this property would create a precedent to change the zoning for other single-family residential properties located in the area.

However, the characteristics of the subject site are very different from those of other adjoining sites zoned single-family, in that the site is surrounded by townhouse uses and zoning that permits townhouse uses on the western, northern, and eastern portion of the site. In addition, commercial and multi-family uses are located immediately across the street to the south. The few other lots that adjoin the site to the north that are zoned R-12 and are developed with single-family homes that do not share the characteristics of the subject property.

Therefore, staff believes that amending the Master Plan and rezoning the site would not set a precedent for similar actions for any properties north of the site, nor require a rezoning of other single-family-zoned properties. The properties on the eastern and western portions of the site are already zoned for and developed with townhomes, with commercial and multi-family zoning and uses on the southern portion of the site.

Although it is the City's policy to discourage the consolidation of properties in established single-family neighborhoods in order to construct townhouse developments that would require spot zoning and be out of character with the neighborhood, the proposed rezoning is not such a case. The proposed townhouse use is comparable in density and use to the surrounding developments, and is consistent with goal of the Master Plan to "preserve and protect the character, scale and density of existing residential uses."

*Traffic, Parking, and Landscape Buffers*

Several of the adjoining residents have also expressed concerns related to the rezoning of the property, including increased traffic, parking problems and the loss of landscaped buffers. While these are legitimate issues that need to be addressed, it is appropriate to discuss them as part of the review the proposed site plan. For a discussion of the site plan and related issues, see DSUP #2002-0048.

**E. Conclusion**

The first test for a proposed rezoning is the assessment of whether the proposed land use is appropriate. In this context, the proposed zoning change from single-family homes to townhouses is appropriate, given the adjoining townhouse zoning, land use, and development pattern.

Staff recommends approval of the applicant's request to rezone the subject properties from R-8 to RB and the change in land use designation from residential low to residential medium. Staff also recommends approval of the increase in the height restriction in the Master Plan from 35 feet to 45 feet. The proposed increase is consistent with the 45 ft. height restriction at the Quaker Village and the ARHA properties. The density and scale of the proposed development are generally compatible with the existing density, character and scale of Colonial Heights and Quaker Village, the neighboring townhouse developments, a stated goal of the small area plan with regard to residential uses.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning and Master Plan amendment for the following reasons.

- The townhouse use is compatible with the existing mix of townhouse, multi-family and commercial uses that surround the site.
- The proposed RB zoning is compatible with the zoning of the adjacent properties.
- The density, scale and height of the development permitted in RB-Townhouse zone is consistent with the intent of the Master Plan to "preserve and protect the character, scale and density of existing residential uses."
- The density and scale of the proposed development and RB zone, with a proffer of reduced density, are generally consistent with the adjoining townhouse developments.
- The density and scale of the development will be compatible with the adjoining townhomes and will provide an appropriate transition from Duke Street to the single-family homes that are located on the northern portion of the site (north and west of Quaker Lane).
- The use is appropriate given the adjacent roadway pattern, as the site is located adjacent to Duke Street, one of the arterial roadways within the City.

There are remaining site plan-related issues, such as open space, tree preservation, and landscape buffers, which are discussed in the accompanying development special use permit staff report.

MPA #2003-0004  
REZ #2002-0005  
QUAKER RIDGE

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval of the applicant's request to rezone the property from R-8/Single-family to RB/Townhouse, and a Master Plan amendment to change the land use designation from residential low to residential medium and to increase the height limit from 35 feet to 45 feet.

**STAFF:** Eileen Fogarty, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning;  
Jeffery Farner, Development, Division Chief;  
Kathleen Beeton, Urban Planner;  
Lorrie Pearson, Urban Planner.

RESOLUTION NO. MPA 2003-0004

WHEREAS, under the Provisions of Section 9.05 of the City Charter, the Planning Commission may adopt amendments to the Master Plan of the City of Alexandria and submit to the City Council such revisions in said plans as changing conditions may make necessary; and

WHEREAS, an application for amendment to the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan chapter of the 1992 Master Plan was filed with the Department of Planning and Zoning on November 15, 2002 for changes in the land use designations to the parcels at 3517-3551 Duke Street; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Planning and Zoning has analyzed the proposed revision and presented its recommendations to the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, a duly advertised public hearing on the proposed amendment was held on November 6, 2003 with all public testimony and written comment considered; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that:

1. The proposed amendment is necessary and desirable to guide and accomplish the coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan section of the City; and
2. The proposed amendment is generally consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the 1992 Master Plan and with the specific goals and objectives set forth in the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan chapter of the 1992 Master Plan; and
3. The proposed amendment shows the Planning Commission's long-range recommendations for the general development of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan; and
4. Based on the foregoing findings and all other facts and circumstances of which the Planning Commission may properly take notice in making and adopting a master plan for the City of Alexandria, adoption of the amendment to the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan chapter of the 1992 Master Plan will, in accordance with present and probable future needs and resources, best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare of the residents of the City;


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Alexandria that:

1. The following amendment is hereby adopted in its entirety as an amendment to the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan chapter of the 1992 Master Plan of the City of Alexandria, Virginia in accordance with Section 9.05 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, Virginia:

Change the designation of parcels at 3517, 3517-A, 3525, 3535, 3541, and 3551 Duke Street from Residential Low to Residential Medium and change the height from 35 feet to 45 feet.


2. This resolution shall be signed by the Chairman of the Planning Commission and attested by its secretary, and a true copy of this resolution forwarded and certified to the City Council.

ADOPTED the 6th day of November, 2003.

  
Eric Wagner, Chairman

Alexandria Planning Commission

ATTEST:

  
Eileen P. Fogarty, Secretary

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR:

[X] MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

MPA #2003-0004

[X] ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

REZ #2002-0005

PROJECT NAME: Quaker Ridge (formerly known as Duke Street Commons)

PROPERTY LOCATION: 3517, 3517A, 3525, 3535, 3541, 3551 Duke Street

APPLICANT Name: Carrhomes, LLC

Address: 7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325, Annandale, VA 22003

PROPERTY OWNER Name: See Property Ownership Section

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Interest in property: ☐ Owner ☒ Contract Purchaser  
☐ Developer ☐ Lessee ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

If property owner or applicant is being represented by an authorized agent such as an attorney, a realtor, or other person for which there is some form of compensation, does this agent or the business in which they are employed have a business license to operate in Alexandria, VA:

☒ yes: If yes, provide proof of current City business license.

☐ no: If no, said agent shall obtain a business license prior to filing application.

THE UNDERSIGNED certifies that the information supplied for this application is complete and accurate, and, pursuant to Section 11-301B of the Zoning Ordinance, hereby grants permission to the City of Alexandria, Virginia, to post placard notice in the property which is the subject of this application.

J. Howard Middleton, Jr.  
Print Name of Applicant or Agent

  
Signature

Reed Smith LLP, 3110 Fairview Park Dr.  
Mailing/Street Address

703-641-4225 703-641-4340  
Telephone # Fax #

Falls Church, VA 22042  
City and State Zip Code

September 25, 2003  
Date

=====

FOR CITY STAFF USE ONLY:

Date application received: \_\_\_\_\_ Fee Paid: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
Date application completed: \_\_\_\_\_ Staff Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION - PLANNING COMMISSION: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION - CITY COUNSEL: \_\_\_\_\_

MPA # 2003-0004REZ # 2002-0005

## SUBJECT PROPERTY

Provide the following information for each property for which an amendment is being requested.  
(attach separate sheets if needed)

Address Tax Map-Blk-Lot	Land Use		Master Plan Designation		Zoning Designation		Frontage (feet)	Land Area (acres)
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed		
1 <u>3517 Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 19</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.32</u>
2 <u>3517A Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 20</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.03</u>
3 <u>3525 Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 21</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.39</u>
4 <u>3535 Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 22</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.66</u>
5 <u>3541 Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 23</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.52</u>
6 <u>3551 Duke St.</u> <u>Alex. VA 22304</u> <u>61.01-02, Parcel 24</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>Res</u>	<u>RL</u>	<u>RM</u>	<u>R-8</u>	<u>RB</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>0.55</u>

TOTAL

410 ft. 2.49 acres

## PROPERTY OWNERSHIP:

☐ Individual Owner☐ Corporation or Partnership Owner

Identify each person or individual with ownership interest. If corporation or partnership owner, identify each person with more than 10% interest in such corporation or partnership.

1 Name: Edward Woolf & Shirley A. Woolf, Trustees Extent of Interest: 100%  
Elaine Woolf Stokes & Susan Woolf Rittenberg, Beneficiaries

Address: 2901 Valley Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302-2429

- 2 Name: Edward Woolf & Shirley A. Woolf, Trustees Extent of Interest: 100%  
Elaine Woolf Stokes & Susan Woolf Rittenberg, Beneficiaries  
Address: 2901 Valley Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302-2429
- 3 Name: Susan Danfora Extent of Interest: 100%  
Address: 3525 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22304-6304
- 4 Name: Imad W. Danfora & Susan Danfora Extent of Interest: 100%  
Address: 3535 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22304-6304
- 5 Name: Hyon Kyu Mun & Chong Hyon Mun Extent of Interest: 100%  
Address: 6303 Little River Turnpike, #210, Alexandria, VA 22312-5045
- 6 Name: Robert E. Batt & Diane Crawford Extent of Interest: 100%  
Address: 3551 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22304

MPA # 2003-0004

REZ # 2002-0005

JUSTIFICATION FOR AMENDMENT:

(attach separate sheets if needed)

1. Explain how and why any proposed amendment(s) to the Master Plan are desirable, beneficial to surrounding properties, in character with the applicable Small Area Plan and consistent with City policies:

The area on the north side of Duke Street between North Quaker Lane and Fort Williams Parkway is identified by the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Small Area Plan (Small Area Plan) for residential use. Map 11 of the Small Area Plan designates this area for Residential, in general. Indeed, Map 12, entitled Proposed Land Use Changes, provides in No. 64 that this area should be changed from RL to RM, and it appears that the intent of the Small Area Plan is to designate the area north of Duke Street as medium density residential. However, Map 13, entitled Proposed Land Use, lists the site of the proposed application as RL, with property both to the East, the North and the West of the site designated as RM. In light of this difference, the applicant is proposing to amend Map 13 to indicate that this site is designated RM along with the other townhouse developments to the East, North and West. In addition, Map 15, entitled Proposed Zoning, designates the site as R-8 Zone, with the property to the East and North designated RB and the property to the West designated RT.

In the original application filed Nov. 19, 2002, the CRMU-H Zone was proposed. As a result of community meetings and consultation with the planning staff, the applicant proposes that the site which is the subject of this application be designated on Map 15 as RB.

Although it is clear that the intent of the Small Area Plan is to designate the area north of Duke Street between North Quaker Lane and Fort Williams Parkway as residential medium, the applicant is requesting the amendment to clarify in detail that this area is designated for RM (residential medium). This would designate the site the same as property to the East of the site and West of the site.

Finally, Map 18 in the Small Area Plan designates the height limit for this site as 35 feet in keeping with the residential low land use, although the property to the East and North is designated for a 45 feet limit. We request that Map 18 be amended to indicate a 45 ft height limit for this site. Inasmuch as the property to the East and North is designated for a 45 ft limit, the new height will have no negative impact on surrounding properties. Also, as a practical matter, the site slopes down from the North to Duke Street and, therefore, the townhouses on the site, as shown on the proffered development plan, are lower in height than the townhouses to the North.

2. Explain how and why the proposed amendment to the Zoning Map(s) is consistent with the proposed amendment to the Master Plan, or, if no amendment to the Master Plan is being requested, how the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with the existing Master Plan:

The rezoning application submitted by Carrhomes LLC, revised July, 2003, now proposes a rezoning from the R-8 Zone to the RB Zone. The applicant is submitting a Cluster Development Special Use Permit along with this rezoning application pursuant to Section 11-600 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The RB Zone is a district appropriate for this area. It provides for residential development and allows sufficient flexibility to construct quality townhouses in a cluster with a creative land design. Land adjacent to the site is also zoned RB.

The Development Plan submitted along with this application for Rezoning provides for a residential density of 11.25 dwellings per acre. The RB-Townhouse Zone permits a gross density of 22 dwelling units an acre, twice the density as our proposed development. The RM-Townhouse Zone permits 30 dwelling units per acre, far in excess of the proposed development. The proposed development, which is only 11.25 dwelling units per acre, is along a major right-of-way, Duke Street, in a mixed used area and in the vicinity of RB and RT zoned land. The applicant submits that the proposed rezoning is in keeping with the Master Plan and existing development in this area.

3. Explain how the property proposed for reclassification will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, parking spaces, police and fire, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewers, and schools.

The property will be served adequately by public facilities and services available in this area of the City. Vehicular access will be from Duke Street, which is classified as an arterial right-of-way. Vehicles will ingress and egress from Duke Street onto a private street located within the residential development.

The plan submitted with the Cluster Residential Development Special Use Permit application includes adequate parking within the development, including visitor parking. Utilities such as stormwater management, refuse disposal and water and sewer service, are all adequate for the development proposed for this property. The plan proposes 28-dwelling units, which may be accommodated by the school system presently in existence.

4. If this application is for conditional zoning approval pursuant to Section 11-804 of the Zoning Ordinance, identify all proffered conditions that are to be considered part of this application (see Zoning Ordinance Section 11-804 for restrictions on conditional zoning):

The Applicant proffers that the property subject to this rezoning application shall be developed in accordance with the Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan approved concurrently with this application for rezoning.

Docket Item #11-C  
DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT #2002-0048  
QUAKER RIDGE

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 6, 2003

**ISSUE:** Consideration of a request for a development special use permit, with site plan to construct a 28 unit townhouse cluster development with tandem parking and modifications.

**APPLICANT:** Carr Homes, LLC  
by J. Howard Middleton, Jr., attorney

**LOCATION:** 3517-3551 Duke Street

**ZONE:** R-8/Residential

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, NOVEMBER 6, 2003:** On a motion by Mr. Jennings, seconded by Mr. Komoroske, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of this request, subject to compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances and staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6 to 0. Mr. Wagner was absent.

**Reason:** The Commission considered the information contained in the staff memorandum dated October 16, 2003 and the staff report, and determined that the proposed rezoning and Master Plan amendment were appropriate zoning and land use designations for the subject property. The Commission recommended approval of the development special use permit and site plan request subject to the staff recommendations including a reduction in the total number of units from 28 to 25.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, OCTOBER 7, 2003:** On a motion by Mr. Leibach, seconded by Mr. Dunn, the Planning Commission voted to defer this item. The motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.

**Reason:** The Commission requested staff and the applicant to provide additional analysis on the implications regarding the proposed rezoning, Master Plan amendment, open space, buffers, parking, adjoining single-family home and traffic on Duke Street.

**Speakers:**

Richard Kain, resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed Master Plan amendments, rezoning and development special use permit. He stated that the proposed density is significantly more than the current zoning. Mr. Kain also expressed concern about existing traffic, stating that the traffic

generated by the proposed development will exacerbate congestion on Duke Street. He expressed concern about the loss of trees on the property and stated that, given the elevation of Quaker Village above the subject property, the applicant's proposed buffer would not sufficiently buffer their property from the proposed development.

Alexander Douvres, vice-president of the Colonial Heights Homeowners Association, stated that the Association strongly supports the applicant's requests and has met with the applicant on numerous occasions to address the concerns raised by Colonial Heights and stated that the applicant has been responsive to addressing those concerns. He also stated that traffic is a problem on Duke Street but that the additional traffic generated by the new residents will not make it any worse. Mr. Douvres stated that the Association was appreciative of Seminary Hills' support for their development in the mid-1980s and that they welcomed Quaker Village residents in the mid-1990s and hoped to do the same for the residents of Quaker Ridge.

Robert Batt, owner of 3551 Duke Street, stated that he lived at the subject property for 25 years and that the land was more valuable than the structure and he believes few people would be interested in building a new home on the property. He stated that no use other than townhomes made sense for the subject properties. Mr. Batt also stated that the land on which Quaker Village was developed had been wooded and that it was cleared to accommodate the development, with a retaining wall constructed between the existing single-family homes on Duke Street and the development.

Saba Samee, 3511 Duke Street resident, requested that the applications be deferred. She expressed concern about the deterioration of Duke Street as the surrounding properties were redeveloped and stated that they experienced severe run-off from the Quaker Village development that resulted in structural damage to their home and expensive repairs. She stated that they are the most impacted neighbor and that it is undesirable for them to be the only single family home in this location.

Elaine Woolf Stokols, co-owner of 3517-3517 A Duke Street, stated that she believes that it is in the best interest of the City to have the property redeveloped and was in negotiation with the applicant for over one year before coming to an agreement to sell the property. She stated that she believes noone will buy the property to build a new single-family home.

Diane Kain, 12 Arell Court, expressed concern about the loss of trees on the property and that she does not support rezoning the property.

Robert Coulter, president of the Seminary Ridge Civic Association, expressed concern about traffic on Duke Street and the significant impact the cut-through traffic on Fort Williams Parkway has on their neighborhood. He expressed concern about overflow parking from Colonial Heights residents on Fort Williams Parkway, and concern about the amount of visitor parking.

Bob Page, president of the Quaker Village Homeowners Association, stated the Homeowners Association opposes the applicant's request for a rezoning. He stated that the subject property owners' decision not to maintain their properties should not be the basis for rezoning the properties.

He stated that Quaker Village wants an appropriate buffer between their property and the subject property and that it cannot be provided under the current development plan.


Richard Hobson, 99 N. Quaker Lane, spoke on behalf of the Seminary Hill Civic Association. He referred to a letter from Frank Putzo, president of the Association, stating its opposition to the applicant's requests. Mr. Hobson stated that the proposal was a departure from the 1992 Master Plan and that, at that time, Seminary Hill supported lowering the density of the subject property because it protects their neighborhood. He stated that the Association opposes the rezoning and that the equivalency of the proposed density with the adjacent townhouse developments does not justify a change to the Master Plan.

Elizabeth Wright, 113 South Ingram Street, stated that she lives about a mile from the site and expressed general concerns about infill development, traffic on Duke Street, and the need for sheltered bus stops.

Cynthia Gurne, Fort Williams Parkway resident, stated that the neighborhood has been working with Colonial Heights over the past two years to address spillover parking from that community onto the Parkway.

Suzan Danfora, 3525 Duke Street, stated that she got the adjacent neighbors together to see if people would be interested in selling their properties. She stated that she did not enter into a contract with the applicant just for the money, that she does maintain the property, and that the existing homes are older and are expensive to maintain. She also stated that she has difficulty trying to pull out of her property onto Duke Street.


J. Howard Middleton, Jr., attorney representing the applicant.



## SUMMARY

### A. Overview

The applicant, Carr Homes, is requesting approval of a development special use permit, a rezoning from R-8 to RB, and a Master Plan amendment to construct a 28-unit cluster townhouse development on the 2.49-acre site at 3517-3551 Duke Street. Staff recommends approval of the development special use permit and the associated rezoning and Master Plan amendment (MPA #2003-004, REZ# 2002-0005), subject to the staff conditions.



The site fronts Duke Street and is surrounded on three sides with multi-family/townhouse development, and the proposed townhouse use is appropriate for the site. However, the site includes a considerable change in topography and open space areas that are wooded with a number of mature trees; therefore, the number of townhouse units is more appropriately determined through an analysis of the site and the preparation of an appropriate site plan that responds carefully to the site, rather than through a numeric calculation based on a proposed new zoning classification. The approved plan must ensure a new residential community that is appropriate to the site, considers conservation of the site environment, is compatible with the adjoining townhouse developments and buffered from the adjacent townhomes.

The City has held several meetings with the adjoining residents. Through this process, the applicant has worked with staff to address many of these concerns, which include:

- Density;
- Amount, Quality and Location of Usable Open Space;
- Tree Preservation;
- Landscape Buffers on the Perimeter of the Site;
- Streetscape/Pedestrian Environment;
- Landscaping/Street Trees;

- Traffic and Circulation; and
- Building Design/Materials.

However, staff does not believe that the proposal fully addresses the following issues:

- Overall number of units given the topography and wooded nature of the site;
- Adequate landscape buffers for adjacent residences; and
- Tree preservation.

### **B. Remaining Issues**

#### *Compatibility/Density*

In the initial reviews of this application, staff agreed that, from a planning perspective, the townhouse use was appropriate given the adjacent townhouse development and the frontage on Duke Street. The major concern is that any redevelopment be similar in density to the adjoining townhouse developments. Since the site has a considerable topography and is heavily wooded, the primary concern is the preservation of the character of the site, maintaining the existing landscaping and provision of adequate separation or buffering from the adjacent townhouse uses. Therefore, the discussions with the applicant have focused on the need to resolve site plan concerns, including the provision of appropriate amounts of public and private open space, landscape buffers from adjacent developments, tree preservation, and setbacks.

The following table compares the existing and the applicant's proposed density, zoning, and open space of the townhouse developments adjoining the proposed development:


	Colonial Heights	Quaker Village	Quaker Ridge (Proposed)
<b>Zone</b>	RT Cluster	RB Cluster	RB Cluster
<b>Site Area</b>	4.44 Acres	4.93 Acres	2.49 Acres
<b>Number of Units</b>	44	55	28
<b>Density</b>	9.90 Units/Acre	11.15 Units/Acre	11.24 Units/Acre
<b>Approval Date</b>	1984	1988	NA

The analysis indicates that the applicant's proposed density is slightly higher than Colonial Heights (11.24 units per acre versus 10 units per acre), and it is essentially the same density as Quaker Village, located to the north and east of the site.


#### *Tree Preservation and Buffering For Adjacent Residences*

At the request of staff, the applicant has retained several mature trees located in the central portion of the site and in a landscape buffer on the northern and eastern portion of the site, which provide a canopy and coverage for the adjoining residents. However, with eleven units proposed on the northern portion of the site, several of the larger trees would be eliminated. To create a larger landscape buffer and retain groupings of the existing tree canopy adjacent to Quaker Village, staff is recommending the elimination of lots 18, 19 and 24. With the elimination of these units, a grouping of large trees can be retained on lots 18 and 19, which will augment the landscape buffer on the perimeter of the site and maintain the character of the site, while providing considerable visual relief and screening for the adjoining residents. Further, staff is recommending the elimination of lot 24 in order to relocate the internal street and thereby provide a larger buffer along the northern property line adjacent to Quaker Village.

Proposed Site Plan



Staff Proposal



In summary, to maintain the character of the site and provide adequate buffering for adjacent residents, staff is recommending that three of the proposed units be eliminated. While there may be alternative lot arrangements to provide buffering and retain the mature trees, this approach provides an effective retention of trees, open space, and wooded buffer.

#### **C. Community Concerns**

Neighboring residents have expressed concerns about the proposed density, rezoning, traffic and parking, and the need for a landscape buffer on the perimeter of the property. The staff recommendation, which will result in a reduction in density to approximately 10 du/ac, is now comparable to Colonial Heights.

The community expressed concern about an increase in traffic. The traffic impact study indicates that the increase in traffic volume from the proposed development represents less than a one-half percent increase in the existing Duke Street peak-hour volumes, and will not result in a measurable degradation of existing traffic conditions on Duke Street.

A further concern was raised about an initial staff condition that would restrict access to a right-in-right-out movement, which may have potential impacts on the Colonial Heights neighborhood to the west. Based on that concern, staff agreed to allow full-movement access at the proposed project driveway until such time as an access management plan is implemented in this section of the Duke Street corridor. In recognition of the need for access management in this arterial corridor, the applicant has agreed to proffer additional right-of-way necessary for future implementation.

The community expressed concerns about on-site parking. The proposed development meets current zoning requirements for resident and guest parking.

#### **D. Conclusion**

Staff recommends approval of the development special use permit request, with site plan modifications and tandem parking, on the condition of elimination of three units on the site, for a total of 25. With 25 units, the proposed development is compatible in density with surrounding development; maintains many of the mature trees, which retains the character of the neighborhood; reduces the grading; and retains additional open space and a buffer to the adjacent townhouse developments.

The staff recommendation of approval is predicated upon addressing the site issues of: increasing the buffer on the northern portion of the site, the use of high-quality building materials, preservation of trees and open space, and a reduction in the number of units through the conditions outlined within this report. These recommendations will ensure that the proposed development is compatible with the existing context of the townhouse neighborhoods surrounding the subject properties.

The proposed development with the staff recommendations will provide public benefit by relocating utilities below grade on Duke Street, providing a 12,000-square-foot open space area that will be publically accessible, and preserving several existing large trees of 23 to 30" in caliper, reducing the number of curb cuts on Duke Street, while creating well-designed buildings and a frontage along Duke Street with visible open space, wider sidewalks, and new street trees.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends **approval** subject to compliance with all applicable codes and ordinances and the following conditions:

**Condition # 4 and condition # 16 have been revised to clarify that the public access easement will also include potential future access and use of the proposed internal street for the adjoining single-family home (TM 61.01-02-18).**

1. The applicant shall eliminate two units from lots 13 to lot 23 to retain a grouping trees on the northern portion of the site and eliminate a unit from lots 24-28 to increase the setback from 30" gum trees, that will result in the elimination of three units to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Zoning. The applicant shall eliminate the two surface parking spaces on the eastern portion of the site to retain the 23" caliper tree along the property line on the eastern portion of the site. (P&Z)
2. The applicant shall revise the site plan to provide the following revisions to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z, that at a minimum shall include:
  - a. Provide a side loaded garage for lot # 6, the area now occupied by the driveway shall be converted to open space and landscaping.
  - b. Lot # 1- 3 shall be setback a minimum of 24 ft. and lot # 4-5 shall be setback a minimum of 27 ft. The setbacks shall be from the new property line after the dedication of right-of-way on Duke Street.
  - c. Alternate stoop and driveway for lot 2 to provide adequate area for a continuous row of street trees.
  - d. Within a row of connected units, the front facades shall be aligned in groupings of 3-4 units to create a more uniform street wall. (P&Z)
3. The central open space area "Parcel-A" as generally represented on the preliminary plan shall be accessible to the general public. The applicant shall provide a minimum 10 ft. wide tree preservation area-landscape buffer on the western and northern portion of the property, which shall be a separate parcel and shall be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association. (P&Z)
4. A public ingress/egress easement shall be recorded by the applicant for the entire portion of the internal private street and adjoining sidewalks.. The easement shall extend to the eastern property line to provide the possibility of future access for the adjoining lot (TM 61.01-02-18). The easement shall provide public vehicular and pedestrian access. A plat depicting the easement(s) and all required documentation shall be submitted to the City Attorney with the final site plan submission. The easement shall be approved by the City Attorney and recorded among the land records prior to the release of the final site plan. (P&Z)

5. The applicant shall extend the proposed 5 ft. sidewalk to the north adjacent to lot 13 to provide a continuous 5 ft. wide sidewalk from Duke Street into the site along the east side of the entrance road to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z. A continuous 5 ft. wide sidewalk shall be provided on the southern portion of the east-west internal drive aisle to the eastern property line to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z. Stamped asphalt crosswalks shall be provided at the internal sidewalk crosswalk and at the intersection of the internal drive aisle and Duke Street. Where sidewalks are proposed in front of units (lots # 24-28) the driveway materials, color or texture will be distinguishable from the sidewalk materials, color and/or texture. (P&Z)
6. All private driveways serving individual garages shall have a minimum length of 16.0 feet or less than 10 ft. (measured from garage door to edge of sidewalk in front of unit or the inside edge of curb if no sidewalk is planned in front of unit), the driveways for lots 24-28 shall be designed to minimize encroachment of parked cars onto the adjoining sidewalk. Vehicles shall not be permitted to park in driveways with a length less than 16 ft., and in no case will cars parked in driveways be permitted to encroach onto sidewalks or into the private streets. No portion of any vehicle shall extend into the EVE. These prohibitions shall be clearly noted in the Homeowner's Agreement (HOA), and the HOA will also provide for enforcement of this condition. (P&Z)
7. The townhouse garages shall contain a minimum unobstructed dimension of 18 ft. x 18.5 ft. for the two standard size spaces. In addition to the parking required by the zoning ordinance for residents, 15 % additional parking(excluding driveway parking spaces) shall be provided for visitors.(P&Z)
8. All visitor parking spaces shall require all applicable signage as required by the zoning ordinance and shall be installed by the applicant. All appropriate on-street parking signage and any other signage for control of pedestrians and vehicles shall be installed by the developer to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (P&Z) (T&ES)
9. The final architectural elevations shall be consistent with the level of quality and detail provided in the preliminary architectural elevations dated August 13, 2003. In addition, the applicant shall provide additional refinements to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Zoning that shall at a minimum include:
  - a. On the side elevations, reduce the width of the window to 4'3" and eliminate the trim or brick detail around the arch used in the vertical portions of the window.
  - b. The window locations on the end units shall be coordinated with the floor plans, shall align vertically, and shall not be more than a distance of 10 feet on center from the rear-most windows.
  - c. The materials of the units shall be limited to brick, stone or cementitious siding.

- d. Brick and cementitious siding shall be provided for the front facades as generally represented on the preliminary elevations. The front side and rear facades for lots 1-5 and lots 24-28, shall be brick, unless cementitious siding and stone are provided on the front of the unit, then cementitious siding and stone shall also be provided on the rear facade. For the remaining units brick shall be provided for the side facades.
  - e. Decks for lots 1-5 and 24-28 shall be prohibited other than as represented on the preliminary elevations.
  - f. For all of the units the width of shutters needs to equal half the width of the adjacent window.
  - g. The units shall provide varying roof pitches and high quality composite shingles.
  - h. Color elevations shall be submitted with the final site plan.
  - i. Architectural elevations (front, side and rear) shall be submitted with the final site plan. Each elevation shall indicate average finished grade. (P&Z)
10. Rear fences for lots adjacent to Duke Street shall be limited to a maximum height of 3.5 ft. and shall be limited to a decorative open style metal fence to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z. Fences shall be prohibited within the 10 ft. tree conservation area on the northern portion of the property. A detail of all fences shall be provided on the final site plan. (P&Z)
11. The applicant shall reduce the height of the proposed retaining wall on Duke Street to a maximum height of 4-5 ft. The material of the retaining walls shall be stone similar to the existing stone retaining walls within Quaker Village. (P&Z)
12. In the event any trees designated to be saved are damaged or destroyed during the development process, the applicant shall replace such tree with additional trees of significant caliper equal, cumulatively, to the tree destroyed. In addition, the applicant shall pay the City \$15,000 each if any of the 30" Gum trees, along the eastern property line are damaged or destroyed during the construction process by the applicant or contractor as determined by the City Arborist. The landscape bond shall be for a period of 28 months. (P&Z)
13. A revised landscape plan shall be provided with the final site plan to the satisfaction of the Directors of P&Z and RP&CA. At a minimum the plan shall provide the level and quality of landscaping depicted on the preliminary landscape plan and the plan shall also provide:
- a. Provide streetscape and site furnishings for the internal open space such as benches to encourage its use.
  - b. Provide a significant amount of shrubs, landscaping and groundcover for the yards of the units that are adjacent to Duke Street.
  - c. Each lot shall provide an ornamental or columnar street tree adjacent to the internal private streets. The lots shall be revised to exclude the street trees adjacent to the internal private streets.

- d. A continuous row of shade trees such as London Plane shall be provided on east side of the entrance street and to the extent possible on the west side of the street. The spacing of the trees shall be 25-30 ft. on-center.
  - e. Evergreen and deciduous landscaping shall be provided in the buffer area between the development and Colonial Heights in consultation with Colonial Heights residents and to the satisfaction of the Directors of P&Z and RP&CA. The evergreen plantings shall be a minimum of 10-12' at the time of planting and the trees shall be a minimum of 4" caliper at the time of planting.
  - f. The tree preservation methods shall be installed and inspected by the City Arborist prior to any construction, demolition, grading or utility work for the site.
  - g. Utility lines such as water, storm sewer and electric lines shall be located to minimize impacts on proposed street trees and open space.
  - h. The location of all light poles shall be coordinated with the street trees.
  - i. Depict horizontal sight distance on the landscape plan.
  - j. All landscaping shall be maintained by the HOA in good condition and replaced as needed.
  - k. All plant materials and specifications shall be in accordance with the current and most up to date edition of the American Standard for Nursery Stock (ANSI Z60.1) as produced by the American Association for Nurserymen, Washington, D.C.
  - l. Landscaping shall be installed at a time to be determined in consultation with the City Arborist and Planning & Zoning so the survival of the landscaping will not be jeopardized by planting during a season that will not support its survival.
  - m. A tree preservation plan for all trees that are required to be preserved on the site plan. The tree preservation plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist or other horticultural professional with a demonstrated expertise in tree preservation. The tree preservation plan shall be submitted to the City Arborist with the submission of the final site plan. The applicant shall perform all necessary enhancements for the street trees such as watering/fertilizer, etc., that are required by the tree preservation plan prior to construction/grading of the site. (P&Z) (Police) (RP&CA)
14. Before commencing any clearing or grading of the site, the applicant shall hold a meeting with homeowners association representatives and adjacent single family home owners to review the hauling routes, location of construction worker parking, plan for temporary pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and hours and overall schedule for construction. The Departments of P&Z and T&ES shall be notified of the date of the meeting before the permit is issued. (P&Z)

15. The applicant shall identify a person who will serve as liaison to the community throughout the duration of construction. The name and telephone number of this individual shall be provided in writing to residents, property managers and business owners whose property abuts the site, and to the Directors of P&Z and T&ES. (P&Z)(T&ES)
16. Prior to the release of the first certificate of occupancy for the project, the City Attorney shall review and approve the language of the Homeowner's Agreement to ensure that it conveys to future homeowners the requirements of this development special use permit, including the restrictions listed below. The HOA language shall establish and clearly explain that these conditions cannot be changed except by an amendment to this special use permit approved by City Council.
  - a. Individual townhouse garages and spaces may be utilized only for parking; storage which interferes with the use of the garages for vehicle parking is prohibited.
  - b. Vehicles shall not be permitted to park on sidewalks, in driveways which obstruct sidewalks, on any emergency vehicle easement. The Homeowner's Association shall maintain a contract with a private towing company to immediately remove any vehicles violating this condition.
  - c. For units adjacent to Duke Street decks shall not be permitted, outdoor storage and sheds are prohibited. The fencing for the yards adjacent to Duke Street shall be limited to a 3 -3.5 ft. tall open metal fence.
  - d. Exterior changes or additions to units shall not be permitted without approval of City Council or the Director of Planning and Zoning, as determined by the Director.
  - e. No balconies, bay windows, or any other improvements shall be allowed to encroach into the space above an emergency vehicle easement.
  - f. All landscaping and screening shown on the final landscaping plan shall be maintained in good condition and may not be reduced without approval of City Council or the Director of Planning and Zoning, as determined by the Director of Planning and Zoning.
  - g. The applicant shall notify prospective purchasers, including language in sales and marketing brochures, that visitor parking is limited to driveway parking spaces on each individual lot and on-site visitor parking.
  - h. The Homeowners Association documents shall disclose to all prospective buyer(s) through the sales literature and documents, sales contracts etc. that the internal public access easement for the streets and sidewalks will be for general public use including the adjoining property (TM 61.01-02-18) and the potential liability. The central open space will be accessible to the public.
  - i. The developer shall notify prospective buyers, in its marketing materials, that the proposed streets and on-site storm sewers are privately maintained.
  - j. The proposed entrance on Duke Street shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. The future condition will be right-in, right-out at such

time deemed necessary by the Director of T&ES or current operation deemed unsafe. Notification will need to be provided in all applicable homeowners documentation disclaimers and literature. (T&ES) (P&Z)

17. Freestanding subdivision or development sign(s) shall be prohibited. (P&Z)
18. A temporary informational sign shall be installed on the site prior to the approval of the final site plan for the project and shall be displayed until construction is complete or replaced with a marketing sign incorporating the required information; the sign shall notify the public of the nature of the upcoming project and shall provide a phone number for public questions regarding the project. (P&Z)
19. A plat of consolidation and final subdivision plan shall be consistent with the final site plan, and shall be approved and recorded prior to the release of the final site plan. The subdivision plan and all easements shall be submitted as part of the first final site plan submission. (P&Z)
20. The applicant shall attempt to secure mail delivery to individual homes from the USPS. If such delivery cannot be secured, two ganged mailboxes per block shall be permitted within the development in a location to the satisfaction of the Director of P&Z. (P&Z)
21. The applicant shall be allowed to make minor adjustments to the building locations if the changes do not result in the loss of required or visitor parking, open space, existing trees to be protected or an increase in the building height or building footprint. (P&Z)
22. Any inconsistencies between the various drawings submitted by the applicant shall be reconciled to the satisfaction of the Directors of Planning and Zoning and Transportation and Environmental Services. (P&Z)
23. Submit a building location survey to the Planning and Zoning staff prior to applying for a certificate of occupancy permit for each unit. (P&Z)
24. Temporary construction trailer(s) shall be permitted and be subject to the approval of the Director of P&Z. (P&Z)
25. Temporary structures for sales personnel, as well as sales/marketing signs, shall be permitted, with the size and site design for such temporary structures, including signs, subject to approval by the Director of Planning and Zoning. (P&Z)

26. The applicant shall attach a copy of the final released site plan to each building permit document application and be responsible for insuring that the building permit drawings are consistent and in compliance with the final released site plan prior to review and approval of the building permit by the Departments of Planning and Zoning and Transportation and Environmental Services. (P&Z)
27. All utility structures (except fire hydrants) shall be located out of view of public property and rights-of-ways and shall be screened to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Zoning. (P&Z)
28. Developer to comply with the peak flow requirements of Article XIII of AZO. (T&ES)
29. Solid waste services shall be provided by the City. The developer must provide adequate space within each unit to accommodate a City Standard super can and recycling container. The containers must be placed inside the units or within an enclosure that completely screens them from view. The developer must purchase the standard containers from the City or provide containers that are compatible with City collection system and approved by the Director of T&ES. The development must meet all minimum standard requirements for solid waste access. (T&ES)
30. Applicant shall provide \$850/ea to the Director of T&ES for the purchase and installation of two (2) City standard street cans along Duke Street. (T&ES)
31. The applicant shall dedicate additional 7 feet of right-of-way on Duke Street , except for the area of the retaining wall as depicted on the preliminary plan for 2 ft. of additional landscaping, 1 foot additional sidewalk and 4 feet for future access management improvements on Duke Street. Relocate private utilities outside of proposed right-of-way. (T&ES)
32. The applicant shall provide a site lighting plan to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES in consultation with the Chief of Police. The plan shall show the existing and proposed street lights and site lights. Indicate the type of fixture, and show mounting height, and strength of fixture in Lumens or Watts. Provide manufacturer's specifications for the fixtures. Provide lighting calculations to verify that lighting meets City Standards and are located to prevent excessive spillover lighting and glare from adjacent properties. (T&ES)
33. Plan must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES that an adequate non-erosive stormwater outfall is available to the site. (T&ES)
34. Show all existing and proposed easements, both public and private. (T&ES)

35. Replace existing curb and gutter, sidewalks, and handicap ramps that are in disrepair or broken along the site frontage to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
36. Provide City Standard pavement for emergency vehicle easements.(T&ES)
37. Provide proposed elevations (contours and spot shots) in sufficient detail on grading plan to clearly show the drainage patterns.(T&ES)
38. Any inconsistencies in the drawings shall be reconciled to the satisfaction of the directors of P&Z and T&ES.(T&ES)
39. The site is located on marine clay areas as delineated on City map of marine clay areas. Prior to the release of the final site plan, provide geotechnical report with recommendations from a geotechnical professional for the pavement design, cut slopes and embankments, and retaining walls, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
40. Provide and install underground conduit with nylon pull cord and junction boxes at 300 feet centers and terminals for City traffic signal interconnection wiring along Duke Street. (T&ES)
41. Underground existing overhead utility lines along the frontage of the property on Duke Street, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
42. The developer shall notify prospective buyers, in its marketing materials, that the proposed streets and on-site storm sewers are private. (T&ES)
43. All private street signs that intersect a public street shall be marked with a fluorescent green strip to notify the plowing crews, (both City and contractor), that they are not to plow those streets. (T&ES)
44. Prior to the release of the final site plan, provide a Traffic Control Plan for construction detailing proposed controls to traffic movement, lane closures, construction entrances, haul routes, and storage and staging. (T&ES)
45. All Traffic Control Device design plans, Work Zone Traffic Control plans, and Traffic Studies shall be sealed by a professional engineer, registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia. (T&ES)
46. Prior to release of final site plan show vehicle sight distance (horizontal and vertical) at project entrance, per AASHTO guidelines and adjust any obstructions to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES and P&Z. (T&ES) (P&Z)

47. Provide all pedestrian and traffic signage to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
48. Provide a narrative describing how the project will comply with the stormwater quantity and quality requirements of Article XIII of the Zoning Ordinance. (T&ES)
49. Provide pre and post development, two and ten year storm water computations for the entire site. (T&ES)
50. The applicant is advised that all stormwater designs that require analysis of pressure hydraulic systems and/or inclusion and design of flow control structures must be sealed by a professional engineer, registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia. If applicable, the Director of T&ES may require resubmission of all plans that do not meet this standard. (T&ES)
51. Revise proposed rear yard stormwater drainage for Lots 6-23 to minimize overland runoff across individual lots. Provide area drains in the back yards and pipe runoff to a closed stormwater collection system. Provide easements to ensure that overland relief is protected from future rear yard improvements by homeowners. Connect all downspouts to the stormwater collection system, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
52. Easements are required for both sanitary sewer and water mains located within the private streets and plan shows overlapping easements for the water lines (Virginia American Water Company) and the sanitary sewers (City of Alexandria). Revise alignment of proposed sanitary sewers and water lines to provide minimum 10' horizontal separation to adequately accommodate the required easements per City standards. (T&ES)
53. Provide a City standard bus shelter on Duke Street, designed to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. (T&ES)
54. If fireplaces are to be included in the development, the applicant is required to install gas fireplaces to reduce air pollution and odors. Animal screens must be installed on chimneys.(T&ES)
55. Due to the close proximity of the site to the Duke Street the following conditions be included:
  - 1) The applicant shall prepare a noise study identifying the interior levels of noise residents at the site will be exposed to at the present time and 10 years into the future in a manner consistent with the Noise Guidance Book used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
  - 2) Identify options to minimize noise exposure to future residents at the site, particularly in those units closest to Duke Street, including special construction methods to reduce noise transmission, including:

- a. Triple-pane glazing for windows
  - b. Additional wall and roofing insulation.
  - c. Installation of resilient channels between the interior gypsum board leaf and the wall studs.
  - d. Others as identified by the applicant.
- 3) If needed, install some combination of the above-mentioned noise mitigation measures or others to the satisfaction of the Directors of Planning & Zoning, T&ES, and Code Enforcement.(T&ES)
56. The stormwater collection system is part of the Cameron Run watershed. All on-site stormwater curb inlets and public curb inlets within 50 feet of the property line shall be duly marked to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.(T&ES)
57. Provide a drainage map for the area flowing to the chosen BMPs, including topographic information and storm drains.(T&ES)
58. The stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) required for this project shall be constructed and installed under the direct supervision of the design professional or his designated representative. The design professional shall make a written certification to the City that the BMP(s) are constructed and installed as designed and in accordance with the approved Final Site Plan.(T&ES)
59. The surface appurtenances associated with the on-site structural BMPs shall be marked to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES to identify them as part of the structural BMP system.(T&ES)
60. For any surface-installed Best Management Practices, i.e. Bio-Retention Filters, Vegetated Swales, etc. that are employed for this site, descriptive signage for the BMPs is required to be installed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and Environmental Services.(T&ES)
61. The applicant shall furnish the Homeowner Association with an Owner's Operation and Maintenance Manual for all the Best Management Practices (BMP's) used on site. The manual shall include at a minimum: an explanation of the functions and operations of the BMP(s), drawings and diagrams of the BMP(s) and any supporting utilities, catalog cuts on maintenance requirements and a copy of the maintenance agreement with the City. (T&ES)
62. The applicant shall furnish each home purchaser with a brochure describing the stormwater BMP(s) installed on the site, outlining the responsibilities of the homeowners and the Homeowner's Association (HOA) with respect to maintenance requirements. Upon activation of the HOA, the Developer shall furnish five copies of the brochure per unit to the HOA for distribution to subsequent homeowners. (T&ES)

63. The applicant is encouraged to participate in the City's "Adopt-a-Street" program.(T&ES)
64. During the construction phase of this development, the site developer, its contractor, certified land disturber, or owner's other agents shall implement a waste and refuse control program. This program shall control wastes such as discarded building materials, concrete truck washout, chemicals, litter or trash, trash generated by construction workers or mobile food vendor businesses serving them and sanitary waste at the construction site and prevent its off site migration that may cause adverse impacts to the neighboring properties or the environment to the satisfaction of Directors of Transportation and Environmental Services and Code Enforcement. All wastes shall be disposed off site properly in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws.(T&ES)
65. New construction must comply with the current edition of the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC). Shown as Note 3 on Sheet 2. (T&ES)
66. The final site plans shall show placement of fire easement signs.(T&ES)
67. A soils report must be submitted with the building permit application. (Code)
68. Prior to submission of the Final Site Plan, the developer shall provide a fire flow analysis by a certified licensed fire protection engineer to assure adequate water supply for the structure being considered. (Code)
69. All exterior walls within 3 feet from an interior property line shall have a fire resistance rating of 1 hour, from both sides, with no openings permitted within the wall. An alternative, a 2 hour fire wall may be provided. (Code)
70. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit or land disturbance permit, a rodent abatement plan shall be submitted to Code Enforcement that will outline the steps that will taken to prevent the spread of rodents from the construction site to the surrounding community and sewers. (Code)
71. Roof drainage systems must be installed so as neither to impact upon, nor cause erosion/damage to adjacent property. (Code)
72. The proposed dead end emergency vehicle easement shall have provisions for fire apparatus turnaround. The proposed turnaround by lots 23 and 24 does not meet the required length for fire apparatus to maneuver. Each arm of the turnaround should measure at least 60 feet deep from the midpoint of the main EVE roadway. The emergency vehicle turnaround may include Grasscrete to the satisfaction of the Directors of P&Z, T&ES and Code Enforcement. (Code Enforcement) (P&Z)

73. Fifteen foot turning radii across from Lot 13 is inadequate. A minimum of 25 foot turning is required for emergency vehicle easements. (Code)
74. Add one additional hydrant at street corner by Lot 6. (Code)
75. An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided. (Code)
76. Based on a history of sound transmission complaints, it is recommended that all dwelling units have a STC rating of at least 60. (Code)
77. Hydraulic calculations will be completed to verify main sizes upon final submittal of the site plan. Profiles will be required for hydraulic calculations. (VAWC)
78. Maintain a 10 foot horizontal separation between water and sewer mains, measured edge to edge. This condition is currently not met in front of lots 1-3 and 15-23. (VAWC)
79. Alexandria Archaeology will work with the developer and the archaeological consultant to ensure that cost of the field work to the developer will not exceed \$50,000. (Archaeology)
80. All archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with the City of Alexandria Archaeological Standards and is subject to the approval of the City Archaeologist. (Archaeology)
81. The applicant shall not allow any other metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology. (Archaeology)
82. In accordance with the City's Affordable Housing Policy, the applicant shall make a contribution to the City's Housing Trust Fund of \$1.00 per gross square foot of new building area. The applicant shall pay the contribution to the City at the time of sale to the end user in the case of condominium or single family housing, or prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy in the case of rental units or commercial development. (Housing)

**Special use permits and modifications requested by the applicant and recommended by staff:**

1. Development special use permit to construct a 25 unit cluster townhouse development.
2. Special use permit for tandem parking.
3. Modifications of the front, rear and side yard setbacks as depicted on the site plan.
4. Modification of the requirement restricting the amount of impervious surface in a required yard for the front yards.
5. Modification of the 75 foot Duke Street setback requirement.

---

**Staff Note:** In accordance with section 11-506(c) of the zoning ordinance, construction or operation shall be commenced and diligently and substantially pursued within 18 months of the date of granting of a special use permit by City Council or the special use permit shall become void.

## **BACKGROUND**

The applicant, Carr Homes, is requesting approval of a development special use permit, with site plan and modifications, to construct 28 fee-simple townhouses in a cluster development on Duke Street west of Quaker Lane. The subject property consists of five lots of record with 412 feet of frontage on Duke Street, 175 feet to 345 feet of depth, and a total lot area of 2.49 acres. The site is currently developed with five single-family homes. Concurrently, the applicant is seeking a rezoning and Master Plan amendment to change the zoning and land use designation of the subject property from R-8 (residential low) to RB (residential medium) and to amend the height designation. For a discussion of those requests, see MPA #2003-0004.

### **A. Project Description**

The applicant's proposed development plan consists of 28 attached townhouse units arranged around an internal east-west private street. The net square footage (nsf) of the units, including the garage ranges from 2,595 to 2,655 nsf on three floors. The proposed height of the units is approximately 42 feet. The two required parking spaces per unit will be provided within the footprint of the unit and will be accessed by front-loaded garages. A total of 62 parking spaces will be provided, with an additional 48 spaces located within the driveways of the townhouses. Eight visitor parking spaces are required and are provided adjacent to the private streets.

Staff has worked with the applicant to ensure that the facades of the 10 units facing Duke Street will appear as the front facades of the homes, rather than the rear or sides, and to ensure that the overall architecture and building materials are of high quality.

Access to the development is provided via a single curb cut on Duke Street. In its original plan, the applicant and the City proposed restricting access to right-in/right-out. However, based upon community concerns, T&ES agreed to allow full-movement access at the proposed project driveway until such time as an access management plan is implemented in this section of the Duke Street corridor. In recognition of the need for access management in this arterial corridor, the applicant is required to proffer additional right-of-way necessary for future implementation.


Working with the flexibility allowed under the cluster ordinance provisions related to lot area and yard requirements, the applicant has proposed a centrally-located, roughly 12,000-square-foot open space area within the development. Several mature trees are located in this area and are proposed to be preserved; the applicant proposes to plant new trees in this area, which visually enhances the streetscape. Buffers are proposed between Colonial Heights to the west and Quaker Village to the north. At the request of Colonial Heights residents, the applicant is providing a metal fence on the shared property line. New trees are also proposed in the both buffer areas. The applicant has met with Quaker Village residents to discuss the existing wooded buffer along the northern portion of the subject property.

Streetscape improvements are proposed along the frontage of the property and include the undergrounding of utilities, a wider sidewalk, new street trees, and a bus shelter. The applicant proposes to dedicate approximately 8,300 square feet of property to the City for public street purposes. As a condition of approval, staff have requested that the applicant dedicate an additional seven feet of right-of-way, in order to provide four feet for future access management; two feet for additional landscaping; and one foot for additional sidewalk.

### **B. Zoning**

The current zoning of the site is R-8, Single-family zone. The site is adjacent to CL, CG, and RA zones on the south, RT/Townhouse zone to the west, R-12 to the north, and RB/Townhouse to the east and north.

Nearby sites have undergone a change in zoning in recent years. The property at 3750 Duke Street was rezoned from R-8 to RB in 1994 to allow a cluster development. It is now known as Wheaton Grove and consists of 10 townhouse units. The Colonial Heights property was rezoned from R-8 to RT in 1980, with development approval for 44 units granted in 1984. The property located immediately to the north of the subject property was rezoned in 1988 from R-8 and R-20 to RB/Townhouse and R-12. A total of 55 townhouse units were constructed and are known as Quaker Village.



- ☐ Townhouse Zones (RB, RT)
- ☐ Zones that allow Townhouses (CG, CL, CSL, CRMU/H)

The applicant is seeking a modification of the 75-foot Duke Street setback for the townhouses located adjacent to Duke Street. The proposed setback ranges from 58.54 feet to 66 feet from the center line of Duke Street.

The applicant is also seeking modifications of the front, side, and rear yard setbacks, and for the amount of impervious surface in a required yard. A discussion of these modifications is provided below.

QUAKER RIDGE			
<b>Property Address:</b>	3517, 3517A, 3525, 3535, 3541, 3551 Duke Street		
<b>Total Site Area:</b>	2.49 acres		
<b>Zone:</b>	R-8 (Current zone) RB (Proposed zone)		
<b>Current Use:</b>	Single-family residential		
<b>Proposed Use:</b>	Townhouses		
	<u>R-8 (Current Zone)</u>	<u>RB (Proposed Zone)</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
<b>FAR</b>	.35	.75	.686 without decks .7091 with decks
<b>Yards -Front</b>	30'	20'	3.12 -51' (modification requested)
<b>Side</b>	1:2, min. 8'	1:2, min. 8'	5'-12' (modification requested)
<b>Rear</b>	1:1, min. 8'	1:1, min. 8'	14' - 29' (modification requested)
<b>Highway Setback</b>	75'	75'	58.54' (modification requested)
<b>Height</b>	35'	45'	42.25'
<b>Open Space</b>	none	800 sq.ft./du (22,400 sq. ft)	1554 sq. ft./du (43,512 sq. ft.)
<b>Parking</b>	2 sp/du	2 sp/du + 15%visitor parking	62 spaces + 48 spaces in driveways + 8 visitor spaces

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

### **A. Summary**

Staff recommends approval of the proposed development special use permit, with site plan modifications and tandem parking, with a reduction in the number of units, the preservation of specific large trees, and the provision of adequate buffers for adjacent development. Throughout the conceptual review process, the applicant has worked extensively with staff to address fundamental issues such as providing consolidated open space, tree preservation and buffers; grading; undergrounding of utilities; and building design and materials. In addition, the applicant has worked with the adjacent townhouse communities to address concerns related to site access, tree preservation, and buffers.

Upon the resolution of these concerns, staff believes that the development can provide considerable public benefit, including the undergrounding of utilities along Duke Street, enhanced streetscape along Duke Street, preservation of many trees on the site, and consolidated open space that is visually and physically accessible from Duke Street.

### **B. Remaining Issues**

Staff has several remaining concerns regarding the project, including density, tree preservation, and buffering from existing adjacent development.

#### *Density*

The following table depicts the existing and proposed densities of other nearby residential developments:


	<b>Colonial Heights</b>	<b>Quaker Village</b>	<b>Wheaton Grove (Metzger)</b>	<b>Quaker View</b>	<b>Quaker Ridge (Proposed)</b>
Zone	RT Cluster	RB Cluster	RB Cluster	CL	RB Cluster
Site Acreage	4.44 Acres	4.93 Acres	1.20 Acres	0.57 Acres	2.49 Acres
Maximum Number of Allowable Units	44 units	79 Units	22 Units	15 Units	54 units
Number of Units	44	55	10	8	28

Project Density	9.90 Units/Acre	11.15 Units/Acre	8.3 Units/Acre	14 Units/Acre	11.24 Units/Acre
Average FAR Per Lot	1.24	1.40	.92	NA	1.18
Site FAR	0.42	0.59	0.55	0.75	0.69
Average Lot Size	1,467 sf	1,655 sf	2,823 sf	NA	3,002 sf
Approval Date	1984	1988	2000	NA	NA

The analysis indicates that, as proposed, the density is slightly higher than Colonial Heights (9.9 units per acre versus 11.24 units per acre), but is essentially the same density as Quaker Village located to the north of the site (11.15 units per acre v. 11.24 units per acre).

Staff is concerned about the proposed density of the development not because it is more dense than the zoning ordinance allows, or because the proposed density significantly exceeds the density of adjacent townhouse developments. Rather, staff's density concern stems from the unique characteristics of the site itself. The site contains a significant amount of wooded open space between and around the existing single family dwellings, providing a natural buffer between the Quaker Village development to the north and Duke Street. In addition, the site contains a significant amount of topography.

Colonial Heights




Quaker Village




These site conditions require creative, balanced solutions that allow for an appropriate level of development while ensuring the protection of trees, provision of quality open space, and appropriate buffering of adjacent residential communities.

Seeking that balance, staff recommends that the total number of units be limited to 25, or three units less than proposed by the applicant, in order to provide a greater buffer between the proposed development and its neighbors, to preserve large trees, and to provide larger, more visually connected open spaces within the proposed development. Staff has prepared an alternative site layout that eliminates two units located along the northern property line and shifts the units to the south, providing a 10-foot buffer of screening for the adjacent Quaker Village development immediately to the north of the subject property. The shift results in the loss of two units (Lots #18 and #19), but in exchange will protect a grouping of large trees that are currently proposed to be removed by the applicant, and will create another smaller open space area that is visually connected to the larger open space within the development and adjacent to Duke Street. Staff also recommends elimination lot #24 along Duke Street, in order to provide more open space adjacent to Duke Street. The staff proposal will result in the elimination of three units. While there may be alternative lot arrangements to provide buffering and retain the mature trees, this approach provides an effective retention of trees, open space and wooded buffers.

*Proposed Site Plan*



*Staff Proposal*



*Landscape Buffer - Tree Preservation*

The applicant proposes to retain several of the trees on the site, including several large gum trees that are part of the large common open space area. However, as discussed above, there is a grouping of large trees near the north property line that the applicant proposes to remove. Given the height and canopy of these trees, they would significantly augment the proposed buffer. For these reasons, staff recommends retaining these trees and expanding the proposed buffer, and has prepared a revised layout of the site which depicts the elimination of two units in the vicinity of the tree grouping along the northern boundary.

In addition to protecting the grouping of trees and ensuring its survivability during construction, a new open space area is created across from the larger open space area, which visually connects the two spaces and provides a swathe of green space through the site.

Neighboring residents have expressed concern to staff about the existing wooded buffer between their development and the proposed development. To that end, both staff and the applicant have met with adjacent residents to discuss their concerns related to tree preservation and the provision of adequate buffers at the perimeter of the site. The applicant has submitted, as part of the site plan, a landscaping plan which depicts the protection of many trees on the property and the provision of additional trees both on the site and the Quaker Village property to the north. In order to preserve as much of the existing buffer as possible and to ensure that the buffer area and the trees will not be removed by residents of the development at a later date, staff recommends that a 10-foot wide conservation area be provided along the northern and western boundary of the site, to be owned and maintained as common property by the homeowners' association.



Staff recommends several incentives to ensure that the trees that are designated to be retained are protected during construction. First, in the event any tree designated to be retained is damaged or destroyed during the development process, the applicant will be required to replace the tree with additional trees of significant caliper, cumulatively equal to the tree. Second, the applicant will be required to pay the City \$15,000 if any large tree that designated to be retained is damaged or destroyed during the construction process.

#### *Architectural Elevations*

Staff has worked with the applicant to revise the architectural elevations in order to create variation in the units, along with providing high-quality building materials, such as brick, this will ensure the overall quality of the development. With regard to the units facing Duke Street, staff worked with the applicant so that the facades of the units appear as the front facade, rather than having the rear or side facade facing Duke Street.

Revised Architectural Elevations (Illustrative)



To ensure the use of high-quality construction materials, which the applicant has represented to staff will be used, staff recommends a condition requiring the applicant to provide brick and cementitious siding for the front facades as generally represented on the preliminary elevations, and that brick be provided for the front side and rear facades for lots 1-5 and lots 24-28. If cementitious siding and stone are provided on the front of the unit, then cementitious siding and stone shall also be provided on the rear facade.

**C. Other issues**

*Traffic*

Access to the consolidated site is provided by a single entrance on Duke Street. Based on a traffic impact study submitted by the applicant, this redevelopment will increase the total number of trips generated by 155 per day. During the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of traffic flow on Duke Street, the projected driveway volumes are expected to increase by 14 vehicles (2 entering and 12 exiting) and 14 vehicles (10 entering and 4 exiting), respectively.

As concluded in the traffic impact study, these increases in traffic volume represent less than a one-half percent increase in the existing Duke Street peak hour volumes and will not result in any measurable degradation of existing traffic conditions on Duke Street or any additional traffic impacts. Daily fluctuations in traffic volumes on roadways such as Duke Street typically range from five to ten percent, well above the projected one-half percent increase for the proposed redevelopment.

A specific concern raised by the community was the possible impact on the Colonial Heights neighborhood to the west by restricting the project entrance on Duke Street to right-in-right-out operation. In particular there was concern that, with this staff-proposed restriction, traffic exiting

the site and traveling westbound as required by the right-out restriction would use the entrance to Colonial Heights as a turn-around in order to travel eastbound on Duke Street. Based on that concern, staff agreed to allow full-movement access at the proposed project driveway until such time as an access management plan is implemented in this section of the Duke Street corridor. In recognition of the need for access management in this arterial corridor, the applicant has agreed to proffer additional right-of-way necessary for future implementation.

#### *Affordable housing*

The applicant met with the City several months ago to discuss the affordable housing contribution. At that time, the City recommended that the applicant provide a contribution of \$1.00 per gross square foot of floor area rather than provide affordable units on-site. Given the likely asking price for the new homes and the amount of subsidy necessary to buy down the cost of a unit to make it affordable, it was determined that the contribution would not be sufficient to subsidize even one unit. The total gross square footage in the project is estimated at 83,592 sq. ft. which would give a \$83,592 contribution or buy-down amount. In addition, the affordable unit would likely not remain affordable after the initial, heavily discounted sale price.

#### **D. Zoning Modifications**

##### *Modification of Front Yard (lots 1-4; 6-11; 13-26), Rear Yard (all lots), and Side Yard (lots 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, 23, 24, 28) Setbacks*

The applicant has requested modifications of the front, rear, and side yard requirements, as stated above. The requested modifications are typical of cluster development requests. Staff supports the requested modifications and notes that flexibility in the site layout and design is encouraged in the cluster zoning provision, along with the preservation of open space, with adequate protections for the existing and potential developments that adjoin the proposed cluster development. Staff believes the proposed, commonly-owned, landscaped buffer along the northern and western portions of the site adjacent to Quaker Village and Colonial Heights as recommended by staff, as well as the preservation of existing trees and the amount of proposed open space, will adequately protect those developments.

##### *Impervious Surface in Front Yards (lots 1-27)*

The Zoning Ordinance states that not more than 50% of the required yard may be paved for use as driveways or parking spaces. In this case, the majority of units have driveways to provide access the front-loaded garages which occupy more than 50% of the required front yard, necessitating the modification. Staff recommends approval of the modification.

*Duke Street Setback (lots 1-5; 24-28)*

For properties that abut Duke Street from Quaker Lane west to the City limits, there is a 75-foot setback requirement. The applicant is requesting a reduction of the requirement in order to set back the units between 58.54 feet at the closest point and 66 feet from the center line of Duke Street. The Duke Street setback requirement originated from the requirement for service roads along Duke Street, which is no longer applicable. In fact, service roads on portions of Duke Street have recently been removed. The applicant is proposing a typical townhouse setback on Duke Street and staff is therefore recommending approval.

The applicant is proposing to dedicate 8,326 square feet along Duke Street to the City for public street purposes. The Department of Transportation and Environmental Services staff is requesting that the applicant dedicate an additional seven feet of right-of-way in this area, in order to provide two feet for additional landscaping, one foot for additional sidewalk, and four feet for future access management improvements on Duke Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed development special use permit, with site plan and modifications, subject to the conditions outlined within the staff report.

**STAFF:** Eileen Fogarty, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning;  
Jeffrey Farnier, Chief, Development;  
Kathleen Beeton, Urban Planner;  
Lorrie Pearson, Urban Planner.

CITY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Legend: C - code requirement R - recommendation S - suggestion F - finding

Transportation & Environmental Services:

- C- 1 Bond for the public improvements must be posted prior to release of the plan.
- C- 2 All downspouts must be connected to a storm sewer by continuous underground pipe.
- C- 3 The sewer tap fee must be paid prior to release of the plan.
- C- 4 All easements and/or dedications must be recorded prior to release of the plan.
- C- 5 Plans and profiles of utilities and roads in public easements and/or public right-of-way must be approved prior to release of the plan.
- C- 6 All drainage facilities must be designed to the satisfaction of T&ES. Drainage divide maps and computations must be provided for approval.
- C- 7 All utilities serving this site to be underground.
- C- 8 Provide site lighting plan to meet minimum city standards.
- C- 9 The applicant shall comply with the City of Alexandria's Noise Control Code, Title 11, Chapter 5, which sets the maximum permissible noise level as measured at the property line.
- C- 10 The applicant must comply with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act in accordance with Article XIII of the City's zoning ordinance for storm water quality control which includes requirements for pollutant load reductions and treatment of the Water Quality Volume Default (WQV).
- C- 11 The applicant must comply with the City of Alexandria, Erosion and Sediment Control Code, Section 5, Chapter 4. This includes naming a Responsible Land Disturber on the Erosion and Sediment Control sheets prior to engaging in land disturbing activities in accordance with Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law.

- C- 12 All required permits from Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, Army Corps of Engineers, Virginia Marine Resources must be in place for all project construction and mitigation work prior to release of the final site plan. This includes the new state requirement for a VPDES permit for all construction activities greater than 1 acre.
- F-1 Project lies entirely within an area described on historical maps as containing marine clays. Construction methodology and erosion and sediment control measures must account for this.
- F-2 Plan does not indicate whether or not there are any know soil and groundwater contamination as required with all preliminary submissions. Should any unanticipated contamination or underground storage tanks, drums and containers are encountered at the site the applicant must immediately notify the City of Alexandria Department of Transportation and Environmental Services, Division of Environmental Quality.
- R-1 Developer to comply with the peak flow requirements of Article XIII of AZO.
- R-2 Solid waste services shall be provided by the City. The developer must provide adequate space within each unit to accommodate a City Standard super can and recycling container. The containers must be placed inside the units or within an enclosure that completely screens them from view. The developer must purchase the standard containers from the City or provide containers that are compatible with City collection system and approved by the Director of T&ES. The development must meet all minimum standard requirements for solid waste access.
- R-3 Applicant shall provide \$850/ea to the Director of T&ES for the purchase and installation of two (2) City standard street cans along Duke Street.
- R-4 Dedicate additional 7 feet of right-of-way on Duke Street for 2 feet of additional landscaping, 1 foot additional sidewalk and 4 feet for future access management improvements on Duke Street. Relocate private utilities and retaining walls outside of proposed right-of-way.
- R-5 Show existing and proposed street lights and site lights. Indicate the type of fixture, and show mounting height, and strength of fixture in Lumens or Watts. Provide manufacturer's specifications for the fixtures. Provide lighting calculations to verify that lighting meets City Standards.
- R-6 Plan must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES that an adequate non-erosive stormwater outfall is available to the site.
- R-7 Show all existing and proposed easements, both public and private.

- R-8 Replace existing curb and gutter, sidewalks, and handicap ramps that are in disrepair or broken along the site frontage.
- R-9 Provide City Standard pavement for emergency vehicle easements.
- R-10 Provide proposed elevations (contours and spot shots) in sufficient detail on grading plan to clearly show the drainage patterns.
- R-11 Any inconsistencies in the drawings shall be reconciled to the satisfaction of the directors of P&Z and T&ES.
- R-12 The site is located on marine clay areas as delineated on City map of marine clay areas. Prior to the release of the final site plan, provide geotechnical report with recommendations from a geotechnical professional for the pavement design, cut slopes and embankments, and retaining walls, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-13 Provide and install underground conduit with nylon pull cord and junction boxes at 300 feet centers and terminals for City traffic signal interconnection wiring along Duke Street.
- R-14 Underground existing overhead utility lines along the frontage of the property on Duke Street, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-15 The developer shall notify prospective buyers, in its marketing materials, that the proposed streets and on-site storm sewers are private.
- R-16 All private street signs that intersect a public street shall be marked with a fluorescent green strip to notify the plowing crews, (both City and contractor), that they are not to plow those streets.
- R-17 Prior to the release of the final site plan, provide a Traffic Control Plan for construction detailing proposed controls to traffic movement, lane closures, construction entrances, haul routes, and storage and staging.
- R-18 All Traffic Control Device design plans, Work Zone Traffic Control plans, and Traffic Studies shall be sealed by a professional engineer, registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- R-19 Prior to release of final site plan show vehicle sight distance (horizontal and vertical) at project entrance, per AASHTO guidelines and adjust any obstructions to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.

- R-20 Provide all pedestrian and traffic signage to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-21 Provide a narrative describing how the project will comply with the stormwater quantity and quality requirements of Article XIII of the Zoning Ordinance.
- R-22 Provide pre and post development, two and ten year storm water computations for the entire site.
- R-23 The applicant is advised that all stormwater designs that require analysis of pressure hydraulic systems and/or inclusion and design of flow control structures must be sealed by a professional engineer, registered in the Commonwealth of Virginia. If applicable, the Director of T&ES may require resubmission of all plans that do not meet this standard.
- R-24 Revise proposed rear yard stormwater drainage for Lots 6-23 to minimize overland runoff across individual lots. Provide area drains in the back yards and pipe runoff to a closed stormwater collection system. Provide easements to ensure that overland relief is protected from future rear yard improvements by homeowners. Connect all downspouts to the stormwater collection system, to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-25 Easements are required for both sanitary sewer and water mains located within the private streets and plan shows overlapping easements for the water lines (Virginia American Water Company) and the sanitary sewers (City of Alexandria). Revise alignment of proposed sanitary sewers and water lines to provide minimum 10' horizontal separation to adequately accommodate the required easements per City standards.
- R-26 Provide a City standard bus shelter on Duke Street, designed to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-27 Revise the proposed retaining wall along Duke Street such that no portion of the wall extends into the Duke Street right-of-way.
- R-28 If fireplaces are to be included in the development, the applicant is required to install gas fireplaces to reduce air pollution and odors. Animal screens must be installed on chimneys.
- R-29 Due to the close proximity of the site to the Duke Street the following conditions be included in the SUP:
  - 1) The applicant shall prepare a noise study identifying the interior levels of noise residents at the site will be exposed to at the present time and 10 years into the future in a manner consistent with the Noise Guidance Book used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
  - 2) Identify options to minimize noise exposure to future residents at the site,

particularly in those units closest to Duke Street, including special construction methods to reduce noise transmission, including:

- Triple-pane glazing for windows
- Additional wall and roofing insulation.
- Installation of resilient channels between the interior gypsum board leaf and the wall studs.
- Others as identified by the applicant.
- Installation of a berm or sound wall.

- 3) If needed, install some combination of the above-mentioned noise mitigation measures or others to the satisfaction of the Directors of Planning & Community Development, T&ES, and Code Enforcement.

- R-30 The stormwater collection system is part of the Cameron Run watershed. All on-site stormwater curb inlets and public curb inlets within 50 feet of the property line shall be duly marked to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES.
- R-31 Provide a drainage map for the area flowing to the chosen BMP, including topographic information and storm drains.
- R-32 The stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) required for this project shall be constructed and installed under the direct supervision of the design professional or his designated representative. The design professional shall make a written certification to the City that the BMP(s) are constructed and installed as designed and in accordance with the approved Final Site Plan.
- R-33 The surface appurtenances associated with the on-site structural BMPs shall be marked to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES to identify them as part of the structural BMP system.
- R-34 For any surface-installed Best Management Practices, i.e. Bio-Retention Filters, Vegetated Swales, etc. that are employed for this site, descriptive signage for the BMPs is required to be installed to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and Environmental Services.
- R-35 If the units will be sold as individual units and a home owner's association established the following two conditions shall apply:  
The applicant shall furnish the Homeowner Association with an Owner's Operation and Maintenance Manual for all the Best Management Practices (BMP's) used on site. The manual shall include at a minimum: an explanation of the functions and operations of the BMP(s), drawings and diagrams of the BMP(s) and any supporting utilities, catalog cuts on maintenance requirements and a copy of the maintenance agreement with the City.

The applicant shall furnish each home purchaser with a brochure describing the stormwater BMP(s) installed on the site, outlining the responsibilities of the homeowners and the Homeowner's Association (HOA) with respect to maintenance requirements. Upon activation of the HOA, the Developer shall furnish five copies of the brochure per unit to the HOA for distribution to subsequent homeowners.

Otherwise the following condition applies:

The applicant shall furnish the owners with an Operation and Maintenance Manual for all Best Management Practices (BMPs) on the project. The manual shall include an explanation of the functions and operations of each BMP and any supporting utilities, catalog cuts on any mechanical or electrical equipment, a schedule of routine maintenance for the BMP(s) and supporting equipment, and a copy of the maintenance agreement with the City.(T&ES)

- R-36 The applicant is encouraged to participate in the City's "Adopt-a-Street" program.
- R-37 During the construction phase of this development, the site developer, its contractor, certified land disturber, or owner's other agents shall implement a waste and refuse control program. This program shall control wastes such as discarded building materials, concrete truck washout, chemicals, litter or trash, trash generated by construction workers or mobile food vendor businesses serving them and sanitary waste at the construction site and prevent its off site migration that may cause adverse impacts to the neighboring properties or the environment to the satisfaction of Directors of Transportation and Environmental Services and Code Enforcement. All wastes shall be disposed off site properly in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws.
- R-38 The proposed entrance on Duke Street shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Director of T&ES. The future condition will be right-in, right-out at such time deemed necessary by the Director of T&ES or current operation is deemed unsafe. Notification will need to be provided in all applicable homeowners documentation disclaimers and literature.
- R-39 New construction must comply with the current edition of the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC). Shown as Note 3 on Sheet 2.
- R-40 The final site plans shall show placement of fire easement signs.

Code Enforcement:

- C-1 A Certificate of occupancy shall be obtained prior to any occupancy of the building or portion thereof, in accordance with USBC 118.0.
- C-2 Construction permits are required for this project. Plans shall accompany the permit application that fully detail the construction as well as layouts and schematics of the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.
- C-3 New construction must comply with the current edition of the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC). Shown as Note 3 on Sheet 2.
- C-4 The final site plans shall show placement of fire easement signs. See attached guidelines for sign details and placement requirements.
- C-5 A soils report must be submitted with the building permit application.
- C-6 Prior to submission of the Final Site Plan, the developer shall provide a fire flow analysis by a certified licensed fire protection engineer to assure adequate water supply for the structure being considered.
- C-7 A Certificate of occupancy shall be obtained prior to any occupancy of the building or portion thereof, in accordance with USBC 118.0.
- C-8 All exterior walls within 3 feet from an interior property line shall have a fire resistance rating of 1 hour, from both sides, with no openings permitted within the wall. As alternative, a 2 hour fire wall may be provided.
- C-9 Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit or land disturbance permit, a rodent abatement plan shall be submitted to Code Enforcement that will outline the steps that will taken to prevent the spread of rodents from the construction site to the surrounding community and sewers.
- C-10 Roof drainage systems must be installed so as neither to impact upon, nor cause erosion/damage to adjacent property.
- C-11 Construction permits are required for this project. Plans shall accompany the permit application that fully detail the construction as well as layouts and schematics of the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.

- C-12 The proposed dead end emergency vehicle easement shall have provisions for fire apparatus turnaround. The proposed turnaround by lots 23 and 24 does not meet the required length for fire apparatus to maneuver. Each arm of the turnaround should measure at least 60 feet deep from the midpoint of the main EVE roadway.
- C-13 15 foot turning radii across from Lot 13 is inadequate. A minimum of 25 foot turning is required for emergency vehicle easements. See Notes F-1 to F-3
- C-14 Add one additional hydrant at street corner by Lot 6.
- F-1 Turning movement exhibit does not account for ladder truck movement.
- F-2 15 foot turning radii are unacceptable for fire apparatus movement and causes apparatus to cross opposing lanes of traffic to negotiate turns.
- F-3 Inadequate turn around provisions for ladder truck by Lots 23 and 24. Ladder truck length is 56'6".
- R-1 An automatic sprinkler system is recommended.
- R-2 Based on a history of sound transmission complaints, it is recommended that all dwelling units have a STC rating of at least 60.

Health Department:

No comments were received from this agency.

Police Department:

- F-1 No lighting plan submitted.
- R-1 All trees to be limbed up to a minimum of 6 feet as they mature to allow for natural surveillance. Several trees planned for this project can not be limbed to six feet because of their height. Two examples are Eastern Red Cedar and Leland Cypress. The growth of these trees near walkways allows persons to conceal themselves from the residents and guests. Recommended that these trees be replaced. (Police)

**Planning and Zoning staff does not support this recommendation as the tree species and location proposed is intended to provide landscape screening and buffer. Limbing all trees and/or the elimination of the proposed species would contradict that intention.**

- R-2 The applicant is contact the Crime Prevention Unit of the Alexandria Police Department at 703-838-4520 regarding a security survey for the business.
- R-3 The applicant is to contact the Crime Prevention Unit of the Alexandria Police Department at 703-838-4520 regarding a robbery awareness program for all employees.

**Planning and Zoning staff does not support these recommendations as neither recommendation is applicable to a townhouse development.**

- R-4 Trees are not to be planted under or near light poles.
- R-5 No shrubs higher than 3 feet to be planted within 6 feet of walkways.
- R-6 The proposed shrubbery is to have a maximum height of 36 inches when it matures.

Historic Alexandria (Archaeology):

- F-1 This property has the potential to yield significant archaeological resources which could provide insight into military activities in Alexandria during the Civil War. Fort Williams and a battery and rifle trenches were situated just north of these lots. There have been reports that Civil War period artifacts have been recovered from the area. Other potential archaeological resources on the property include remains associated with a 19 th century residence which was located on the development site or adjacent to it, according to the 1878 and 1894 maps. In addition, previous archaeological work on an adjacent lot (Quaker Village) has yielded evidence of prehistoric use of the area by Native Americans. However, the prehistoric artifacts on that site were found in disturbed contexts, and it is likely that a similar situation would be present on this development property, since the extant houses on the lots were probably constructed in the mid-20 th century.
- C-1 To insure that significant information is not lost as a result of the current development project, the applicant must hire an archaeological consultant to conduct a walkover and metal detection survey for an Archaeological Evaluation. Upon request, Alexandria Archaeology will prepare a scope of work for this investigation. If significant resources are discovered, the consultant must complete a Resource Management Plan, as outlined in the *City of Alexandria Archaeology Standards*. Preservation measures presented in the Resource Management Plan, as approved by the City Archaeologist, will be implemented. Alexandria Archaeology will work with the developer and the archaeological consultant to ensure that cost of the field work to the developer will not exceed \$50,000.


- C-2 All archaeological preservation measures must be completed prior to ground-disturbing activities (such as coring, grading, filling, vegetation removal, undergrounding utilities, pile driving, landscaping and other excavations as defined in Section 2-151 of the Zoning Ordinance. To confirm, call Alexandria Archaeology at (703)838-4399.
- C-3 Call Alexandria Archaeology immediately (703-838-4399) if any buried structural remains (walls, foundations, wells, privies, cisterns, etc) or concentrations of artifacts are discovered during development. Work must cease in the area of the discovery until a City archaeologist comes to the site and records the finds.
- C-4 The General Notes of the Preliminary and Final Site Plans must include the statements in C-2 and C-3 above so that on-site contractors are aware of the requirements. Additional statements to be included on the Final Site Plan will be determined in consultation with Alexandria Archaeology.
- C-5 Certificates of occupancy will not be issued for this property until the final archaeological report has been received and approved by the City Archaeologist.
- C-6 If warranted by the City Archaeologist, the developer will erect a historic marker on the property according to specifications provided by Alexandria Archaeology. The marker highlight the historical and archaeological significance of the property.
- C-7 If warranted by the City Archaeologist, the developer will produce a booklet for the public on the history and archaeology of the property, according to specifications provided by Alexandria Archaeology.
- R-1 All archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with the City of Alexandria Archaeological Standards and is subject to the approval of the City Archaeologist.
- R-2 The applicant shall not allow any other metal detection to be conducted on the property, unless authorized by Alexandria Archaeology.

Virginia American Water Company:

- R-1 Hydraulic calculations will be completed to verify main sizes upon final submittal of the site plan. Profiles will be required for hydraulic calculations.
- R-2 Maintain a 10' horizontal separation between water and sewer mains, measured edge to edge. This condition is not currently met in front of lots 1-3 and 15-23.

Attachment 1

Staff Proposed Site Plan



REVISED: 7/2/03  
FILED: NOV. 15, 2002

~~Completed~~  
APPLICATION for  
DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT with SITE PLAN  
DSUP # 2002-0048

PROJECT NAME: Quaker Ridge (formerly known as Duke Street Commons)

PROPERTY LOCATION: 3517, 3517A, 3525, 3535, 3541, 3551 Duke Street

TAX MAP REFERENCE: Tax Map 61.01-02, Parcels 19-24 ZONE: RB Townhome

APPLICANT Name: Carrhomes, LLC

Address: 7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325, Annandale, VA 22003

PROPERTY OWNER Name: See Attachment 1

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL: Carrhomes LLC proposes to construct a cluster townhouse development, with subdivision, consisting of 28 townhouses with off-street parking and open space area. The application is filed in accordance with Section 11-600 as a cluster residential development.

MODIFICATIONS REQUESTED: (1) Rear yard setback reduction for Lots 1-28; (2) Side yard set back reduction for Lots 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28; (3) Front yard setback reduction for Lots 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13-26; (4) Duke Street setback reduction for Lots 1-5, 24-28.

SUP's REQUESTED: Cluster Residential Development, Section 11-600, of the Zoning Ordinance

THE UNDERSIGNED hereby applies for Development Site Plan, with Special Use Permit, approval in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Alexandria, Virginia.

THE UNDERSIGNED, having obtained permission from the property owner, hereby grants permission to the City of Alexandria to post placard notice on the property for which this application is requested, pursuant to Article XI, Section 11-301(B) of the 1992 Zoning Ordinance of the City of Alexandria, Virginia.

THE UNDERSIGNED also attests that all of the information herein provided and specifically including all surveys, drawings, etc., required of the applicant are true, correct and accurate to the best of his knowledge and belief.

J. Howard Middleton, Jr.  
Print Name of Applicant or Agent

[Signature]  
Signature

Reed Smith LLP, 3110 Fairview Park Dr.  
Mailing/Street Address

703-641-4225 703-641-4340  
Telephone # Fax #

Falls Church, VA 22042  
City and State Zip Code

July 2, 2003  
Date

=====DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE - OFFICE USE ONLY=====

Application Received: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fee Paid & Date: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Received Plans for Completeness: \_\_\_\_\_  
Received Plans for Preliminary: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION - PLANNING COMMISSION: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION - CITY COUNCIL: \_\_\_\_\_

Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan (DSUP) # 2002-0048

All applicants must complete this form.

Supplemental forms are required for child care facilities, restaurants, automobile oriented uses and freestanding signs requiring special use permit approval.

1. The applicant is the (check one):

☐ Owner

☒ Contract Purchaser

☐ Lessee

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

State the name, address and percent of ownership of any person or entity owning an interest in the applicant, unless the entity is a corporation or partnership in which case identify each owner of more than ten percent:

Thomas E. Jordan

Christopher B. Rupp

If property owner or applicant is being represented by an authorized agent such as an attorney, realtor, or other person for which there is some form of compensation, does this agent or the business in which the agent is employed have a business license to operate in the City of Alexandria, Virginia?

☒ Yes. Provide proof of current City business license

☐ No. The agent shall obtain a business license prior to filing application, if required by the City Code.

## NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

2. The applicant shall describe below the nature of the request in detail so that the Planning Commission and City Council can understand the nature of the operation and the use, including such items as the nature of the activity, the number and type of patrons, the number of employees, the hours, how parking is to be provided for employees and patrons, and whether the use will generate any noise. If not appropriate to the request, delete pages \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Carrhomes, LLC proposes to construct a townhouse community consisting of 28-dwelling units, named Quaker Ridge on the site plan. Vehicular access will be provided from Duke Street extending into the site to an east-west private street which will extend from the eastern to the western boundary of the property. The development will be located on 2.49 acres of land, with a density of approximately 11 dwelling units per acre. A central feature of the development is an open space, which extends from Duke Street into the site and consists of approximately 12,000 square feet of land area including mature trees to be saved. The focus of the open space and, indeed, the development consists of significant trees that will be preserved. The applicant is requesting a cluster residential development special use permit with site plan and subdivision.

Along with this application, a master plan and zoning amendment application has also been filed.

### Project Design

The proposed townhouse development is compatible with neighboring properties. From Quaker Lane on the east to Fort Williams Parkway on the west, the stretch of land on the north side of Duke Street consists primarily of townhouse development. To the east and to the north is the Quaker Village townhouse community and to the west is the Colonial Heights townhouse community. Also to the east is a subsidized housing area. The purpose of the proposed development is to assemble several single family lots with aging houses and create an attractive community of high architectural quality in keeping with existing development on the north side of Duke Street. Immediately across Duke Street is the Sunrise Assisted Living facility, zoned CRMU-H. Other uses along the south side of the Duke Street are rental apartments and a McDonalds restaurant. Quaker Ridge will therefore be compatible with the residential elements north of Duke Street and improve the character of this stretch between North Quaker Lane and Fort Williams Parkway.

One single family house immediately on the eastern border of the site is not part of this site plan, although the owner has been invited to make her property a part of the plan. The private street network is designed to allow this owner to develop her site in the future and connect into the private right-of-way system. An example of this design has been submitted to the planning staff to demonstrate how this could be accommodated in the future.

Parking will be provided on site sufficient for the townhouse residents and for visitors. Twenty-six (26) of the townhouses will have a parking garage for two cars, and 2 of the townhouses will have a one car garage with the second car in the driveway. In addition, eight additional visitor parking spaces are located on the private right-of-way within the site. Therefore, there are a total of 62 parking spaces, and an additional 50 spaces within the driveways of 26 of the townhouses.

The standards for development north of Duke Street between Quaker Lane and Fort Williams Parkway have already been set by the townhouse developments presently in this location. None of the townhouses in the Quaker Village project or the Colonial Heights townhouse development face along Duke Street. Ten of the houses in Quaker Ridge have frontage along Duke Street. The rear of each of the houses is designed to appear as a front with a door leading out into the yard and fenestration appropriate for a front. In addition, there is a large open space area which will extend to Duke Street between a row of houses and the private right-of-way.

As a result of the design of the houses and the private street network, the applicant is requesting modification of yard requirements, which may be permitted in a cluster development as indicated in Section 11-603(G). The setback reduction along Duke Street will vary as shown on the preliminary site plan included with this application. We submit that the varying of setback along Duke Street from Quaker Lane to Fort Williams Parkway provides an attractive ambiance for the vehicular and pedestrian traffic along the street, and that a uniform setback of 75 feet serves no useful purpose for this stretch of the arterial road. In addition, the applicant is requesting yard modifications as specified on the site plan. These modifications are necessary to support the quality design of the development.

#### Special Use Permit

Carrhomes, LLC is requesting a special use permit pursuant to Section 11-600 of the Zoning Ordinance which permits a cluster residential development. The cluster development enables the applicant to preserve a large area of open space with existing trees near the center of the site and open to views from Duke Street. The cluster concept allows the applicant to preserve this open space as well as create a well designed community of townhouses.

Most of the lots in Duke Street Commons have frontage along the private street network, which is, of course, common to cluster townhouse developments including the other developments in the neighborhood.

In summary, the proposed development is in keeping with the comprehensive plan and with the existing residential development north of Duke Street, and will provide a balance of uses along Duke Street with townhouse communities, including subsidized housing, on the north side and Sunrise Assisted Living facility, Normandy Hill Apartments and McDonalds restaurant on the south side of Duke Street.

Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan (DSUP) # 2002-0048

3. How many patrons, clients, pupils and other such users do you expect?  
Specify time period (i.e., day, hour or shift).

Residential development, 28 townhouses dwellings

4. How many employees, staff and other personnel do you expect?  
Specify time period (i.e., day, hour or shift).

Not applicable

5. Describe the proposed hours and days of operation of the proposed use:

Day	Hours	Day	Hours
<u>Not applicable</u>			

6. Describe any potential noise emanating from the proposed use:

- A. Describe the noise levels anticipated from all mechanical equipment and patrons.

Not applicable

- B. How will the noise from patrons be controlled?

Not applicable

7. Describe any potential odors emanating from the proposed use and plans to control them:

Not applicable

Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan (DSUP) #2002-0048

8. Provide information regarding trash and litter generated by the use:

A. What type of trash and garbage will be generated by the use?

Normal residential refuse

B. How much trash and garbage will be generated by the use?

Normal residential trash for 28 dwellings

C. How often will trash be collected?

City collection

D. How will you prevent littering on the property, streets and nearby properties?

Not applicable

9. Will any hazardous materials, as defined by the state or federal government, be handled, stored, or generated on the property?

☐ Yes. ☒ No.

If yes, provide the name, monthly quantity, and specific disposal method below:

10. Will any organic compounds, for example paint, ink, lacquer thinner, or cleaning or degreasing solvent, be handled, stored or generated on the property?

☐ Yes. ☒ No.

If yes, provide the name, monthly quantity, and specific disposal method below:

Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan (DSUP) # 2002-0048

11. What methods are proposed to ensure the safety of residents, employees and patrons?

City police protection will be available

**ALCOHOL SALES**

12. Will the proposed use include the sale of beer, wine, or mixed drinks?

☐ Yes. ☒ No.

If yes, describe alcohol sales below, including if the ABC license will include on-premises and/or off-premises sales. Existing uses much describe their existing alcohol sales and/or service and identify any proposed changes in that aspect of the operation.

**PARKING AND ACCESS REQUIREMENTS**

13. Provide information regarding the availability of off-street parking:

- A. How many parking spaces are required for the proposed use pursuant to section 8-200(A) of the zoning ordinance?

56 spaces

- B. How many parking spaces of each type are provided for the proposed use:

60

Standard spaces

2

Compact spaces

                     Handicapped accessible spaces

50

Other: Additional space for parking on driveways of 26 dwelling units.

Development Special Use Permit with Site Plan (DSUP) # 2002-0048

- C. Where is the required parking located? (check one) ☒ on-site ☐ off-site.

If the required parking will be located off-site, where will it be located:

Pursuant to section 8-200(C) of the zoning ordinance, commercial and industrial uses may provide off-site parking within 500 feet of the proposed use, provided that the off-site parking is located on land zoned for commercial or industrial uses. All other uses must provide parking on-site, except that off-street parking may be provided within 300 feet of the use with a special use permit.

- D. If a reduction in the required parking is requested, pursuant to section 8-100(A)(4) or (5) of the zoning ordinance, complete the PARKING REDUCTION SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION.

14. Provide information regarding loading and unloading facilities for the use:

- A. How many loading spaces are required for the use, per section 8-200 (B) of the zoning ordinance? Not applicable

- B. How many loading spaces are available for the use? \_\_\_\_\_

- C. Where are off-street loading facilities located? \_\_\_\_\_

- D. During what hours of the day do you expect loading/unloading operations to occur? \_\_\_\_\_

- E. How frequently are loading/unloading operations expected to occur, per day or per week, as appropriate? \_\_\_\_\_

15. Is street access to the subject property adequate or are any street improvements, such as a new turning lane, necessary to minimize impacts on traffic flow?

Access from Duke Street is adequate



## GOROVE/SLADE ASSOCIATES, Inc.

Suite 700 / 1140 Connecticut Ave., NW / Washington, DC 20036

Phone: (202) 296-8625  
Fax: (202) 785-1276  
Toll Free: (888) 212-4242

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Steve Ness CarrHomes  
Tara Craven CarrHomes

**FROM:** Christopher M. Tacinelli, P.E.  
Chad A. Baird

**DATE:** July 2, 2003

**SUBJECT:** Quaker Ridge

### INTRODUCTION

We have looked at your proposed Quaker Ridge development along Duke Street in the City of Alexandria and have addressed two questions:

1. Traffic Projections – What impact if any does the development of the project have on the surrounding road network?
2. Existing Duke Street Traffic – What is the situation that exists today for traffic trying to exit the adjacent Colonial Heights development onto Duke Street?

### PROJECT BACKGROUND

Quaker Ridge is located along the north side of Duke Street (Route 236), west of Arell Court, and east of Carriage House Circle in the City of Alexandria, Virginia. The proposed use of twenty-eight (28) dwelling units replaces the five (5) existing dwelling units on the property. The Quaker Ridge site is currently 5 single-family sites over a total of 2.5 acres and is zoned R-8. A regional map showing the location of the site is shown on Figure 1.

### QUAKER RIDGE – TRAFFIC PROJECTIONS

Based on the existing conditions, Quaker Ridge is currently a 5 single-family home development over approximately 2.5 acres (approximately 0.5 acre per lot). Table 1 summarizes the total number of trips generated by five (5) single-family dwelling units based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers 6<sup>th</sup> edition Trip Generation Manual. The development plan for Quaker Ridge is to develop 28 Single Family Dwelling Units over approximately 2.5 acres. Table 1 provides the trip generation for the proposed development with a comparison to the existing conditions.



Figure 1  
Site Vicinity Map



**Table 1**  
**Existing Condition vs. Proposed Condition**

ITE				Week day								
				Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic between 7 and 9 AM			Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic between 4 and 6 PM			ADT		
Land Use	Code	Size		TOTAL	In	Out	TOTAL	In	Out	TOTAL	In	Out
<b>Existing</b>												
Zone R8												
Single Family Residential	210	5	Dwelling Units	5	1	4	7	4	3	66	33	33
<b>Proposed</b>												
Residential												
Residential, Condo, Townhouse	230	28	Dwelling Units	19	3	16	21	14	7	221	111	110
<b>COMPARISON (PROPOSED - APPROVED)</b>				<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>77</b>

Note: ITE Formulas not applicable for 5 dwelling units during the AM Peak hour. Numbers adjusted based on comparable land use experience.

As indicated in Table 1, the proposed development plan for Quaker Ridge will generate a negligible increase in traffic as compared to the existing conditions on site. The proposed development plan will generate approximately **14 additional trips** during the AM peak hour, **14 additional trips** during the PM peak hour, and approximately **155 additional trips** over an entire typical day.

### Findings and Recommendations

- The maximum hourly increase in traffic is 14 additional trips during the PM peak hour.
- This level of traffic increase will not be perceptible along the Duke Street Corridor.
- The traffic increase will not result in any additional traffic impacts.
- In the vicinity of the site, Duke Street carries approximately 3,000 vehicles per hour, which would make an increase of 14 trips a 0.5% increase in traffic.

### EXISTING DUKE STREET TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

It is our understanding that residents within the vicinity of the site, specifically in the Colonial Heights development, are concerned about the existing volume of traffic along Duke Street during the PM peak hours. We performed a field visit during a Friday PM peak hour, a weekday AM peak hour, and a non-Friday weekday PM peak hour.

The following are site observations made during these time periods:

#### FRIDAY PM PEAK

- The eastbound traffic along Duke Street tends to back up from the Telegraph Road off ramp exit to somewhere within the vicinity of Jordan Street.
- The traffic backup is due to, in large part, the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. The bridge has been under construction for the past few years and is not projected to be completed until at least 2006.
- Currently, there is a police officer positioned at the exit from Duke Street onto the Telegraph Road ramp to regulate traffic exiting Duke Street onto Telegraph Road. By forcing the right turning vehicles into the far right lane along Duke Street, it appears the objective is to allow through traffic along Duke Street the opportunity to traverse past the queuing traffic turning right onto Telegraph Road.

- Based on field observations, traffic will stay in the far right lane for about 1000 feet, just far enough away from the police officer who is regulating traffic onto the ramp. After the 1000 feet, traffic is queued up in both lanes along Duke Street for at least a mile.
- This back up on Duke Street affects the side streets, specifically Quaker Lane at Duke Street and the Colonial Heights Development.

#### WEEKDAY AM

- During the morning peak hour all traffic appeared to be moving through the corridor without significant delay.
- The intersections were operating acceptably and there were no significant backups.
- Traffic at unsignalized intersections was able to take advantage of the gaps in traffic to exit the side street driveways.

#### WEEKDAY PM

- During a non Friday PM peak hour traffic appeared to back up from the Telegraph Road exit as it does during the Friday late afternoon.
- The backup appears to be caused by the Woodrow Wilson Bridge construction and the limited capacity over the bridge.
- The maximum back up from the Telegraph Road exit along Duke Street was observed at times to extend to Sweely Street, east of Quaker Lane.
- In the vicinity of the site adjacent traffic signals provided gaps in the traffic along Duke Street to provide opportunities for traffic to exit the side street and turn onto Duke Street.

#### Possible Solutions

- The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has approximately \$732,000 in the 6 year plan allocated for "Duke Street Congestion Relief". This is UPC #T961. It is possible that some of this money will go towards implementing measures to improve the congestion in this section of roadway.
- A possible solution would be to widen Duke Street or the Telegraph Road on ramp to increase the storage space for traffic destined for Telegraph Road and the Beltway. This may not be possible due to development constraints along the Duke Street Corridor.
- Another alternative would be to place a police office at all unsignalized driveways to prevent vehicles from blocking the access. The City would not entertain this as a possibility as they would expect those driveways to operate as right in right out during congested periods.
- An additional alternative would be to widen the Wilson Bridge, which is being done. The backups occur when the construction associated with the widening limits the capacity over the bridge and therefore backs up traffic, not only along the Beltway but the feeder roadways as well. Once the construction is completed the congestion will be greatly reduced.
- As a solution we investigated the installation of traffic signals at either Fort Williams Parkway or the Colonial Heights driveway entrance. Based on the traffic volumes at these locations, it does not appear that they would meet the traffic signal warrants that the City of Alexandria has adopted as minimum requirements to install a signal.
- Further with regard to signal installation, during the most congested times, typically Friday PM peak hour, a signal would not help to reduce the back up resulting from the Telegraph Road on ramp congestion. During other times of the day, adjacent signals provide gaps in traffic for motorists to take advantage of. Even if warranted, additional signalization would not provide a significant enhancement.

## CONCLUSION

This memorandum focuses on evaluating the projected site traffic increases as well as looking at the existing conditions along Duke Street. The analysis presented in this memorandum supports the following major conclusions:

### Traffic Projections

- The maximum hourly increase in traffic is 14 additional trips during the PM peak hour.
- This level of traffic increase will not be perceptible along the Duke Street Corridor.
- The traffic increase will not result in any additional traffic impacts.
- In the vicinity of the site Duke Street carries approximately 3,000 vehicles per hour, which would make an increase of 14 trips a 0.5% increase in traffic.

### Duke Street Corridor

- Traffic congestion along the corridor is caused by backups on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge that back up to the Telegraph road on ramp from Duke Street and west along Duke Street past the proposed site.
- This condition was magnified during the Friday PM peak hour. During the other Weekday AM and PM peak hours observed the back ups do not extend past Quaker Lane
- There are no solutions that would improve the back up from the Bridge at this condition at this time. The completion of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge widening will greatly improve this situation.
- The \$732,000 that VDOT has allocated for "Duke Street Congestion Relief" may provide an opportunity to implement measures to improve the congestion along Duke Street in the vicinity of the site.

**Quaker Village Homeowners Association  
99 Arell Court  
Alexandria, VA 22304**

May 20, 2003

Memorandum

To: Mayor Kerry J. Donley  
City Council Members  
City of Alexandria Planning Commission

Re: Proposed developments adjacent to Quaker Village

The members of the Quaker Village HOA board and the QVHOA homeowners are opposed to the following proposed developments:

A. Carr Homes LCC, 22 townhouses to be built on Duke Street, north side and just west of Arell Court, Alexandria

B. Townhouses, about 9, to be built at the northeast corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street

1. The Quaker Village Homeowners Association had a meeting and all of the participants are opposed to multi-family unit development of both areas.
2. Current zoning for the property between Quaker Village and Duke St. is for single family, not multi-family units. Quaker Village residents purchased these homes with the understanding that they were backed against single-family properties. Any discussion regarding this kind of development lacks integrity based upon the zoning laws and demonstrates an arbitrary approach to city planning.
3. The city has not even begun to see the effects of the Patent Office and related area construction. We are already seeing the increased traffic on Duke/Quaker due to overflow traffic from neighboring streets and highways. It is completely irresponsible to even consider further development without witnessing the long-term effects of prior approved development.
4. The Duke Street/Quaker Lane intersection is one of the busiest intersections in the city. It is currently a traffic hazard area as it stands with cars illegally pulling into the intersection and blocking opposing traffic after the lights have changed. There has been no attempt by the city to correct this problem, and adding as many as sixty more cars (from the two proposed developments - assuming 30 homes total and 2 cars for each home) only adds to the current disaster.
5. Both developments have traffic control barriers noted in their plans. The Quaker/Duke

corner development proposes a no left turn into or out of the development on Quaker Lane. The Duke St. development proposes a Y-shaped cement barrier that would only allow for a right turn and out of the development to keep the traffic flowing. There will be no left turns from or onto Duke St. No matter what is developed, drivers may disobey the driving barriers (like jumping them or exiting out the entrance lanes), or make inappropriate u-turns on Duke St. and Quaker Lane, and will therefore increase accidents and traffic confusion. In addition, traffic through Alexandria side streets will increase to cover the unconventional traffic barriers.

6. This proposed development further compromises the quality of life and the environmental quality of Alexandria. Any construction of townhouses on current vacant lands increases the heat index of the area. 25 town homes with a 20x35 foot footprint will cover 17,500 square feet of space and this doesn't include sidewalks, roads, or parking spaces. The current space is full of large, mature trees which, based upon the proposed plan and the City of Alexandria's prior approval track record, will be torn down. This will displace the wildlife, degrade the environmental balance and increase noise pollution.

7. It is time for the City of Alexandria to renew its vision for a livable city. The potential city revenue for these properties, in the context of already approved development for the rest of the city, cannot possibly outweigh the safety, environmental balance, and quality of life benefits retained by maintaining the current properties as they were originally zoned.

From:


Robert Page, President, QVHOA  
Lee Ware, Secretary, QVHOA phone (703) 461-3693; LTWare@msn.com  
Richard and Diane Kain (both former presidents, QVHOA)  
Kathleen McBride

*Carrie Mychuita*



CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

301 King Street, Suite 2300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314



Tree City USA

Andrew H. Macdonald, Ph.D.  
Councilman

October 6, 2003

City Hall (703) 838-4500  
Studio (703) 548-7572  
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com

To: Chair and Members of the Planning Commission  
From: Andrew Macdonald, Councilman  
RE: "Quaker Ridge" Development Proposal/Master Plan Amendment

PC Docket Item#  
22 A-C

Dear Mr. Wagner:

DSUP 2002-0048  
REZ 2002-0005  
MPA 2003-0004

Many residents living near this Duke Street parcel would like too see this proposal DEFERRED so that its impact on the community and City can be more carefully studied. I believe their request is quite reasonable given the number of issues involved and in order to give them enough time to review the Staff report.

Replacing a few single family homes (with large yards and adequate tree cover). with a cluster of densely packed town homes that may adversely affect the quality of life in the adjacent community and in surrounding neighborhoods, is not a simple rezoning matter. The consequences of additional traffic, less tree cover (and open space) separating the properties, a sensitive geological environment, and building so many more homes close to Duke Street should be scrutinized VERY carefully.

In addition, there is the outstanding matter of the development of the wooded parcel above the site, just above the adjacent town homes. Groundwater seeping from overlying Pliocene-Pleistocene terrace gravel deposits has created numerous problems for current homeowners --- and it may well affect the stability of any new structures that are built further down the hill as well. The impact of building anything on this site should be studied at the same time as the Duke Street proposal is being discussed. I'd like to see the community, City Staff and the Planning Commission analyze its **open space** potential.

Finally, the community has suggested that we take advantage of this opportunity to put together a more comprehensive -- and I might add, a more comprehensible -- community planning process. I agree with them.


Respectfully,

Andrew H. Macdonald, PhD Geology  
Councilman

CC: Mayor and Members of City Council  
Eileen Fogarty, Planning Director  
Ms. Kathleen McBride, resident

# ReedSmith

J. Howard Middleton  
Direct Phone: 703.641.4225  
Email: jmiddleton@reedsmith.com



3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, VA 22042-0681  
703.641.4200  
Fax 703.641.4340

September 17, 2003

*DC Docket Item #22-AC  
MRA 2003-0004  
REZ 2002-0005  
DSUP 2002-0048*

Mr. Jeffrey Farnar  
Acting Chief, Development Division  
Department of Planning and Zoning  
City of Alexandria  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Re: Quaker Ridge; Application for Development Special Use Permit and Site Plan;  
Unsafe Tree

Dear Jeff:

At our meeting on the site on August 29, you personally inspected the property with special attention to the various trees that may be preserved for the future development of Quaker Ridge. You were accompanied at the site by Kathleen Beeton along with the Carr Homes representatives, including Edward Kowalski, the Carr Homes arborist for the project. During the meeting, various trees were discussed and agreements were reached. However, one oak tree was singled out for further review by the city arborist. At the site, Steve Ness of Carr Homes and Mr. Kowalski both expressed the opinion that the tree should not be preserved.

Following the meeting, Mr. Kowalski was requested by Mr. Ness to study the oak tree in a more detailed manner and report on his findings. Enclosed is a letter dated September 12, 2003 in which Mr. Kowalski analyzes the tree in detail and expresses the opinion that the tree would be unsafe if retained in the new development. He states:

"The tree has a moderate severe lean indicating a structural defect. The leaning condition of this tree in direction of the proposed improvements would be justification for its removal. Preserving it will present a liability. If any foot traffic, parking, common areas, etc. in the vicinity of this tree are proposed, then a hazard will be created."

58

LONDON ♦ NEW YORK ♦ LOS ANGELES ♦ SAN FRANCISCO ♦ WASHINGTON, D.C. ♦ PHILADELPHIA ♦ PITTSBURGH ♦ OAKLAND ♦ PRINCETON  
FALLS CHURCH ♦ WILMINGTON ♦ NEWARK ♦ MIDLANDS, U.K. ♦ CENTURY CITY ♦ RICHMOND ♦ HARRISBURG ♦ LEESBURG ♦ WESTLAKE VILLAGE

reedsmith.com

Mr. Jeffrey Farner  
September 17, 2003  
Page 2

Mr. Kowalski's conclusion is that the tree has "questionable structural integrity" and is unsafe. In light of this professional opinion, the tree should be removed because of the potential liability and unsafe condition for present and future homeowners, visitors and the general public.

Very truly yours,

REED SMITH LLP



J. Howard Middleton

cc: Eileen Fogarty  
Stephen Ness

Enclosure



## Zimar & Associates, Inc.

Arboriculture • Forestry • Consulting  
10105 Residency Road, Suite 207 • Manassas, Virginia 20110  
Tel (703) 331-3731 • Fax (703) 331-1359  
www.zimarinc.com

September 12, 2003

Steve Ness, CarrHomes  
7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 235  
Annandale, VA 22003

RE: 30" DBH oak

Dear Steve:

This letter is to summarize the findings and opinions on the 30" oak tree reviewed at the Duke Street Property on August 29, 2003:

- This tree is a 30" DBH southern red oak (*Quercus falcata*) that is in fair condition. It is located in the rear lawn area of the existing home and is growing in compacted soil. It appears to be a native tree that may have existed prior to the development of the existing lot.
- The tree has a moderate to severe lean indicated a structural defect. The leaning condition of this tree in the direction of the proposed improvements should be justification for its removal. Preserving it will present a liability. If any foot traffic, parking, common areas, etc. in the vicinity of this tree are proposed, then a hazard will be created.
- The fair condition rating was based on visible above ground observations including the presence of insects or diseases, visible decay or cavities, leaf size and color, branch distribution, and dieback or decline. Leaf size and color appeared to be normal. The crown is somewhat lopsided with most of the weight on the south side. I did not detect the presence of destructive insects at this time. No decline was noted.
- The tree has an obvious lean to the south. Leaning trees are usually an indication of a structural deficiency in the root system or soil stability. Root stability can be compromised by the presence of a number of root decay fungi that occur naturally. Fungi can be detected by the presence of fruiting bodies (mushrooms, shelf fungi) on the root flare or on the surface of the ground wherever roots may be located. Fruiting bodies are visible when conditions are right for development but they are short-lived and disappear when they release spores. There were no fruiting bodies the day we met. Root decay fungi can also be detected by exposing roots and examining them for discoloration and decay (root collar excavation). Soil issues are based on structure. In some cases, roots cannot penetrate deeply due to differences in soil textures. For example, if a tree is growing in a loamy soil that is above a clayey soil, the roots will grow down until the clay layer is reached. They will not penetrate the clay, but grow horizontally along the loam. Over time the soil cannot support the weight of the tree because of the poor anchorage and the tree begins to lean. Tree failure in these situations will occur, but determining when is very difficult. Usually a storm event will solve that. Imminent failure can be detected if the ground is heaving opposite the direction of the lean. This condition was not noticed here. Sometimes trees lean because they are suppressed or shaded on one side and exposed on the other. The tree will lean to the exposed side to capture the sunlight it needs. Over time the branches


*"We can see the forest and the trees."*

and trunk will begin to straighten when the entire crown has exposure. I do not think that is the situation with this tree as it is dominant of all other adjacent vegetation.


- There are possibly one or two cavities on the trunk of this tree at approximately twelve and fifteen feet above ground on the north and south side of this tree. Cavities are hollow areas caused by a number of factors. Their size can be determined by visual inspection. These cavities appear to be at the locations of branches that were pruned off or died and broke off. Their extent is unknown, but their presence is another indication of a structural defect in the tree's stability.
- To provide the least disturbance to this tree in the proposed development, a sixty foot diameter undisturbed area (one foot per inch of diameter) around the tree would be necessary. Any disturbance in this zone will further impact the root system of a tree with already questionable structural integrity.

Please call if you have any questions or comments regarding this report. Thank you.


Sincerely,



Edward Kowalski, Certified Arborist #MA-0461  
cc: Tara Craven



17°



163

**COLONIAL HEIGHTS HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION**

P.O. Box 61, Merrifield, Virginia 22116

*Board of Directors**Rich Williamson, President    Alex Douvres, Vice President**Ellen Crawford, Treasurer    Gregory Leiby, Secretary**Members at Large: Steven Mohlhenrich, Sue Scheller*

September 30, 2003

*DC Docket Item # 22-A-C  
MPA 2003-0004  
REZ 2002-0005  
DSUP 2002-0048*

The Honorable Mayor and  
Members of City Council  
and  
The Honorable Chairman and  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Alexandria  
City Hall  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

**Re: Carrhomes' Proposed Development on Duke Street; Quaker Ridge**

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of City Council:

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission:

We are writing this letter on behalf of the Colonial Heights Homeowners Association. We are owners of townhouses along Duke Street adjacent to the proposed Quaker Ridge project by Carrhomes. Representatives of our group have met with Carrhomes' representatives on many occasions over the past several months to discuss the proposed project. On the basis of our conversations and the commitments that Mr. Ness, on behalf of Carrhomes, has made to us, we are writing this letter to recommend approval of the project. We support his proposal as presented to you.

We were very pleased that following our discussions with Mr. Ness and the planning staff various issues that we were concerned about were resolved. The buffer between our community and Quaker Ridge is significant and it meets our approval.

Our Association believes that a high quality townhouse development adjacent to our property is the right land use for the site and have been pleased to work with Carrhomes on the project.


As we have discussed and agreed with Carrhomes, our support for the proposed development is contingent on the following items being made specific conditions of approval: (1) construction of an iron or brick and iron fence between the properties, of a style in keeping with Colonial Heights' Duke Street fence; (2) removal of the large tree outside the Colonial Heights fence at the rear of #23 and #25 Carriage House Circle, which overhangs those properties and


poses a risk of damage; (3) the planting of a visual screen of evergreen trees at least twelve feet in height between the Quaker Ridge and Colonial Heights properties; and (4) traffic exiting Quaker Ridge being permitted to turn both left and right onto Duke Street. Once again, we sincerely thank Carrhomes for making the above commitments to us. Both Colonial Heights and Carrhomes agree that those commitments should be explicit conditions of approval of the project.


Moreover, we wish to thank Carrhomes for agreeing to construct a brick bus shelter between our properties, since such a structure will benefit both our residents, many of whom will utilize buses to the Pentagon metro station for their daily commutes. The City should be aware that we have no objection to the location of the bus stop being moved the ten or so yards East on Duke Street, so as to be on the boundary line between Colonial Heights and the proposed Quaker Ridge development.


Again, we would like to say that we support the Quaker Ridge project and recommend approval.

Yours truly,

  
Rich Williamson, President

  
Alex Douvres, Vice President

  
Ellen Crawford, Treasurer

  
Gregory Leiby, Secretary

PC Docket Item # 22 A-C  
DSUP 2002-0048  
MPA 2003-0004  
REF 2002-0005

**TO:** Mayor William D. Euille, Vice Mayor Redella S. Pepper, Councilwoman Joyce Woodson, Councilman Ludwig Gaines, Councilman K. Rob Krupicka, Councilman Andrew H. Macdonald, Councilman Paul C. Smedberg

Planning Commission Chair Eric Wagner, Vice Chair Richard Leibach, Donna Fossum, John Komoroske, H. Stewart Dunn, Jr., J. Lawrence Robinson, Jesse Jennings

**FROM:** Quaker Village Home Owners (please see p. 7)

**DATE:** October 1, 2003


Dear Mayor and Members of Council, Planning Commission:

As residents of Alexandria in the Duke Street area, we are alarmed by the high volume of development around us and its seemingly unplanned nature. These developments are either proposed to be built or are already completed within an approximately one-mile radius of our community—half of them within a block:

1. Proposed construction of 28 townhouses (Quaker Ridge) by CarrHomes, Inc., on Duke Street one block west of Quaker Lane, adjoining the southern boundary of Quaker Village.
2. Proposed construction of Quaker View townhouses on the corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street, previously denied by the Planning Commission.
3. Proposed construction of four single-family houses on the Wiecking property on the northwest end of Arell Court (inside Quaker Village).
4. Recently constructed Phoenix Hill townhouses on Duke Street.
5. Recently constructed skate park located opposite Quaker Lane on Duke Street.
6. Proposed large single-family homes by the builder, Elm Street, at 1400 Janney's Lane.
7. Recurring discussions of a road connecting Duke Street and Eisenhower Avenue.
8. In-process development of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office complex and surrounding properties.

We ask the City to please carefully evaluate these developments, singly and as an overall approach to growth, in conjunction with the following factors, which affect the safety, health, and quality of life of area residents:

-66



- Adherence to the City's master plan and current zoning.
- Environmental issues, including the displacement of wildlife, exacerbated air pollution, and noise levels related to increased traffic, and increased temperatures resulting from diminishing green space.
- Structural integrity of existing houses, retaining walls, and fences that may be threatened by proposed developments (already an issue from City-approved plans that were not as built).
- Current traffic patterns and congestion.
- Traffic safety, including the requirements of emergency response vehicles.

We offer our concerns about and requests for each development:

### 1. Proposed Carr 28-Townhouse Development

The 28 townhouses Carr is proposing to build on Duke Street west of Quaker Lane are an example of diverging from the current master plan. Carr is proposing changing zoning from single-family to multiuse housing, reducing the 75-foot setback to 50 feet, and, as is often typical for land developers to request, and for the City to allow, cutting down many mature trees. We see several kinds of problems:

- Master Plan and Variance Requests—Quaker Village residents purchased homes knowing that they bordered single-family properties on both Duke and Quaker. Rezoning to multiuse would demonstrate an arbitrary approach to City planning. Those in favor of the townhouse development state that multiuse housing is justified by the surrounding townhouse developments. This is faulty logic because the master plan was created to blend single-family and townhouse developments after Quaker Village and Colonial Heights were planned. This fact is proven by the proposal of four (originally six) single-family houses in Quaker Village. Residents should be able to rely on the City's master plan as written.
- Environmental Issues—Many of us purchased our houses because our development was surrounded by trees that provide not only privacy and an attractive environment, but also a green buffer to noise and air pollution. Carr has identified for us which trees would remain and which they would destroy. With a 20x35-foot footprint, covering 20,000 square feet of space plus sidewalks, roads, and parking spaces, the townhouses represent a great loss of green space in an area that has precious little. The loss of trees would not only increase the noise level but upset the environmental balance, displacing the wildlife (many birds, rabbits, raccoons, chipmunks, a fox). Another development would contribute to the heat index and to the high ozone level—already a serious problem for the City.
- Structural Integrity of Existing Properties—The loss of trees, the grading of the land and attendant alteration of topography, and construction activity so close to the retaining wall behind Quaker Village could cause structural damage to our houses.

67

Some structural damage is already evident in the houses of our community that adjoin the existing single-family houses: chimneys separating from outer walls, decks sloping and pulling away. An engineering report was filed with the City stating our development was approved by the City as built (it was built with a 3-foot slope in back instead the 1-foot slope the builder's plans showed).

- Traffic Congestion—Even one more small development will contribute more cars to Duke Street—which already cannot handle its daily volume in excess of 30,000 cars plus frequent overflow from the beltway—and to the Duke/Quaker intersection, one of the busiest and most hazardous in the City. During peak hours, turning from Quaker onto Duke can easily take 30 minutes, and then reaching the Telegraph Road/I-95 ramp can take another 20 minutes. Accidents occur frequently, but official records do not reflect accurate totals because many do not require police intervention.
- Traffic Safety—By adding to traffic congestion, the 28 townhouses could impede the ingress and egress of medical and fire emergency vehicles that regularly visit the Sunrise Assisted Living facility directly across from the proposed building site. Should a raised median strip be placed in the center of Duke to limit turns (we are told by T&ES it is a strong possibility for the future), it would disallow the Alexandria EMTs traveling on Duke Street westbound from gaining the immediate access to Sunrise that they need. Motorists, in turn, would be encouraged to make U-turns into and out of Arell Court (Quaker Village) or the Colonial Hts. development close by.
- Parking—Because the building plans include minimal parking for visitors, visitors will go to Arell Court to park and perhaps to Fort Williams Parkway where those home owners have complained this is a common problem already.

We want to believe that you, as our elected officials, are seeking our best interests in your desire to preserve our quality of life as citizens of this great city. **We ask you to reject CarrHomes' rezoning proposal**—and instead adhere to the master plan. We strongly appeal to you to continue to protect the environment, the existing green space, and the property of current residents.

## **2. Proposed Quaker View Townhouses**

The Quaker View development proposed for the northeast corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street was justifiably denied by the Planning Commission on the bases of traffic safety, congestion and inaccessibility by future residents who would be unable to turn left into or out of their neighborhood. The fire station nearby on Duke Street opposed the development because of added traffic and the suggested "safety" measures, such as a speed bump, which would impede their response time when turning the corner from westbound Duke onto Quaker. **We ask the City Council to support the Planning Commission's conclusion** as well as surrounding residents when the decision is officially appealed. We reiterate our position that any development on this property would create new safety concerns and intensify the regular traffic backups in the Quaker/Duke intersection that have posed a growing problem for more than a decade.

68

### 3. Wiecking Property

After building the Quaker Village townhouses on underground springs, six years ago Pulte Homes decided not to build the six single-family houses it had planned. Less than a year ago, a representative from CarrHomes, when asked, stated to Quaker Village residents that Carr would not choose to build on the Wiecking property. We have been told that long-time prior owners of the property installed underground conduits in conjunction with the springs to direct water for their livestock on the property. These are not known to be mapped by the City, and would pose an additional obstacle for building consideration. A current single-family home owner off the perimeter of the Quaker Village/Arell Court cul-de-sac, who has years of experience with unresolvable water problems, personally shared the long-held view that the Quaker Village hill was considered unsuitable for any type of building.

Now, four single-family homes may be built despite the well-documented history of drainage problems tied to the property. For more than a year, the Quaker Village HOA and owners of the 16 most-affected townhouses were in discussion with Pulte and the City to correct the ongoing problem of water standing in backyards due to runoff from the springs under Quaker Village property. The measures taken have not been completely successful, and now we are concerned that new development will undermine the measures, worsening the situation for at least 16 home owners. Without rain for months at a time and all during the summer drought water could be seen running, standing, oozing out of cracks in pavement/sidewalks. By disturbing the springs further, the development could also create or exacerbate water problems elsewhere in the neighborhood.

Because the City expresses confidence in the suitability of this land for development, Quaker Village asks the City to require the builder to provide a 20-year, \$20 million insurance policy to guarantee the funds to pay owners for any problems related to the springs that manifest themselves during or subsequent to the building of the proposed houses. A builder's posted "short-term" bond would not serve this purpose as we now continue to have water drainage/springs issues after 9 years.

### 4. Phoenix Hill Townhouses

The Phoenix Hill development is a prime example of the City's need for a comprehensive master plan. Numerous special-use permits were required, including overriding the City's setback requirement of 75 feet which resulted in a development that is practically a sidewalk's width away from Duke St. Not only could the extreme proximity be a safety factor, but it would also seem to preclude any possible widening of the Duke St. corridor in the future. Considering Duke a gateway to Old Town, the City has given itself the goal of creating a unified look for the street in keeping with the feel of Old Town. **We encourage this approach through the City's plan designed to achieve consistent, desirable results;** however, this is not achieved by approving a development in which the units do not even face the street.

## 5. Skate Park

The Quaker Village HOA opposed the skate park because of concern for the safety of children riding skateboards through and around the congested, accident-prone intersection of Quaker Lane and Duke Street. The park elevation is higher than anticipated and closer to the street. The proximity to the street increases exposure to car exhaust, ongoing development of particulate matter, and other forms of pollution. This encourages the growing incidence of asthma in children due to environmental factors tied to development and traffic-related pollution, and puts children more at risk.

## 6. Other Examples of Unchecked Development

Adding to our concerns are even more developments in our immediate neighborhood and the Duke Street corridor:

- The proposed large single-family homes development by the builder, Elm Street, on Janney's Lane (less than a mile from Quaker Village).
- Recurring discussions about an Eisenhower connector road (across the street from Quaker Village).
- The Patent and Trademark Office complex and surrounding properties.

The Patent and Trademark Office alone will bring an estimated total of 7,000 commuters to the vicinity. Surrounding residential and business sites in the Eisenhower Valley combined with others farther down Duke Street such as the still-under-construction Cameron Station, already have increased traffic in unreported numbers. This, in addition to the overflow from the beltway because of the Wilson Bridge construction, including heavy trucks rerouted onto Duke, has created a traffic safety and congestion nightmare for the City's residents and safety officers alike.

As stated in Richard Baier's quote as the City's director of transportation and environmental services, in the *Washington Post*, "Traffic Forecast: Much More Pain Before Any Gain," August 21, 2003:

"...you're already at a level of service that's F-minus anyway. It's a parking lot."

This heightened volume of traffic alone is adequate reason to postpone further development—and that is our request.

## Proposal to Address Current Problems

**Any proposed development should be put on hold.** Once the approved projects named above are completed, once the City has found effective ways to handle the resulting increased traffic, once the City has made adjustments to counteract any negative effects to the environment, then it will be time to plan and pursue new development along Duke Street. Now is the time for Alexandria to begin the work of renewing its vision for a livable city, deciding, neighborhood by neighborhood, on the healthiest and most desirable approach. As stated in the City of Alexandria Plan for Planning, Department of Planning and Zoning, 2001-2005, June 8, 2001, where "it outlines a community-focused planning process":

- "...redevelopment pressures provide the City—City Council, the Planning Commission and City staff—and our citizenry both a wonderful opportunity and a significant challenge. The opportunity is to change the City's manner of dealing with land use development moving from an essentially reactive mode to one that is considerably more 'proactive' and that works to achieve established community goals and values." (Introduction)
- "Redevelopment. ...other established communities face significant redevelopment pressures which need to be managed to ensure that the existing neighborhoods are not transformed in undesirable ways." (p. 3)
- "In redevelopment areas, planning activities must be undertaken in concert with the neighborhood to identify the needs and desires of the existing community, to determine a preferred future for the area..." (p. 3)
- "It is important that we control and direct growth in our new development areas...we must also move to address those older, developed areas of the City and related corridors that have redevelopment potential, so as to strengthen the areas themselves and their adjacent neighborhoods. And it is certainly important that we address the developed areas in the City that, in the near term, are likely to face increasing redevelopment pressures which, if left unchecked, may transform the areas in ways we do not wish." (pgs. 4-5)
- "...Zones that provide specific protection to and ensure compatibility with adjacent properties through both incentives and standards..." (p. 9)
- "The Planning Department will be looking to establish standards to ensure compatibility of the new construction with the neighborhood in which it is occurring." (p. 9)
- "...determine if we can enhance the City's ability to have new development projects include valuable open space." (p. 9)
- "...Mission Statement...assures that all new development reflects the community's vision." (p. 10)
- "Without area plans, permit processing takes place in reaction to individual applications. Lacking a broader context for the proposal, this process frequently leads to acrimony, disappointment and conflict. The department is today committed to solving neighborhood land use issues by having plans in place in those areas of most urgent need, prior to development applications." (p. 12)
- "The planning studies and initiatives discussed above will result in establishing a firm community/land use/market basis for a carefully crafted economic development program geared to individual neighborhood needs..." (p. 14)

In a 9/29/03 phone conversation between one of our home owners, Diana Cangelosi, and Chairman Eric Wagner, Mr. Wagner was favorable to our request for an on-site visit of the Council and Planning Commission members. We have been advised to send an e-mail to each of the Council and Planning Commission members with our request (which Capt Cangelosi will do.). We feel it will be most helpful in presenting with clarity the concerns in this letter.

To date, the following home owners and associations have been contacted and are protesting against building the proposed CarrHomes development at 3517-3551 Duke Street (Quaker Ridge), and the proposed Jade Development Group townhouse complex (Quaker View) at the corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street:

Allison, John	#65	Kain, Richard	#12
Bachman, Katy	#31	King, Karin	#21
Bandy, Ellen	#10	Kusek, Laurie	#18
Bandy, Jeff	#10	Klinetop, Norman	#2
Bjelland, Karen	#23	McBride, Kathleen L.	#14
Cangelosi, Diana T.	#81	Macintosh, Caitlin	#16
Collins, Donna	#57	Mahin, Claudine	#48
Culver, Johanna M.	#35	Mierzejewski, Richard	#77
Culver, Victor I.	#35	Mocarsky, Thomas	#31
Dixon, Franklin P.	#37	Norris, James M.	#69
Dixon, Rhea R.	#37	Page, Jill	#26
Dunbar, Carlton	#51	Page, Robert	#26
Elyaderani, Maryam	#1	Page, Louis	#4
Elyaderani, Morteza	#1	Page, Francisca	#4
Fike, Ronald J.	#8	Patterson, Brian	#55
Fitzgerel, Betsy	#65	Recalde, Patricio	#6
Gettel, Donna	#67	Rigney, Susan	#49
Gettel, Robert	#67	Salim, Maryam	#17
Giddis, W. James	#45	Schwallie-Giddis, Pat	#45
Gilbert, Gail H.	#29	Schwartz, Judi	#24
Gitterman, Janet E.	#11	Scoville, Suzanne	#59
Gordon, Rebecca Y.	#41	Sienkiewicz, Henry	#20
Haines, Robert L.	#23	Umphrey, Jack	#9
Halloway, Helen L.	#43	Ware, Lee	#22
Higgins, Joan C.	#71	Ware, Tom	#22
Hinden, Jack	#21	Yager, Brenda	#61
Hogue, Margaret A.	#8	Seminary Hill Assoc.	Alexandrians for Sensible Growth
Jimenez, Antonio	#28		
Kain, Diane	#12		

cc: Eileen Fogarty, Director,  
Planning and Zoning

Seminary Hill Association  
Clover-College Park Civic  
Association

Wakefield Tarleton Civic  
Association  
Alexandria Federation of Civic  
Associations

Alexandria, Va.  
15 Sept., '03

To The Board of Architectural Review, and  
The Board of Zoning Appeals

Dear Sirs and Madams,

My name is Edward Hoalf, part owner of 3517 Duke St.,  
Alexandria, Va. which is presently under contract with  
other adjoining properties.

We the owners have met, and agreed that the developers will  
construct fine town homes on the assembled properties  
which will be an asset to the city, as well as a source of  
increased taxes to the city.

It would provide housing for the soon to be completed U.S.  
Patent Office which may be within walking distance.

It would provide substantial sales taxes from the residents  
who would shop at the nearby shopping center.

There has been much interest by developers to assemble and  
improve this aging part of the city, and at long last we  
the owners are in agreement.

I have lived in Alexandria for more than half a century, and  
have ~~raised~~ 4 children, all of whom have graduated from city  
schools.

Should there be any objections, I ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> hope that  
your departments will agree that improving this part  
of the city is truly an asset that merits your approval.

Thank you for your consideration and I trust your decisions  
will be favorable.

Very sincerely,

Edward Hoalf

PC Docket 1407#22-A-C  
DSUP 2003-0048  
REZ 2003-0005  
ALPA 2003-0004

73



ATTEN:  
MR. JEFF TARNER

SUSAN AND IMAD DANFORA  
3525 and 3535 Duke Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6304

PC Docket Item # 22-AC  
DSUP 2002-0048  
MPA 2003-0004  
REF 2002-0005

September 30, 2003

Alexandria Planning Commission and  
Alexandria City Council  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, VA 22304

Re: DSUP - #2002- 048  
Quaker Ridge


Dear Planning Commission and City Council Members:

We would like to express our feelings on the proposed Quaker Ridge project. Our parents purchased the property at 3525 Duke Street in 1975 and the adjoining property at 3535 Duke Street in 1993. We have seen townhouse and commercial development completely surround our homes. The Quaker Village town homes were built to the North of us. These town homes were built right up to our back property line and have towered over our homes for years. The Colonial Heights town homes and public housing town homes were built two lots to the west and east of our homes respectively. In about 1997 the massive Sunrise Assisted Living Facility was constructed immediately across the street from our homes, not to mention the nearby McDonalds restaurant, lighted ball field and most recently the skateboard park. Needless to say all of the development that has taken place around us has completely changed the character of the area surrounding our home.

As we all know, our homes and the adjoining homes are over 60 years old and require a lot of maintenance. We have numerous maintenance issues with our homes and feel that it is finally time to move on and relocate to houses that do not require extensive and very expensive maintenance.

It seems that our property would be a good place to continue to build town homes. Please take all of this information into consideration for the owners who have over the years watched intense development completely surround them. It is finally our turn to move on.

Thank you,



Susan Danfora



74

Imad Danfora



<Eric.R.Wagner@Medstar.net>

10/07/2003 01:32 PM

To: <barbara.ross@ci.alexandria.va.us>

CC:

Subject: Greetings from Your Neighbors in Quaker Village

Barbara, here's the first one I got on this subject.

Eric R. Wagner  
Senior Vice President  
Managed Care  
MedStar Health  
5565 Sterrett Place  
Columbia, Maryland 21044  
(410) 772-6595

----- Forwarded by Eric R Wagner/CCO/MedStar on 10/07/2003 01:31 PM -----

```

|----->
|               "Cangelosi, Diana T, CAPT, JCS NMCC" |
|               <diana.cangelosi@js.pentagon.mil@intern|
|               et.mhg.edu>                             |
|               10/02/2003 09:25 AM                     |
|----->

```

```

>-----
>-----|
|
|
|       To:      "'eric.r.wagner@medstar.net'" <eric.r.wagner@medstar.net>,
"'erwagner@comcast.net'"
|       <erwagner@comcast.net@internet.mhg.edu>, "'richleibach@aol.com'"
|       <richleibach@aol.com@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'jlawrencerobinson@msn.com'"
|       <jlawrencerobinson@msn.com@internet.mhg.edu>, "'jlr@cpma.com'"
|       <jlr@cpma.com@internet.mhg.edu>, "'donna_fossum@rand.org'"
|       <donna_fossum@rand.org@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'jsssjennings@aol.com'" <jsssjennings@aol.com@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'komorosj@nasd.com'"
|       <komorosj@nasd.com@internet.mhg.edu>, "'john.komoroske@nasd.com'"
|
|       <john.komoroske@nasd.com@internet.mhg.edu>, "'hsdunn@ipbtax.com'"
|       <hsdunn@ipbtax.com@internet.mhg.edu>
|       cc:      "'dfkain@comcast.net'"
|       <dfkain@comcast.net@internet.mhg.edu>, "'dkain@ida.org'"
|       <dkain@ida.org@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'elizabeth.wright@baesystems.com'"
|       <elizabeth.wright@baesystems.com@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'d.cangelosi@verizon.net'"
|       <d.cangelosi@verizon.net@internet.mhg.edu>, "'rmmmyer@aol.com'"
|       <rmmmyer@aol.com@internet.mhg.edu>,
|       "'vculver@bellatlantic.net'"
|       <vculver@bellatlantic.net@internet.mhg.edu>
|

```

Subject: Greetings from Your Neighbors in Quaker Village

>-----  
-----|  
  
Dear Members of the Alexandria Planning Commission,

Thank you for your service to our City. The homeowners of Quaker Village (Arell Court near the intersection of Duke Street and Quaker Lane) are especially grateful that you are looking out for all of the concerns of the present and future residents of Alexandria.

When I spoke with Mr. Wagner, he suggested that a good way to get in contact with all of you is via email.

We have become alarmed at the recent increase in the volume of plans and proposals for even more development within a one-mile radius of our homes.

To more fully express our concerns we have drafted a detailed letter which has been mailed to your home addresses and which should arrive shortly. The purpose of this email is to alert you to the arrival of our letter and to extend an invitation to you to visit us prior to your 07 October 03 meeting.

We realize that there is not much time left before the meeting, but several of us have volunteered to try to be available at your convenience to show you the backyards of the homes that will be affected by the proposed Carr Development as well as the locations of the underground springs on the adjoining Weicking property which have the potential to ruin the yards and foundations of our adjoining townhouses.

I'd be happy to arrange, for example, to arrive late to work to facilitate a brief tour for any of you who might have a few minutes to stop by on your way to work. Other homeowners have offered to be available to you at other times of the day. Perhaps while you are running errands on Saturday morning, you'd have 15 minutes to spare to take a look at our situation.

All of us are, just like you, swamped with work, volunteer activities and commuting. We fully realize the value of your time. We are a small housing area and few of us have much experience in working with the City Council or your Planning Commission. But we are eager to do all we can to have a Quaker Village resident be available to you to show you around.

If you could reply to this email with your preferred time to visit, I would be happy to match you up with a resident who will be your point of contact. If you reply to all of the people on the cc: lines, that will allow many of us to get your email at our homes and be able to get back to you sooner.

Also please feel free to call me at work. If you get my voice mail,

I am not far away and will call back ASAP. My home number is (703) 751-2032 and my cell phone is (703) 862-0153.

Thanks so much for your time and concern.

Very Respectfully,  
Diana T. Cangelosi  
81 Arell Court

CAPT Diana T. Cangelosi, USN  
Joint Staff, J-3, DDIO  
(703) 614-2092 [DSN 224]  
diana.cangelosi@js.pentagon.mil



<Eric.R.Wagner@Medstar.net>

To: <barbara.ross@ci.alexandria.va.us>

cc:

Subject: Follow-up re Quaker Ridge (Item 22)

10/07/2003 01:30 PM

Barbara, as we discussed.

Eric R. Wagner  
Senior Vice President  
Managed Care  
MedStar Health  
5565 Sterrett Place  
Columbia, Maryland 21044  
(410) 772-6595

----- Forwarded by Eric R Wagner/CCO/MedStar on 10/07/2003 01:29 PM -----

"Tom Parry"
<tparry@mptechlaw.com@internet.mhg.edu>
10/07/2003 11:06 AM

-----

To: <eric.r.wagner@medstar.net>

cc:

Subject: Follow-up re Quaker Ridge (Item 22)

-----

Dear Commissioner Wagner:

I'm probably not able to attend tonight, so I have to make my pitch to you today. You're welcome to call at your convenience (202-463-7293) if you have any questions about this. What I wanted to pass on to you--

I think the need for a deferral of the Carr/Quaker Ridge application is becoming more apparent.

1. Very lengthy staff report available only at last minute; insufficient time for residents to respond; process is unfair to residents.

2. Inadvertent use of wrong map in staff report posted on web; this is an error regarding material information (see email below). See the zoning

maps

on page 4 on the web and page 5 of the hard copy, Docket Item No. 22-B.  
The map is "misleading" regarding the location of existing Quaker Village townhouses and their proximity to the new Quaker Ridge townhouses.

3. My understanding is that not all Commission members have yet made a site visit; this compounds the significance of the map error. And until the error was noticed last night--24 hours before the hearing--it appears no one had had time to review the material carefully and discover the error.

4. As of Monday some Commission members had not yet reviewed the staff report and there was confusion as to whether the project requires a plan amendment and rezoning. It does. This level of confusion because of the late delivery of the staff report and the lack of time for Commission members to focus on this matter prior to today is very disconcerting.

5. The scuttlebutt is that the development will be approved. But please manage a process that residents perceive as fair. There is no need to rush to a decision tonight. Maybe staff did take a long time; but that is no reason to deprive residents of a reasonable amount of time to review and respond to the staff report.

Lastly, the Commission wants Council this month to uphold their 6-1 denial of the application for the corner of Quaker and Duke--just a block away from

Quaker Ridge (Eric--my understanding is that you were the "1"; but I am trusting that you would defer to your 6 colleagues and seek to uphold their decision before Council). Both that project and Quaker Ridge raise serious traffic problems but Commission is moving toward having one denied project (the corner project) and one likely approved project (Quaker Ridge) being considered at the same Council meeting. This is inconsistent, is very hard to explain and just doesn't make a lot of sense to Council. Let Council focus on the Quaker/Duke corner this month, and give us residents a chance to

rally the troops before Council in support of the denial by Commission of the Quaker/Duke corner project. Then do what you will re Quaker Ridge in November. Please don't let the Quaker Ridge project make it more likely that the Commission will be reversed by Council on the Quaker/Duke corner project.

But the key here is fairness to the residents. Applicant and staff had plenty of time; please give us residents a fair shake.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas M. Parry  
Marzouk & Parry  
1120 19th St., NW, Suite 750  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 463-7293  
Fax: (202) 955-9371  
tparry@mptechlaw.com

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Parry [mailto:tparry@mptechlaw.com]  
 Sent: Monday, October 06, 2003 8:05 PM  
 To: Eric R. Wagner; eric.r.wagner@medstar.net; donna\_fossum@rand.org; J. Lawrence Robinson; jlawrencerobinson@msn.com; jssjennings@aol.com; John Komoroske; komorosj@nasd.com; Richard Leibach; H. Stewart Dunn, Jr.  
 Cc: rhobson@mcguirewoods.com; dfkain@comcast.net; rakain@aol.com; kathleen\_mcbride@plastics.org; klmcbride@comcast.net; diana.cangelosi@js.pentagon.mil; d.cangelosi@verizon.net; info@alex4sensiblegrowth.org  
 Subject: 10/7/03 Docket #22

Dear Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission:

I hope you consider granting the request for deferral of the October 7, 2003

Docket Item No. 22 to your November meeting. The affected residents have had insufficient time to review, analyze and respond to the very lengthy staff reports on Carr's Quaker Ridge development. Access to the reports over one weekend is just not enough time for residents to prepare a response.

One example suffices to show the level of detail that needs to be reviewed and responded to: the zoning map on page 4 [on the web, page 5 of the hard copy] of Docket No. 22-B appears to misplace existing townhouses on the wrong side of Arell Court, incorrectly outlines the current zone boundaries and misdraws property lines for at least one relevant property. This is a very important map in this proceeding, and the information on it does not appear to comport to what is now on the land nor to the zoning boundaries.

The developer and the staff had ample time to prepare their submissions; please allow residents reasonable time to respond to the staff report.

Most importantly, the length of time taken in the staff's review of the application and to prepare the staff report is not a valid reason for giving shortshrift to the concerned residents. And the tremendous difficulties of volunteer neighborhood groups to marshal their case in opposition to the combined weight of the developer and staff should be acknowledged.

There is no compelling need to rush the process on this application; there is no substantial prejudice to the developer caused by a 30-day delay. There is, however, tremendous benefit in ensuring that the process is both in fact and perception fair to Alexandria residents.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Tom Parry  
 w: (202) 463-7293  
 h: (703) 212-0982

---

From: "Diane Kain" <dfkain@comcast.net>  
 Date: Sun, 5 Oct 2003 22:47:52 -0400  
 To: "Donna Fossum \ (E-mail\)" <donna\_fossum@rand.org>, "Eric Wagner \ (E-mail 2\)" <erwagner@comcast.net>, "Eric Wagner \ (E-mail\)" <eric.r.wagner@medstar.net>, "H. Stewart Dunn Jr. \ (E-mail\)" <hsdunn@ipbtax.com>, "J. Lawrence Robinson \ (E-mail 2\)" <jlr@cpma.com>, "J."

Lawrence Robinson \ (E-mail\)" <jlawrencerobinson@msn.com>, "Jesse Jennings  
 \ (E-mail\)" <jssjennings@aol.com>, "John Komoroske \ (E-mail 2\)"  
 <john.komoroske@nasd.com>, "John Komoroske \ (E-mail\)" <komorosj@nasd.com>,  
 "Richard Leibach \ (E-mail\)" <richleibach@aol.com>  
 Cc: "Richard Kain \ (E-mail\)" <rakain@aol.com>, "Kathleen McBride  
 \ (E-mail\)" <kathleen\_mcbride@plastics.org>, "Kathleen McBride \ (E-mail  
 2\)"  
 <klmcbride@comcast.net>, <info@alex4sensiblegrowth.org>,  
 <ghparry@fortebrio.com>, "Diana Cangelosi \ (E-mail\)"  
 <diana.cangelosi@js.pentagon.mil>, "Diana Cangelosi \ (E-mail 2\)"  
 <d.cangelosi@verizon.net>, <rhubson@mcguirewoods.com>, <dfkain@comcast.net>  
 Subject: Oct. 7 Planning Comm., CarrHomes Development

On Friday, October 3, we received a copy of the City staff's 75-page report  
 with recommendations for the approval of the CarrHomes Quaker Ridge  
 development. Because of the amount of in-depth material presented, we are  
 requesting additional time to prepare an informed response before any  
 official discussion by the Planning Commission. We respectfully request  
 this matter be postponed until the Nov. Planning Commission meeting in  
 order  
 to allow our community time to study and respond to the staff report.

Your willingness to support our request is an example of your concern in  
 supporting a community-focused process. If you have any questions/comments  
 you are welcome to contact one of the Quaker Village homeowners below:

Diane Kain  
 (703) 461-3802 (hm)

Richard Kain  
 (571) 437-5918 (cell)

Kathleen McBride  
 (703) 751-9433 (hm)  
 (703) 741-5585 (wk)

Diana Cangelosi  
 (703) 751-2032 (hm)  
 (703) 614-2092 (wk)

## **Geotechnical Consulting & Testing, Inc.**

*Geotechnical Environmental Construction Services*


September 30, 2002

Mr. Steve Ness  
Vice President, Land Acquisition and Development  
Carrhomes, Inc.  
7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325  
Annandale, Virginia 22003

• 8551 Sudley Road  
Manassas, VA 20110  
(703) 335-5134  
FAX (703) 335-1835

• 21505 Greenoak Way  
Dulles, VA 20166  
(703) 421-4000  
FAX (703) 421-8000

Re: Duke Street Property  
Preliminary Subsurface Investigation and Geotechnical Study  
GC&T Project No. 22D-1841



Dear Steve:

Pursuant to your request, Geotechnical Consulting & Testing, Inc. (GC&T) is pleased to present the results of our preliminary geotechnical study at the above referenced project site.

### ***Purpose and Scope of Work***

The scope of our work was limited to a review of the Conceptual Site Plan provided to us by Bowman Consultants, the drilling of 4 soil test borings to depths ranging between 20 and 40 feet below existing grades, and soil laboratory testing of selected samples recovered from the borings.

The approximate locations of the borings are shown on the Boring Location Plan presented as Enclosure 1 of this report. The boring logs and soil laboratory test results are included as Enclosures 2 and 3, respectively.

### ***Subsurface Observations***

The soils observed at the boring locations were consistent with those expected in the Coastal Plain Physiographic Province. Cretaceous Age Potomac Group sediments consisting of multicolored clay and silt were generally encountered near the surface and extending to the maximum depth of each boring, with the exception of B-4 which encountered Potomac sand at a depth of approximately 32 feet. The Potomac Group clay soils are noted for high shrink-swell potential and unstable slopes.

Groundwater was not encountered at any of the boring locations.



***Preliminary Recommendations***

We believe that the project site is generally suitable for the proposed residential construction of townhouses and associated site improvements. However, slope stabilization measures may be necessary due to existing site conditions and final site grading.

Soils suitable for use as structural fill for building and pavement support, as well as for backfill for foundation and retaining walls, are expected to be extremely limited in quantity. Lowering of building footings to a minimum depth of 4 feet below final exterior grades will be necessary, and 2 feet of imported structural fill is expected to be necessary beneath all grade slabs and pavements. Granular imported fill will also be necessary for backfill for below grade foundation and retaining walls.

Should you have any questions regarding the content of this letter or the enclosures, please do not hesitate to call us.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.



Mark Hood, P.E.  
Project Manager




Abdallah A. Adas, P.E.  
Principal Engineer

Enclosures:

- 1.) Boring Location Plan with Slope Profile Locations
- 2.) Test Boring Logs
- 3.) Soil Laboratory Test Results

F:\Reports and Letters\GEOTECH\Carrhomes 22D-1841 Duke Street.doc





Geotechnical Consulting & Testing  
 21505 Greenoak Way  
 Dulles, VA 20166  
 703-421-4000 FAX: 421-8000

DUKE STREET PROPERTY  
 FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

BORING LOCATION PLAN

ENCLOSURE 1

PROJ.# 22D-1841

SCALE: 1" = 60'

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-1

ELEVATION: 142 FT (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME 550 ATV

GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-6-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 25.3'

DRY  
24.4'

SHEET 1 OF 2

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
0									
140	9/6 13/6 15/6	28	OL SC	Topsoil (3") Brown Clayey SAND with Gravel, moist, dense					
5	7/6 5/6 5/6	11	CH	Brown and Gray Sandy Fat CLAY with Gravel, moist, stiff					
135	5/6 6/6 6/6	12							
10	7/6 9/6 10/6	19	MH	Brown and Gray Elastic SILT, moist, very stiff					
130									
15	9/6 10/6 14/6	24			25.2	57	27	97.3	
125									
20	8/6 14/6 18/6	32	CH	Brown and Gray Fat CLAY, moist, very stiff to hard	23.8				
120									
25	10/6 17/6 16/6	33			30.5	79	47	93.4	
115									
30	11/6 15/6 15/6	30			29.5				
110									

Test boring terminated at 40 ft.

ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

85

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-1

ELEVATION: 142 FT (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME 550 ATV


GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-6-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 25.3'

DRY  
24.4'

SHEET 2 OF 2

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
35		38							
105		29		With Sand below 38.5 ft.					
40				Bottom of Boring at 40.0 ft.					
100									
45									
95									
50									
90									
55									
85									
60									
80									

Test boring terminated at 40 ft.

ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

86

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-2

ELEVATION: 136 FT (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME 550 ATV

GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-6-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

## AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 21.9'

DRY  
21.0'

SHEET 1 OF 2

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
0									
135	3/6 8/6 14/6	22	OL CH	Topsoil (3") Brown and Gray Sandy Fat CLAY with Gravel, moist, stiff					
	18/6 17/6 9/6	26							
5	5/6 6/6 8/6	14	CH	Gray and Brown Fat CLAY, moist, stiff to hard					
130	6/6 7/6 12/6	19			24.3	60	32	95.8	
10									
125	8/6 13/6 18/6	31			24.0				
15									
120	6/6 11/6 11/6	22			29.4	85	53	92.7	
20									
115	9/6 13/6 15/6	28			28.3				
25									
110	11/6 13/6 20/6	33							
30									
105									

Test boring terminated at 35 ft.

### ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-2

ELEVATION: 136 FT. (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME 550 ATV

GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-6-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

### AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 21.9'

DRY  
21.0'

SHEET 2 OF 2

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="flex: 1;"> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">35</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">100</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">40</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">95</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">45</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">90</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">50</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">85</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">55</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">80</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 5px;">60</div> <div style="text-align: right;">75</div> </div> <div style="flex: 1; position: relative;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 0; right: 0; width: 100%; height: 100%; border: 1px solid black; background: repeating-linear-gradient(45deg, transparent, transparent 2px, black 2px, black 4px);"></div> <div style="position: absolute; top: 0; right: 0; width: 100%; height: 100%; background: linear-gradient(to top right, transparent 49%, black 49%, black 51%, transparent 51%);"></div> <div style="position: absolute; top: 0; right: 0; width: 100%; height: 100%; background: linear-gradient(to bottom right, transparent 49%, black 49%, black 51%, transparent 51%);"></div> </div> <div style="margin-left: 10px;">           9/6 11/6 13/6         </div> </div>	24	SC	Gray and Brown Clayey SAND, moist, medium dense						
				Bottom of Boring at 35.0 ft.					

Test boring terminated at 35 ft.

ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

88

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-3

ELEVATION: 123 FT (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME-550 ATV

GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-7-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY.  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 11.8'

DRY  
11.5'

SHEET 1 OF 1

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
0									
	4/6 5/6 6/6	11	OL CH	Topsoil (3") Brown Sandy Fat CLAY with Gravel, moist, stiff					
120	4/6 5/6 6/6	11							
5	2/6 2/6 3/6	5	CH	Gray and Brown Fat CLAY, moist, medium stiff to very stiff	36.1	52	26	90.6	
115	4/6 10/6 10/6	20			26.3	57	29	98.8	
10									
110	7/6 9/6 12/6	21							
15									
105	10/6 12/6 15/6	27							
20				Bottom of Boring at 20.0 ft.					
100									
25									
95									
30									

Test boring terminated at 20 ft.

ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

89

# TEST BORING LOG

BORING NO. B-4

ELEVATION: 120 FT (EST)

PROJECT: DUKE STREET ASSEMBLAGE  
CLIENT: CARRHOMES  
DRILL RIG: CME 550 ATV






GC&T JOB NO.: 22D-1841  
DATE DRILLED: 8-7-02  
LOGGED BY: M. HOOD

AT COMPLETION -- AFTER 24 HOURS

WATER DEPTH: DRY  
CAVE-IN DEPTH: 5.5'

DRY  
5.5'

SHEET 1 OF 1

ELEVATION and DEPTH	SOIL SYMBOLS SAMPLERS AND TEST DATA	SPT "N" VALUE	USCS	DESCRIPTION	MOIST. %	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC INDEX	% PASS # 200	LOGGERS REMARKS
120 0		8	OL	Topsoil (2")					
		10	CH	Brown Sandy Fat CLAY, trace Gravel, moist, medium stiff					
115 5		8	CH	Gray and Brown Fat CLAY, moist, medium stiff to very stiff					
		13							
110 10		25							
105 15				Bottom of Boring at 15.0 ft.					
100 20									
95 25									
90 30									

Test boring terminated at 15 ft.


ENGINEER'S COMMENTS:

Lines between material descriptions indicate approximate boundaries; actual transitions may vary between test boring locations.

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.

90

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT




SOIL DATA								
SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	1		25.2	30	57	27	MH

LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
 Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
 Project No.: 22D-1841

Figure

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	2.7	97.3	

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	100.0	-	X
#40	99.6	-	X
#60	99.2	-	X
#200	97.3	-	X

\* GC&T

## Soil Description

Brown & Gray Elastic silt

## Atterberg Limits

PL= 30

LL= 57

PI= 27

## Coefficients

D<sub>85</sub>=

D<sub>60</sub>=

D<sub>50</sub>=

D<sub>30</sub>=

D<sub>15</sub>=

D<sub>10</sub>=

C<sub>u</sub>=

C<sub>c</sub>=

## Classification

USCS= MH

AASHTO= A-7-5(32)

## Remarks

Sample No.: 1

Location: B-1; 13.5-15.0 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-23-02

Elev./Depth:

**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
&  
**TESTING, INC.**


Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage

Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

92

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT




SOIL DATA								
SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	3		30.5	32	79	47	CH

LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
 Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
 Project No.: 22D-1841

Figure

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	6.6	93.4	

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	99.7	-	X
#40	98.9	-	X
#60	97.8	-	X
#200	93.4	-	X

**Soil Description**

Fat clay

**Atterberg Limits**

PL= 32 LL= 79 PI= 47

**Coefficients**

D<sub>85</sub>= D<sub>60</sub>= D<sub>50</sub>=  
D<sub>30</sub>= D<sub>15</sub>= D<sub>10</sub>=  
C<sub>u</sub>= C<sub>c</sub>=

**Classification**

USCS= CH AASHTO= A-7-5(52)

**Remarks**

\* GC&T

Sample No.: 3  
Location: B-1; 23.5-25.0 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-22-02  
Elev./Depth:


**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING  
&  
TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

94

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT



## SOIL DATA


SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	5		24.3	28	60	32	CH

LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**

**Client:** Carrhomes  
**Project:** Duke Street Assemblage  
**Project No.:** 22D-1841

**Figure**

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	4.2	95.8	

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	100.0	-	X
#40	99.6	-	X
#60	99.0	-	X
#200	95.8	-	X

**Soil Description**  
Brown & Gray Fat clay

**Atterberg Limits**  
PL= 28      LL= 60      PI= 32

**Coefficients**  
D<sub>85</sub>=      D<sub>60</sub>=      D<sub>50</sub>=  
D<sub>30</sub>=      D<sub>15</sub>=      D<sub>10</sub>=  
C<sub>u</sub>=      C<sub>c</sub>=

**Classification**  
USCS= CH      AASHTO= A-7-6(36)

**Remarks**

\* GC&T

Sample No.: 5  
Location: B-2; 8.5-10.0 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-23-02  
Elev./Depth:

**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
&  
**TESTING, INC.**


Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage

Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

96

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT



SOIL DATA								
SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	7		29.4	32	85	53	CH


LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
 Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
 Project No.: 22D-1841

Figure

97

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	7.3	92.7	

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	100.0	-	X
#40	99.1	-	X
#60	97.9	-	X
#200	92.7	-	X

\* GC&T

**Soil Description**  
Brown & Gray Fat clay

**Atterberg Limits**  
PL= 32 LL= 85 PI= 53

**Coefficients**  
D<sub>85</sub>= D<sub>60</sub>= D<sub>50</sub>=  
D<sub>30</sub>= D<sub>15</sub>= D<sub>10</sub>=  
C<sub>u</sub>= C<sub>c</sub>=

**Classification**  
USCS= CH AASHTO= A-7-5(58)

**Remarks**

Sample No.: 7  
Location: B-2; 18.5-20.0 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-22-02  
Elev./Depth:


**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING  
&  
TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

98

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT



## SOIL DATA

SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	9		36.1	26	52	26	CH

LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**


Client: Carhones  
 Project: Duke Street Assemblage

Project No.: 22D-1841

Figure

99

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	9.4		90.6

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	100.0	-	X
#40	97.7	-	X
#60	96.2	-	X
#200	90.6	-	X

## Soil Description

Brown Fat clay

## Atterberg Limits

PL= 26

LL= 52

PI= 26

## Coefficients

D<sub>85</sub>=

D<sub>60</sub>=

D<sub>50</sub>=

D<sub>30</sub>=

D<sub>15</sub>=

D<sub>10</sub>=

C<sub>u</sub>=

C<sub>c</sub>=

## Classification

USCS= CH

AASHTO= A-7-6(27)

## Remarks

\* GC&T

Sample No.: 9  
Location: B-3; 5.0-6.5 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-22-02  
Elev./Depth:

**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING  
&  
TESTING, INC.**


Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage

Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

100

# LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT



## SOIL DATA

SYMBOL	SOURCE	SAMPLE NO.	DEPTH (ft.)	NATURAL WATER CONTENT (%)	PLASTIC LIMIT (%)	LIQUID LIMIT (%)	PLASTICITY INDEX (%)	USCS
•	PI & Grain Size	10		26.3	28	57	29	CH


LIQUID AND PLASTIC LIMITS TEST REPORT  
**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING**  
 &  
**TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
 Project: Duke Street Assemblage  
 Project No.: 22D-1841

Figure

101

# Particle Size Distribution Report



% COBBLES	% GRAVEL	% SAND	% SILT	% CLAY
0.0	0.0	1.2	98.8	

SIEVE SIZE	PERCENT FINER	SPEC.* PERCENT	PASS? (X=NO)
#4	100.0	-	X
#10	100.0	-	X
#40	100.0	-	X
#60	99.9	-	X
#200	98.8	-	X

\* GC&T

## Soil Description

Brown & Gray Fat clay

## Atterberg Limits

PL= 28

LL= 57

PI= 29

## Coefficients

D<sub>85</sub>=

D<sub>60</sub>=

D<sub>50</sub>=

D<sub>30</sub>=

D<sub>15</sub>=

D<sub>10</sub>=

C<sub>u</sub>=

C<sub>c</sub>=

## Classification

USCS= CH

AASHTO= A-7-6(34)

## Remarks

Sample No.: 10  
Location: B-3; 8.5-10.0 ft

Source of Sample: PI & Grain Size

Date: 8-23-02  
Elev./Depth:

**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING  
&  
TESTING, INC.**

Client: Carrhomes  
Project: Duke Street Assemblage

Project No: 22D-1841

Figure

## MOISTURE CONTENT DETERMINATION

PROJECT: Duke Street Assemblage  
Location: Fairfax County, Virginia

GC&T Job No.: 22D-1841

Sample No.	Test Boring #	DEPTH (FT.)	% M
1	TB-1	13.5 - 15.0	25.2
2	TB-1	18.5 - 20.0	23.8
3	TB-1	23.5 - 25.0	30.5
4	TB-1	28.5 - 30.0	29.5
5	TB-2	8.5 - 10.0	24.3
6	TB-2	13.5 - 15.0	24.0
7	TB-2	18.5 - 20.0	29.4
8	TB-2	23.5 - 25.0	28.3
9	TB-3	5.0 - 6.5	36.1
10	TB-3	8.5 - 10.0	26.3


October 9, 2003

Mr. Stephen A. Ness  
Vice President, Land Acquisition and Development  
Carrhomes, Inc.  
7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325  
Annandale, Virginia 22003

• 8551 Sudley Road  
Manassas, VA 20110  
(703) 335-5134  
FAX (703) 335-1835

• 21505 Greenoak Way  
Dulles, VA 20166  
(703) 421-4000  
FAX (703) 421-8000

Re: Quaker Ridge (Duke Street Property)  
GC&T Project No. 22D-1841



Dear Mr. Ness:

This letter has been prepared to summarize the geotechnical engineering studies performed to date for the Quaker Ridge project site.

GC&T has performed six drilled soil test borings at the project site extending to depths ranging between 15 and 59.4 feet below existing grades. The borings indicate that the onsite soils consist predominately of very stiff to hard high plasticity CLAY (CH) with some silty and clayey SAND (SM-SC). A direct shear test performed on an undisturbed Shelby tube sample from the high plasticity CLAY resulted in a residual friction angle of 13.1 degrees.

We have performed numerous slope stability analyses based on the preliminary grading schemes and have worked with you and the project civil engineers, Bowman Consulting, to ensure that the proposed grading for the site, as well as the adjacent properties, will have an adequate factor of safety against slope instability. Our analyses included the existing building loads of structures of adjacent properties, as well as the existing gravity wall along the northern boundary of the site. Our analyses to date indicate that the proposed preliminary grading will not adversely impact the stability of the adjacent properties.

As the site grading plans develop, GC&T will work closely with Bowman Consulting and continue additional slope stability analyses as necessary to ensure that the final grading scheme will have an adequate factor of safety against slope instability, both for the Quaker Ridge site and the existing surrounding properties. As the site grading nears completion, GC&T will



Quaker Ridge (Duke Street Property)

GC&T Project #22D-1841

Page 2 of 2

prepare a final geotechnical report for submittal to the City of Alexandria for review.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (703)-421-4000.

Sincerely,

GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTING & TESTING, INC.



Mark Hood, P.E.  
Project Manager

F:\Reports and Letters\Letters\CARR 22D-1841 Duke Street Summary 10-9-03.doc



REVISED: 9/25/03  
REVISED: 7/2/03  
FILED: NOV. 19, 2002

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR:

[X] MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT MPA #2003-0004  
[X] ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REZ #2002-0005

PROJECT NAME: Quaker Ridge (formerly known as Duke Street Commons)

PROPERTY LOCATION: 3517, 3517A, 3525, 3535, 3541, 3551 Duke Street

APPLICANT Name: Carrhomes, LLC

Address: 7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325, Annandale, VA 22003

PROPERTY OWNER Name: See Property Ownership Section

Address:

Interest in property: [ ] Owner [X] Contract Purchaser  
[ ] Developer [ ] Lessee [ ] Other

If property owner or applicant is being represented by an authorized agent such as an attorney, a realtor, or other person for which there is some form of compensation, does this agent or the business in which they are employed have a business license to operate in Alexandria, VA:

[x] yes: If yes, provide proof of current City business license.  
[ ] no: If no, said agent shall obtain a business license prior to filing application.

THE UNDERSIGNED certifies that the information supplied for this application is complete and accurate, and, pursuant to Section 11-301B of the Zoning Ordinance, hereby grants permission to the City of Alexandria, Virginia, to post placard notice in the property which is the subject of this application.

J. Howard Middleton, Jr.  
Print Name of Applicant or Agent

  
Signature

Reed Smith LLP, 3110 Fairview Park Dr.  
Mailing/Street Address

703-641-4225 703-641-4340  
Telephone # Fax #

Falls Church, VA 22042  
City and State Zip Code

September 25, 2003  
Date

=====

FOR CITY STAFF USE ONLY:

Date application received: Fee Paid: \$  
Date application completed: Staff Reviewer:

ACTION - PLANNING COMMISSION: MPA- APPROVED 6-0 11/06/03  
REZ- RECOMMEND APPROVAL 6-0 11/06/03

ACTION - CITY COUNSEL: Action deferred until November 25, 2003

18  
REVISED: 7/2/03  
FILED: NOV. 15, 2002

~~Completed~~  
APPLICATION for  
DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL USE PERMIT with SITE PLAN  
DSUP # 2002-0048

PROJECT NAME: Quaker Ridge (formerly known as Duke Street Commons)

PROPERTY LOCATION: 3517, 3517A, 3525, 3535, 3541, 3551 Duke Street

TAX MAP REFERENCE: Tax Map 61.01-02, Parcels 19-24 ZONE: RB Townhome

APPLICANT Name: Carrhomes, LLC

Address: 7535 Little River Turnpike, Suite 325, Annandale, VA 22003

PROPERTY OWNER Name: See Attachment 1

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL: Carrhomes LLC proposes to construct a cluster townhouse development, with subdivision, consisting of 28 townhouses with off-street parking and open space area. The application is filed in accordance with Section 11-600 as a cluster residential development.

MODIFICATIONS REQUESTED: (1) Rear yard setback reduction for Lots 1-28; (2) Side yard setback reduction for Lots 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28; (3) Front yard setback reduction for Lots 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13-26; (4) Duke Street setback reduction for Lots 1-5, 24-28.

SUP's REQUESTED: Cluster Residential Development, Section 11-600, of the Zoning Ordinance


THE UNDERSIGNED hereby applies for Development Site Plan, with Special Use Permit, approval in accordance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Alexandria, Virginia.

THE UNDERSIGNED, having obtained permission from the property owner, hereby grants permission to the City of Alexandria to post placard notice on the property for which this application is requested, pursuant to Article XI, Section 11-301(B) of the 1992 Zoning Ordinance of the City of Alexandria, Virginia.

THE UNDERSIGNED also attests that all of the information herein provided and specifically including all surveys, drawings, etc., required of the applicant are true, correct and accurate to the best of his knowledge and belief.

J. Howard Middleton, Jr.

*Print Name of Applicant or Agent*

  
*Signature*

Reed Smith LLP, 3110 Fairview Park Dr.

*Mailing/Street Address*

703-641-4225 703-641-4340

*Telephone #* *Fax #*

Falls Church, VA 22042

*City and State* *Zip Code*

July 2, 2003

*Date*

**DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE - OFFICE USE ONLY**

Application Received: \_\_\_\_\_

Received Plans for Completeness: \_\_\_\_\_

Fee Paid & Date: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Received Plans for Preliminary: \_\_\_\_\_

ACTION - PLANNING COMMISSION: 11/06/03 RECOMMEND APPROVAL 6-0

ACTION - CITY COUNCIL: Action deferred until November 25, 2003

#42



"Mickey Norris"  
<Mickey.Norris@comcast.net>

11/14/2003 06:00 PM

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>, <rob@krupicka.com>, <MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com>, <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>, <council@joycewoodson.net>  
cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>  
Subject: CarrHomes Quaker Ridge Rezoning Application

16,17,18  
11-15-03

I strongly appeal to you to continue to protect Alexandria's environment, the existing green space, and the safety, quality of life, and property values of current area residents by denying the CarrHomes rezoning application for Quaker Ridge, the proposed townhouse development at 3517-3551 Duke Street. Alexandria's rapid growth over the last 10 years makes planned growth paramount from this point on. With multiple projects already completed, currently underway, or planned within a few miles of this site, moving forward with a project requiring rezoning and special use permits right now is extremely ill advised.

Here is a summary of my concerns in this matter:

- Traffic Congestion and Safety Along Duke Street: Even during off-peak traffic hours, a trip by either bus or automobile from this neighborhood to Old Town routinely takes at least 20 minutes, a significant disincentive to local residents for patronizing Old Town shops and restaurants. That's before the impact on Duke Street traffic from the Patent and Trademark Office's 7,000-plus employees and visitors, which we haven't yet begun to see. In addition, the intersection of Quaker Lane with Duke Street is already one of the most congested and hazardous in the City. Automobile collisions are commonplace at this intersection. (Many of them don't require police intervention and, therefore, aren't reflected in official statistics.)
- Southbound traffic from North Quaker Lane and eastbound traffic on Duke Street consistently create gridlock, even during off-peak traffic hours, because the intersections of North Quaker and South Quaker Lanes with Duke Street, which have two separate sets of traffic lights, are offset by only one-half block, followed by yet another traffic light only one-half block east at the entrance to the Alexandria Commons shopping center.
- The recently opened skate park near this intersection has resulted in significantly greater pedestrian traffic at the intersection, primarily unaccompanied children.

A townhouse development that increases home density by 400% on the existing properties will precipitate still more traffic.

- Parking: Rezoning increases density. SUPs for special variances increases density even more. Fort Williams Parkway homeowners continue to have problems with nonresidents parking in their neighborhood and on access roads adjacent to Duke, a problem that increased density would only worsen.
- Master Plan and Variance Requests: Those who favor the proposed townhouse development assert that multiuse housing is justified by the surrounding townhouse developments. On the contrary, the City's Master Plan was created to blend single-family and townhouse developments after Quaker Village and Colonial Heights were planned. In the absence of significant, unforeseen new considerations, citizens should be able to rely on the City's Master Plan as written.
- Environmental Issues: Trees provide not only privacy and an attractive environment, but also a green buffer to noise and air pollution. Carr proposes tearing down up to 90 mature trees and replacing the area with pavement and buildings. This would increase the noise level, upset the environmental balance, and contribute to higher heat-index and ozone levels, which are already serious problems for the City.
- Structural Integrity of Existing Properties: The loss of trees, the grading of the land and attendant alteration of topography, and construction activity close to the retaining wall behind Quaker Village could cause additional structural damage to the adjoining Quaker Village units

I urge you to disapprove the rezoning request at this time. In the future, I would support a collaborative process among Quaker Village, a developer, and City Planning Staff to look at attractive alternatives to the high-density building proposal that is before you now. For example, a plan for five luxury duplexes would dramatically improve Duke Street's appearance and serve as an attractive gateway to the West End, while minimizing adverse traffic and parking impacts, preserving green space and the environment, maintaining quality of life, and improving property values.

Thank you for your time and deliberation on this important decision.

James M. Norris

69 Arell Court

Quaker Village

703-461-0079

16, 17, 18  
11-15-03



"Temple Moore"  
<templemoore@verizon.net>

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>  
cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>  
Subject: Quaker Ridge

11/14/2003 02:01 PM

Your Honor

I wish to go on record as opposed to the prospective Carr development known as Quaker Ridge. We need to preserve as much of the rapidly dwindling open space as possible and this development will result in a large loss of that precious commodity.

Additionally, as one who frequently must use Duke Street in the morning, any additional traffic, when added to the future influx from the PTO, will result in an intolerable load on an already over crowded street.

My understanding of the Master Plan for development does not include constant use of the SOP provisions, nor does it encourage exemptions from the stated purpose. We need to preserve as much of the already deteriorated quality of life in our city, and this proposed project does not qualify.

Temple Moore



<Kathleen\_McBride@plastics.org>

11/14/2003 06:08 PM

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>, <rob@krupicka.com>, <MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com>, <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>, <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>, <council@joycewoodson.net>

cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>

Subject:

16, 17, 18

11-15-03

Mayor William D. Euille, Vice Mayor Redella S. Pepper, Councilwoman Joyce Woodson, Councilman Ludwig Gaines, Councilman K. Rob Krupicka, Councilman Andrew H. Macdonald, Councilman Paul C. Smedberg:

Tomorrow you will be hearing a proposal for the Quaker Ridge development put forth by CarrHomes, Inc. I am opposed to the Master Plan amendment, the rezoning and the granting of special use permits to the developer that would result in:

- An increase in density on that land by 400%
- A loss of 80-90 trees and open space in an area sorely lacking open space
- Placement of homes inappropriately close to Duke St.
- Needlessly adding to traffic at one of Alexandria's most dangerous intersections.

In addition to reading the planning staff report, you have listened individually to our counter arguments, read our letters of concern, received word that we (surrounding residents) have signed a petition opposing the development, and, hopefully, seen, heard and read our opinion in the media.

Tomorrow you'll hear us again. As a newly elected body you have the unique opportunity to make decisions that are in line with the citizens' vision for a livable city. Your decisions will impact this city for the next 50 years, at least. No more development-as-usual decision-making! With the multiple projects underway or planned within a few miles of this site, we don't see the urgency for moving forward with a controversial project that demonstrates little benefit to the City now, if ever.

Thank you for all your hard work and dedication.

Kathleen McBride  
14 Arell Court



"Jack Hinden"  
<hindenj@hotmail.com>

11/14/2003 12:15 PM

To: <delpepper@aol.com>  
cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>  
Subject: Development at Duke and Quaker

16,17,18  
-----  
11-15-03

Dear Ms. Pepper - I am writing to express my opposition to the development of 4 sites within a block of the Quaker Village community, near Duke St. and Quaker Lane. The worsening gridlock on Duke has yet to feel the impact of the Patent & Trademark Office Buildings with 7,100 employees coming in January 2004. Even with valid arguments against building at this time, the Planning Commission voted UNANIMOUSLY to approve it on 11/6.

We are asking that the City Council reject this 25+ townhome development that is being proposed to be built on Duke Street just west of Quaker Lane (replacing 5 single family homes on large lots with mature trees.) In order to give the developer what he wants the city Master Plan must be amended, the area rezoned and multiple special use permits granted.

There has already been more than enough development in this area of Alexandria. In addition, I am the parent of two young children, and there are absolutely no playgrounds within walking distance of my house. Some of the only remaining green space in the area would be replaced with houses if these developments are approved. During the recent hurricane, Quaker Village residents were without power for three days. Further development would only worsen the power supply during future blackouts.

Please vote against this development, and please respond to this email.

Thanks, Jack Hinden

---

From Beethoven to the Rolling Stones, your favorite music is always playing on MSN Radio Plus. No ads, no talk. Trial month FREE!  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=offers/premiumradio>



<bmarlee@yahoo.com>


11/14/2003 12:28 PM  
Please respond to  
bmarlee

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,  
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,  
<rob@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,  
<paulcsmedberg@aol.com>, <rose.boyd@ci.alexandria.va.usi>,  
<jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>

cc:

Subject: City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor, Vice-Mayor  
and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com, delpepper@aol.com,  
council@joycewoodson.net, councilmangaines@aol.com,  
rob@krupicka.com, macdonaldcouncil@msn.com,  
paulcsmedberg@aol.com, rose.boyd@ci.alexandria.va.usi,  
jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us)

16, 17, 18  
11-15-03



Time: [Fri Nov 14, 2003 12:28:13] IP Address: [149.101.1.126]

Response requested: ☐

**First Name:** Robert

**Last Name:** Coulter

**Street Address:** 3816 Griffith Place

**City:** Alexandria

**State:** Virginia

**Zip:** 22304

**Phone:** 703-299-3745

**Email Address:** bmarlee@yahoo.com

**Comments:**

Seminary Ridge Civic Association

November 14, 2003

Mayor William D. Euille  
Members of the Alexandria City Council  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Re: Proposed Development of Quaker View  
November 15, 2003 City Council Docket Numbers  
16, 17 and 18

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of the City Council:

I write you to on behalf of the Seminary Ridge Civic Association regarding the development proposed for 3517 - 3551 Duke Street, a matter which is set for your consideration at this Saturday's City Council Meeting. The Seminary Ridge Civic Association opposes the proposed rezoning and amendment of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Master Plan required for this development. There are several points that I would like to make with regard to our opposition.

First, the proposed development of Quaker Ridge will increase the amount of cut through traffic in the Seminary Ridge Civic Association. As you are aware, the traffic on Duke Street, especially during rush hour is very heavy. As a result, there is already a large number of cars that use Ft. Williams Parkway and St. Stephens Road as a short cut to I-395 and use Ft. Williams Parkway and Trinity Street to cut back and travel east bound on Duke Street. There is no question but that during rush hour, when it is difficult if not impossible to take a right turn onto Duke Street and travel east bound towards Old Town, the residents of Quaker View will use our neighborhood as the most convenient way to begin their travels north to Washington and east to Old Town. The cut through traffic problem already exists for our neighborhood and will only be made worse by the proposed development.

In this regard I note that the City's Department of Transportation and Environmental Services has already documented the traffic problems that exist in our neighborhood. The City has done traffic studies for both St. Stephens Road and Ft. Williams Parkway and ranked them as the sixth and seventh streets in the city most deserving of traffic calming measures. While the addition of 28 town homes may have a negligible percentage increase upon the already overcrowded Duke Street, the inevitable increase in cut through traffic as a result of this development will be anything but negligible.

Second, the amendment of the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Master Plan and increase in the zoning density for the subject property is not appropriate at this time. There is no question but that the Duke Street corridor is currently a source of irritation for everyone who travels it regularly. To quote Alexandria City Planning Commissioner Richard Leibach "We have overbuilt on Duke Street." Add to this the impending increase in vehicular traffic as a result of the Patent

Trademark Office (estimated at 4,000 vehicles per day), long term construction of the new Wilson Bridge, development of the west end of Eisenhower Valley and the looming connector issues, and it is readily apparent that the Duke Street corridor will become even more troublesome in the near future.

You must decide whether now is the time to amend the Seminary Hill/Strawberry Hill Master Plan and local zoning ordinances to increase density on the Duke Street corridor. I submit to you that it is time to stick to a rational, well thought out plan for the management of the our city and deny the pending application. I understand that a recurring theme of your recent city council retreat was ensuring the continued viability of the City's neighborhoods. Well, the choice is now before you in a very concrete and tangible way. Choose protecting our neighborhood, not an ill conceived increase in the density of an already over developed area of our city.

Sincerely,

Robert Coulter  
President, Seminary Ridge Civic Association



"Stevens, Scott  
(contractor)"  
<StevensS@MTMC.ARM  
Y.MIL>

11/13/2003 11:39 AM

To: "alexvamayor@aol.com" <alexvamayor@aol.com>,  
"delpepper@aol.com." <delpepper@aol.com.>,  
"councilmangaines@aol.com" <councilmangaines@aol.com>,  
"rob@krupicka.com" <rob@krupicka.com>,  
"MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com" <MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com>,  
"PaulCSmedberg@aol.com" <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>,  
"PaulCSmedberg@aol.com" <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>,  
"council@joycewoodson.net" <council@joycewoodson.net>  
cc: "jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us"  
<jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>

Subject: OPPOSTION TO THE QUAKER RIDGE APPLICATION!!!

As a 32 year old, 20 year resident of the beautiful City of Alexandria, I am appalled at the overall ignorance and neglect given to the proposed construction of the Quaker Ridge development (by CarrHomes, Inc.). The city council has heard one valid argument after another but once again cares only to continue to line its pockets with the tax rewards provided by such a project. The Duke Street corridor has reached a critical mass and its impending worsening condition is well known throughout the area. In fact, it has become flat out dangerous to live by and travel along such an area, for both commuters and pedestrians alike.

I beg of you to make an exception to this small and unnecessary project. I have attached two documents outlining the details of this opposition, documents you have probably seen many times before. I ask as a concerned traveler, an ex-USN Reservist, a local constituent and, most importantly, as your fellow citizen of the great City of Alexandria, that you take one additional close look at the incredible merits illustrated in the attached, and heavily consider them prior to this Saturday's vote. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration and please do not hesitate to cotact me at the below information.

<<City\_Council\_Planning\_Commission\_Ltr1.doc>> <<PlanComm Ltr 11-5-03.doc>>

Scott C. Stevens  
200 Stovall St.  
Alexandria, VA 22332  
StevensS@mtmc.army.mil  
(C) 703/919-0810  
(B) 703/428-2147  
(F) 703/428-3316



City\_Council\_Planning\_Commission\_Ltr1.doc PlanComm Ltr 11-5-03.doc

**TO:** Mayor William D. Euille, Vice Mayor Redella S. Pepper, Councilwoman Joyce Woodson, Councilman Ludwig Gaines, Councilman K. Rob Krupicka, Councilman Andrew H. Macdonald, Councilman Paul C. Smedberg

Planning Commission Chair Eric Wagner, Vice Chair Richard Leibach, Donna Fossum, John Komoroske, H. Stewart Dunn, Jr., J. Lawrence Robinson, Jesse Jennings

**FROM:** Quaker Village Home Owners (please see p. 7)

**DATE:** October 1, 2003

Dear Mayor and Members of Council, Planning Commission:

As residents of Alexandria in the Duke Street area, we are alarmed by the high volume of development around us and its seemingly unplanned nature. These developments are either proposed to be built or are already completed within an approximately one-mile radius of our community?half of them within a block:

1. Proposed construction of 28 townhouses (Quaker Ridge) by CarrHomes, Inc., on Duke Street one block west of Quaker Lane, adjoining the southern boundary of Quaker Village.
2. Proposed construction of Quaker View townhouses on the corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street, previously denied by the Planning Commission.
3. Proposed construction of four single-family houses on the Wiecking property on the northwest end of Arell Court (inside Quaker Village).
4. Recently constructed Phoenix Hill townhouses on Duke Street.
5. Recently constructed skate park located opposite Quaker Lane on Duke Street.
6. Proposed large single-family homes by the builder, Elm Street, at 1400 Janney's Lane.
7. Recurring discussions of a road connecting Duke Street and Eisenhower Avenue.
8. In-process development of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office complex and surrounding properties.

We ask the City to please carefully evaluate these developments, singly and as an overall approach to growth, in conjunction with the following factors, which affect the safety, health, and quality of life of area residents:

- Adherence to the City's master plan and current zoning.
- Environmental issues, including the displacement of wildlife, exacerbated air pollution, and noise levels related to increased traffic, and increased temperatures resulting from diminishing green space.
- Structural integrity of existing houses, retaining walls, and fences that may be threatened by proposed developments (already an issue from City-approved plans that were not as built).
- Current traffic patterns and congestion.
- Traffic safety, including the requirements of emergency response vehicles.

We offer our concerns about and requests for each development:

### 1. **Proposed Carr 28-Townhouse Development**

The 28 townhouses Carr is proposing to build on Duke Street west of Quaker Lane are an example of diverging from the current master plan. Carr is proposing changing zoning from single-family to multiuse housing, reducing the 75-foot setback to 50 feet, and, as is often typical for land developers to request, and for the City to allow, cutting down many mature trees. We see several kinds of problems:

- Master Plan and Variance Requests?Quaker Village residents purchased homes knowing that they bordered single-family properties on both Duke and Quaker. Rezoning to multiuse would demonstrate an arbitrary approach to City planning. Those in favor of the townhouse development state that multiuse housing is justified by the surrounding townhouse developments. This is faulty logic because the master plan was created to blend single-family and townhouse developments after Quaker Village and Colonial Heights were planned. This fact is proven by the proposal of four (originally six) single-family houses in Quaker Village. Residents should be able to rely on the City's master plan as written.
- Environmental Issues?Many of us purchased our houses because our development was surrounded by trees that provide not only privacy and an attractive environment, but also a green buffer to noise and air pollution. Carr has identified for us which trees would remain and which they would destroy. With a 20x35-foot footprint, covering 20,000 square feet of space plus sidewalks, roads, and parking spaces, the townhouses represent a great loss of green space in an area that has precious little. The loss of trees would not only increase the noise level but upset the environmental balance, displacing the wildlife (many birds, rabbits, raccoons, chipmunks, a fox). Another development would contribute to the heat index and to the high ozone level? already a serious problem for the City.
- Structural Integrity of Existing Properties?The loss of trees, the grading of the land and

attendant alteration of topography, and construction activity so close to the retaining wall behind Quaker Village could cause structural damage to our houses. Some structural damage is already evident in the houses of our community that adjoin the existing single-family houses: chimneys separating from outer walls, decks sloping and pulling away. An engineering report was filed with the City stating our development was approved by the City as built (it was built with a 3-foot slope in back instead the 1-foot slope the builder's plans showed).

- Traffic Congestion? Even one more small development will contribute more cars to Duke Street which already cannot handle its daily volume in excess of 30,000 cars plus frequent overflow from the beltway and to the Duke/Quaker intersection, one of the busiest and most hazardous in the City. During peak hours, turning from Quaker onto Duke can easily take 30 minutes, and then reaching the Telegraph Road/I-95 ramp can take another 20 minutes. Accidents occur frequently, but official records do not reflect accurate totals because many do not require police intervention.
- Traffic Safety? By adding to traffic congestion, the 28 townhouses could impede the ingress and egress of medical and fire emergency vehicles that regularly visit the Sunrise Assisted Living facility directly across from the proposed building site. Should a raised median strip be placed in the center of Duke to limit turns (we are told by T&ES it is a strong possibility for the future), it would disallow the Alexandria EMTs traveling on Duke Street westbound from gaining the immediate access to Sunrise that they need. Motorists, in turn, would be encouraged to make U-turns into and out of Arell Court (Quaker Village) or the Colonial Hts. development close by.
- Parking? Because the building plans include minimal parking for visitors, visitors will go to Arell Court to park and perhaps to Fort Williams Parkway where those home owners have complained this is a common problem already.

We want to believe that you, as our elected officials, are seeking our best interests in your desire to preserve our quality of life as citizens of this great city. **We ask you to reject CarrHomes' rezoning proposal** and instead adhere to the master plan. We strongly appeal to you to continue to protect the environment, the existing green space, and the property of current residents.

## **2. Proposed Quaker View Townhouses**

The Quaker View development proposed for the northeast corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street was justifiably denied by the Planning Commission on the bases of traffic safety, congestion and inaccessibility by future residents who would be unable to turn left into or out of their neighborhood. The fire station nearby on Duke Street opposed the development because of added traffic and the suggested "safety" measures, such as a speed bump, which would impede their response time when turning the corner from westbound Duke onto Quaker. **We ask the City Council to support the Planning Commission's conclusion** as well as surrounding residents when the decision is officially appealed. We reiterate our position that

any development on this property would create new safety concerns and intensify the regular traffic backups in the Quaker/Duke intersection that have posed a growing problem for more than a decade.

### **3. Wiecking Property**

After building the Quaker Village townhouses on underground springs, six years ago Pulte Homes decided not to build the six single-family houses it had planned. Less than a year ago, a representative from CarrHomes, when asked, stated to Quaker Village residents that Carr would not choose to build on the Wiecking property. We have been told that long-time prior owners of the property installed underground conduits in conjunction with the springs to direct water for their livestock on the property. These are not known to be mapped by the City, and would pose an additional obstacle for building consideration. A current single-family home owner off the perimeter of the Quaker Village/Arell Court cul-de-sac, who has years of experience with unresolvable water problems, personally shared the long-held view that the Quaker Village hill was considered unsuitable for any type of building.

Now, four single-family homes may be built despite the well-documented history of drainage problems tied to the property. For more than a year, the Quaker Village HOA and owners of the 16 most-affected townhouses were in discussion with Pulte and the City to correct the ongoing problem of water standing in backyards due to runoff from the springs under Quaker Village property. The measures taken have not been completely successful, and now we are concerned that new development will undermine the measures, worsening the situation for at least 16 home owners. Without rain for months at a time and all during the summer drought water could be seen running, standing, oozing out of cracks in pavement/sidewalks. By disturbing the springs further, the development could also create or exacerbate water problems elsewhere in the neighborhood.

Because the City expresses confidence in the suitability of this land for development, Quaker Village asks the City to require the builder to provide a 20-year, \$20 million insurance policy to guarantee the funds to pay owners for any problems related to the springs that manifest themselves during or subsequent to the building of the proposed houses. A builder's posted "short-term" bond would not serve this purpose as we now continue to have water drainage/springs issues after 9 years.

### **4. Phoenix Hill Townhouses**

The Phoenix Hill development is a prime example of the City's need for a comprehensive master plan. Numerous special-use permits were required, including overriding the City's setback requirement of 75 feet which resulted in a development that is practically a sidewalk's width away from Duke St. Not only could the extreme proximity be a safety factor, but it would also seem to preclude any possible widening of the Duke St. corridor in the future. Considering Duke a gateway to Old Town, the City has given itself the goal of creating a unified look for the street in keeping with the feel of Old Town. **We encourage this approach through the City's plan designed to achieve consistent, desirable results;** however, this is

not achieved by approving a development in which the units do not even face the street.

## 5. Skate Park

The Quaker Village HOA opposed the skate park because of concern for the safety of children riding skateboards through and around the congested, accident-prone intersection of Quaker Lane and Duke Street. The park elevation is higher than anticipated and closer to the street. The proximity to the street increases exposure to car exhaust, ongoing development of particulate matter, and other forms of pollution. This encourages the growing incidence of asthma in children due to environmental factors tied to development and traffic-related pollution, and puts children more at risk.

## 6. Other Examples of Unchecked Development

Adding to our concerns are even more developments in our immediate neighborhood and the Duke Street corridor:

- The proposed large single-family homes development by the builder, Elm Street, on Janney's Lane (less than a mile from Quaker Village).
- Recurring discussions about an Eisenhower connector road (across the street from Quaker Village).
- The Patent and Trademark Office complex and surrounding properties.

The Patent and Trademark Office alone will bring an estimated total of 7,000 commuters to the vicinity. Surrounding residential and business sites in the Eisenhower Valley combined with others farther down Duke Street such as the still-under-construction Cameron Station, already have increased traffic in unreported numbers. This, in addition to the overflow from the beltway because of the Wilson Bridge construction, including heavy trucks rerouted onto Duke, has created a traffic safety and congestion nightmare for the City's residents and safety officers alike.

As stated in Richard Baier's quote as the City's director of transportation and environmental services, in the *Washington Post*, "Traffic Forecast: Much More Pain Before Any Gain," August 21, 2003:

"...you're already at a level of service that's F-minus anyway. It's a parking lot."

This heightened volume of traffic alone is adequate reason to postpone further development?and that is our request.

## Proposal to Address Current Problems

**Any proposed development should be put on hold.** Once the approved projects named above are completed, once the City has found effective ways to handle the resulting increased traffic, once the City has made adjustments to counteract any negative effects to the environment, then it will be time to plan and pursue new development along Duke Street. Now is the time for Alexandria to begin the work of renewing its vision for a livable city, deciding,

neighborhood by neighborhood, on the healthiest and most desirable approach. As stated in the City of Alexandria Plan for Planning, Department of Planning and Zoning, 2001-2005, June 8, 2001, where “it outlines a community-focused planning process”:

- “...redevelopment pressures provide the City—City Council, the Planning Commission and City staff—and our citizenry both a wonderful opportunity and a significant challenge. The opportunity is to change the City’s manner of dealing with land use development moving from an essentially reactive mode to one that is considerably more ‘proactive’ and that works to achieve established community goals and values.” (Introduction)
- “Redevelopment. ...other established communities face significant redevelopment pressures which need to be managed to ensure that the existing neighborhoods are not transformed in undesirable ways.” (p. 3)
- “In redevelopment areas, planning activities must be undertaken in concert with the neighborhood to identify the needs and desires of the existing community, to determine a preferred future for the area...” (p. 3)
- “It is important that we control and direct growth in our new development areas...we must also move to address those older, developed areas of the City and related corridors that have redevelopment potential, so as to strengthen the areas themselves and their adjacent neighborhoods. And it is certainly important that we address the developed areas in the City that, in the near term, are likely to face increasing redevelopment pressures which, if left unchecked, may transform the areas in ways we do not wish.” (pgs. 4-5)
- “...Zones that provide specific protection to and ensure compatibility with adjacent properties through both incentives and standards...” (p. 9)
- “The Planning Department will be looking to establish standards to ensure compatibility of the new construction with the neighborhood in which it is occurring.” (p. 9)
- “...determine if we can enhance the City’s ability to have new development projects include valuable open space.” (p. 9)
- “...Mission Statement...assures that all new development reflects the community’s vision.” (p. 10)
- “Without area plans, permit processing takes place in reaction to individual applications. Lacking a broader context for the proposal, this process frequently leads to acrimony, disappointment and conflict. The department is today committed to solving neighborhood land use issues by having plans in place in those areas of most urgent need, prior to development applications.” (p. 12)

- “The planning studies and initiatives discussed above will result in establishing a firm community/land use/market basis for a carefully crafted economic development program geared to individual neighborhood needs...” (p. 14)

In a 9/29/03 phone conversation between one of our home owners, Diana Cangelosi, and Chairman Eric Wagner, Mr. Wagner was favorable to our request for an on-site visit of the Council and Planning Commission members. We have been advised to send an e-mail to each of the Council and Planning Commission members with our request (which Capt Cangelosi will do.). We feel it will be most helpful in presenting with clarity the concerns in this letter.

To date, the following home owners and associations have been contacted and are protesting against building the proposed CarrHomes development at 3517-3551 Duke Street (Quaker Ridge), and the proposed Jade Development Group townhouse complex (Quaker View) at the corner of Quaker Lane and Duke Street:

Allison, John	#65	Kain, Richard	#12
Bachman, Katy	#31	King, Karin	#21
Bandy, Ellen	#10	Kusek, Laurie	#18
Bandy, Jeff	#10	Klinetop, Norman	#2
Bjelland, Karen	#23	McBride, Kathleen L.	#14
Cangelosi, Diana T.	#81	Macintosh, Caitlin	#16
Collins, Donna	#57	Mahin, Claudine	#48
Culver, Johanna M.	#35	Mierzejewski, Richard	#77
Culver, Victor I.	#35	Mocarsky, Thomas	#31
Dixon, Franklin P.	#37	Norris, James M.	#69
Dixon, Rhea R.	#37	Page, Jill	#26
Dunbar, Carlton	#51	Page, Robert	#26
Elyaderani, Maryam	#1	Page, Louis	#4
Elyaderani, Morteza	#1	Page, Francisca	#4
Fike, Ronald J.	#8	Patterson, Brian	#55
Fitzgerel, Betsy	#65	Recalde, Patricio	#6
Gettel, Donna	#67	Rigney, Susan	#49
Gettel, Robert	#67	Salim, Maryam	#17
Giddis, W. James	#45	Schwallie-Giddis, Pat	#45
Gilbert, Gail H.	#29	Schwartz, Judi	#24
Gitterman, Janet E.	#11	Scoville, Suzanne	#59
Gordon, Rebecca Y.	#41	Sienkiewicz, Henry	#20
Haines, Robert L.	#23	Umpfrey, Jack	#9
Halloway, Helen L.	#43	Ware, Lee	#22
Higgins, Joan C.	#71	Ware, Tom	#22
Hinden, Jack	#21	Yager, Brenda	#61
Hogue, Margaret A.	#8	Seminary Hill Assoc.	Alexandrians for Sensible Growth
Jimenez, Antonio	#28		
Kain, Diane	#12		

cc: Eileen Fogarty, Director,  
Planning and Zoning

Seminary Hill Association  
Clover-College Park Civic  
Association

Wakefield Tarleton Civic Association  
Alexandria Federation of Civic Associations

**TO:** Planning Commission Chair Eric Wagner, Vice Chair Richard Leibach, Donna Fossum, John Komoroske, H. Stewart Dunn, Jr., J. Lawrence Robinson, Jesse Jennings

**FROM:** Quaker Village Home Owners

**DATE:** November 5, 2003

Dear Planning Commission Members:

This letter represents the Quaker Village homeowners' and supporters' position on the proposed CarrHomes development, Quaker Ridge, at 3517-3551 Duke Street. Since the October 7<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting we have met with Steve Ness, CarrHomes, Howard Middleton, attorney for CarrHomes, and Kathleen Beaton, Planning & Zoning.

We have also spoken with you individually and have heard both your concerns and your praises for this development. We respectfully urge the Planning Commission to truly consider the impact of this high density development in light of the comprehensive arguments we have submitted in writing and at last month's Planning Commission meeting. Our concerns are focused on the issue of density and the impacts of increased density on traffic, safety, health and the environment. Given that we are the 11<sup>th</sup> densest city in the country that has grown 15 percent in the last 10 years (in an Alexandria Open Space Report) we assert that planned growth is paramount. ***With the multiple projects underway or planned within a few miles of this site, we don't see the urgency for moving forward with a project requiring rezoning and special use permits now, if ever.***

In Planning Commission conversations, we've heard it said "What do you want?" and "What are you for?" We are looking for a no rezoning recommendation from the Planning Commission at this time. In the future, we would be interested in participating in a collaborative process with a developer and Planning Staff to look at attractive alternatives to the high-density building proposal that is before you now. For example, a plan for five luxury duplexes would dramatically improve Duke Street's appearance and serve as an attractive gateway to the east end, while minimizing traffic/parking impacts, preserving green space/environment, maintaining quality of life and improving property values. We have attached some photos of comparable homes that are in Arlington.

Thank you for your time and deliberation on this important decision. Below is a summary of our concerns:

- Traffic Congestion and Safety: A development of 400% increase in home density will precipitate more traffic at one of the City's busiest and most dangerous intersections, which has not yet even begun to see the impact of the 7000+ employee PTO opening. Automobile collisions are commonplace at this intersection.
- Parking: Rezoning increases density. SUPs for special variances increases density even more. Fort Williams Parkway homeowners continue to have problems with area nonresidents parking in their neighborhood, and on access roads adjacent to Duke, a problem which would only worsen by additional density.
- Master Plan and Variance Requests? Those in favor of the townhouse development state that multiuse housing is justified by the surrounding townhouse developments. In fact, the Master Plan was created to blend single-family and townhouse developments after Quaker Village and Colonial Heights were planned. Citizens should be able to rely on the City's Master Plan as written.
- Environmental Issues? Trees provide not only privacy and an attractive environment, but also a green buffer to noise and air pollution. Carr is proposing to tear down up to 90 mature trees and replace the area with streets and buildings. This increases noise level, upsets the environmental balance and contributes to the heat index and high ozone levels? already serious problems for the City.
- Structural Integrity of Existing Properties? The loss of trees, the grading of the land and attendant alteration of topography, and construction activity close to the retaining wall behind Quaker Village could cause additional structural damage to our houses.

16,17,18  
11-15-03



**Jackie Henderson**

11/13/2003 03:21 PM

To: alexvamayor@aol.com, delpepper@aol.com,  
councilmangaines@aol.com, rob@krupicka.com,  
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,  
council@joycewoodson.net

cc: Barbara Ross/Alex@Alex, Eileen Fogarty/Alex@Alex, Michele  
Evans/Alex@Alex, Phil Sunderland/Alex@Alex

Subject: Phone message re: Quaker Ridge

Ms. Betsy Wong, 200 E. Taylor Run Parkway, called to say she is opposed to the  
Quaker Ridge project.

Jackie M. Henderson  
City Clerk and Clerk of Council

emailed to ce 11/14/03

16, 17, 18  
11-15-03



<ConnieEisaman@aol.com>

11/13/2003 06:17 PM

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>

cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>

Subject: Quaker Ridge - Rezoning

From: John Eisaman

Re: Construction of Quaker Ridge

I have three questions about this construction and the proposed rezoning:

1. What does the city get from it? Alexandria is changing the Master Plan, which I can only assume has some value. In exchange for changing something that Alexandria saw as beneficial at one time, what new benefit are we getting? If there is no benefit to the city and its citizens then why is it being considered? Obviously a main reason is more tax revenue; however, if this is at the expense of the surrounding neighborhoods and includes creating additional traffic in an already unbearably congested area without a solution in the works is it really worth it? The current single family home zoning would allow for a continuation of the blended community that we value, instead of yet another track of townhouses shoved in to a patch of land.

2. Why are you increasing the traffic problem on Duke Street? I do not think anyone will deny there is a problem with the traffic on Duke Street particularly at the Duke and Quaker intersection. Often times coming from downtown DC, it takes me longer to travel the last block home than it does the entire rest of the route! We carpool to and from work and there have been several instances where one of us has actually walked down the hill to our town home instead of sitting there for another 20 minutes in a back up on the hill. So adding 50 more cars to this problem is only a minimal increase?! I have never heard of a problem that has been solved by minimally adding to it until it goes away. How many more cars can we add to this problem before it exceeds a minimal increase. Are we being fair to the new and possibly naïve Alexandria citizens buying these homes by making them part of this parking lot? If you have not experienced peak drive times in this area, I encourage you to come by some afternoon/evening and see the gridlock at the intersection and the subsequent back up. Some analysis of the actual traffic patterns at that area should be considered before a decision is made.

3. Do any of you live in this neighborhood? In the past year or so we have had a skatepark put in. We were only made aware of this when it was in the final stages of being approved. New development (Quaker View) at the intersection of Duke and Quaker is being considered (although it appears it is temporarily on hold.) And of course the always present connector issue. Now this proposed rezoning (as well as the last minute purchase of an additional parcel that will most likely be developed with additional townhouses but for which no current plan is even on the board for consideration. I can not believe that all of these if any would have gotten as far as the city council if they involved your neighborhood. While we are not opposed to new development to improve the surrounding area, that does not require rezoning and should be consistent with the existing Master Plan.

The only reason for this rezoning that I have heard is: single family homes are inconsistent with the surrounding area and would be unsellable. Do any of you really think that if there were five single family homes there that noone would buy them? Our own community is a blended community of town homes and new construction of several houses planned. That is a positive thing and is consistent with the surrounding area. The fact that there is a developer that wants to reap large returns on a project at the expense of changing the character of the existing neighborhoods, contributing to the already congested traffic and ignoring the Master Plan that was approved should not be the driving force of any decision here.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. I hope you figure out the answers to these questions. As for myself and my wife, we are seriously considering moving back to Arlington where the city government worked together with

citizens to bring about acceptable change without creating excessive strains on traffic of major arteries and considered the impact of planning and zoning decisions with forethought and not solely based on dollar signs. Don't disappoint us by rezoning this area...keep our neighborhood just that, not just another track of townhouses on the already overcrowded Duke Street corridor.

===

John Eisaman  
Business Process Improvement  
Supply Chain Management - Strategies  
United States Postal Service  
(202) 268-2232

===

Connie L. Eisaman  
Director, Finance & Administration  
Union Privilege  
202-778-9815 phone

16,17,18  
11-15-03



**Jackie Henderson**

11/12/2003 04:28 PM

To: alexvamayor@aol.com, delpepper@aol.com,  
councilmangaines@aol.com, rob@krupicka.com,  
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,  
council@joycewoodson.net

cc: Michele Evans/Alex@Alex, Phil Sunderland/Alex@Alex, Barbara  
Ross/Alex@Alex, Eileen Fogarty/Alex@Alex

Subject: Quaker Ridge

Kathleen McBride, 14 Arell Court, called to say she is opposed to the Quaker Ridge development.

Jackie M. Henderson  
City Clerk and Clerk of Council

16, 17, 18  
11-15-03



<tmocarsky@mac.com>

11/12/2003 10:56 AM  
Please respond to  
tmocarsky

To: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>  
CC:  
Subject: City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Jackie M. Henderson  
(jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us)

**Time: [Wed Nov 12, 2003 10:56:15] IP Address: [138.88.202.220]**

**Response requested: [ ]**

**First Name:** Thomas

**Last Name:** Mocarsky

**Street Address:** 31 Arell Court

**City:** Alexandria

**State:** VA

**Zip:** 22304

**Phone:** 703 212 0659

**Email Address:** tmocarsky@mac.com

**Comments:** This is a copy of an email that I send to the Alexandria Council on Wednesday, November 12.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed zone change and development of the property located at 3517-3551 Duke Street.

I have several reasons for my opposition.

#1: Deviation from master plan.

The specific properties are zoned for single family homes, in keeping with a master plan commitment to a mixed use neighborhood. With this development, and with other developments such as Phoenix Mills, the area is being overwhelmed with town homes, causing a drastic increase in density and changing the character of the neighborhood. This is being done, not as part of a carefully considered plan that accounts for the necessary changes in infrastructure and transportation, but at the direction of developers who's prime concern is their own profitability.

## #2: Proliferation of Special Use Permits

The development proposes alterations to established set backs from Duke Street as well as other requests. The city has a poor reputation in this area, in terms of the number that are granted and in terms of the city's enforcement of these Special Use Permits. This continued willingness to abandon carefully considered standards construction and land use, coupled with the reported failures to enforce any adherence to the special use permits as granted, threatens the integrity of our planning process and the character of our city.

## #3: Insufficient concern for environmental impact

The natural springs in the hills overlooking the development and drainage issues related to those springs have not been considered. Today, with only the single family homes on the property and lots of trees to absorb run off, it is not uncommon, long after a rain storm, to see water flowing from driveways onto Duke Street even as the surrounding terrain has dried. With the additional construction of single family home planned for Quaker Village, the flow of water off the hills into the existing developments and the planned development will be a serious issue that the developer has not given any evidence of having taken into consideration.

## #4: Traffic, traffic, traffic.

While any single development makes a minimal impact to the total traffic on Duke, the aggregation of the development in the area, including the skate park, will likely have a measurable impact of an already overtaxed and dangerous intersection. Duke Street is already a parking lot at peak hours. The Patent and Trademark Office has yet to open (and will do so without key transportation infrastructure elements such as the pedestrian tunnel) so we do not yet know what impact that major development will have. We simply cannot keep piling on like this absent a coherent plan that we adhere to for transportation and land use.

In conclusion, I request that you reject the request for a change in zoning for the property of 3517-3551 Duke Street and adhere to the existing master plan for Alexandria.

Thom Mocarsky  
31 Arell Court  
Alexandria, VA 22304  
703-212-0659



<Laurie\_Kusek@americ  
anchemistry.com>

11/12/2003 05:11 PM

To: <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,  
<rob@krupicka.com>, <MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com>,  
<PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>, <council@joycewoodson.net>  
cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>  
Subject: Vote NO on Quaker Ridge on Saturday

Vote NO on Nov. 15 on Docket number 16 (Master Plan Amendment #2003-0004, Quaker Ridge); number 17 (Rezoning #2002-0005, Quaker Ridge); and number 18 (Development Special Use Permit #2002-0048, Quaker Ridge).

Traffic Congestion and Safety -- This development would mean a 400% increase in home density and will precipitate more traffic at one of the City's busiest and most dangerous intersections, which has not yet even begun to see the impact of the 7000+ employee PTO occupancy. Automobile collisions are commonplace at this intersection.

Parking: Rezoning increases density -- SUPs for special variances increases density even more. Ft. Williams Parkway homeowners continue to have problems with area nonresidents parking in their neighborhood, and on access roads adjacent to Duke, a problem which would only worsen by additional density.

Master Plan and Variance Requests -- Those in favor of the townhouse development state that multi-use housing is justified by the surrounding townhouse developments. In fact, the Master Plan was created to blend single-family and townhouse developments after Quaker Village and Colonial Heights were planned. Citizens should be able to rely on the City's Master Plan as written.

Environmental Issues -- Trees provide not only privacy and an attractive environment, but also a green buffer to noise and air pollution. Carr is proposing to tear down up to 90 mature trees and replace the area with streets and buildings. This increases noise level, upsets the environmental balance and contributes to the heat index and high ozone levels -- already serious problems for the City.

Structural Integrity of Existing Properties -- The loss of trees, the grading of the land and attendant alteration of topography, and construction activity close to the retaining wall behind Quaker Village could cause additional structural damage to our houses.

---

Laurie J. Kusek, APR  
18 Arell Court (Quaker Village)  
Alexandria, VA 22304  
H: 703/751-3113  
Email: lauriejkusek@aol.com

16,17,18  
11-15-03



"Jack Umphrey"  
<jkumphrey@comcast.net>  
et>

11/12/2003 08:18 PM

To: "Jack Umphrey" <jkumphrey@comcast.net>,  
<alexvamayor@aol.com>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,  
<rob@krupicka.com>, <MacdonaldCouncil@msn.com>,  
<PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>, <PaulCSmedberg@aol.com>,  
<council@joycewoodson.net>  
cc: <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>, "Diane Kain"  
<dfkain@comcast.net>  
Subject: RE: QUAKER RIDGE APPLICATION

Please substitute the following for my original message sent at 6:56 pm earlier today.

Thanks.

JK Umphrey

#### CORRECTED COPY

I am opposed to the Quaker Ridge Application and respectfully request you to vote against the project because of the adverse impact on my property at 9 Arell Court, Alexandria, VA 22304.

As has been stated many times orally and in writing to the Planning Commission, the impact of the increased density on traffic, safety, health and the environment should be the primary consideration of the Council in reviewing this application. We, citizens and property owners of the City of Alexandria, consider this project to be unnecessary, unwarranted and a serious departure from the previously approved master plan.

Duke Street already has a terrible traffic problem and the activation of the PTO before the tunnel is completed will exacerbate the situation. The tunnel, when built, will help a little but certainly not enough to compensate for the additional traffic caused by the PTO. And, I am sure you are aware that the Duke Street/Quaker Lane intersection is one of the most dangerous intersections in the City. We really do not need more townhouses with their attendant traffic in this area.

Again, please deny the Application.

Sincerely,

JK Umphrey

16,17,18  
11-15-03



Jackie Henderson  
11/11/2003 07:54 AM

To: alexvamayor@aol.com, delpepper@aol.com,  
councilmangaines@aol.com, rob@krupicka.com,  
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,  
council@joycewoodson.net  
cc: Phil Sunderland/Alex@Alex, Michele Evans/Alex@Alex, Barbara  
Ross/Alex@Alex, Eileen Fogarty/Alex@Alex  
Subject: Duke Street Development

Since this was addressed to "undisclosed recipients," I wasn't sure if Council received this e-mail, so I'm forwarding it to you.

Jackie M. Henderson  
City Clerk and Clerk of Council

----- Forwarded by Jackie Henderson/Alex on 11/11/2003 07:51 AM -----



<SHAssociation@aol.co  
m>

11/10/2003 08:11 PM

To: undisclosed-recipients;;  
cc:  
Subject: Duke Street Development

Subject: Letter from our neighbors re. development of **Duke Street** property

Action: We urge you to contact City Council with your opinion

From: Frank Putzu, President, SHA

In spite of all the opposition to the proposed Carr (Quaker Ridge) development provided by 3 different homeowner/civic associations, numerous long-time area residents, and land-use attorneys, and our arguments brought forward for the last 6 months about Duke St. gridlock, recurring traffic accidents, disappearing greenspace bringing more noise and pollution, the 6 members of the Commission (the Chair was absent) each spoke in their "what a good project" mode, voting unanimously for the change to the City's Master Plan (joke), rezoning from single-family to high-density, and Special Use Permit variances to serve the developer. This was also in spite of the fact that one member stated she "must have received 75 faxes & e-mails today" opposing the development. Unbelievable!!

Two years ago City staff formed a partnership with the developer and has worked with THEM to bring about what THEY want. When the builder's attorney was asked if the builder would be willing to go from 25 to 22 units, the attorney lamented they had already given up so much starting out with 31! The report from Traffic & Environmental Services last night said additional traffic provided (by 50+ cars) "would not be a measurable increase." For who? Remember that the next time you can't turn left from Ft. Williams Parkway onto Duke because of the cars in gridlock, some of them waiting to turn left into Colonial Heights OR into the new Carr development (and there will still be NO traffic lights at these intersections to help out) or when you're trying to get to Telegraph, Old Town, Rt. 1, 495...

The City Staff/Planning Commission mantra is and has been "I see nothing wrong with it--looks like a pretty good project to me" for all building. The clincher was that just YESTERDAY the developer closed a deal with the 6th hold-out single-family house (nearest one to Arell) where, if you can believe it, the owner will move "next door" to a new Carr townhouse while her old house remains on the lot. And THIS promotes beautification of Duke? This is because her house was not included in the developer's original plan submitted to the City. When asked by the Commission what was planned for this site, the attorney said, "Well, er...uh...more townhouses." When asked how that fit with the current number of townhouses recommended for THIS plan, the attorney did not have a ready answer and mumbled something about they would deal with that at a later date. Absolutely. No sense upsetting the apple cart when you're about to close the deal. The Commission member smiled slightly and said, "Maybe even open space?" knowing that would never be a consideration. That's because the developer KNOWS they'll build on it and add more than is even currently agreed upon by the City! Another Commission member said that if an application came back to them to build more on this site he would "certainly not be in favor of that." Does that mean he will vote FOR but not be in favor OF?

The City of Alexandria is the 11th densest city in the country while the staff has NO PLAN for density, for traffic, for the rights of the citizens of Alexandria. 5 single-family homes are rezoned for a 400% increase in that density. The Master Plan is changed for what reason? The City Staff said building higher-density at this site is consistent with the higher density further out Duke St. (There were MULTIPLES of Special Use Permits we are told by a veteran land-use attorney with the Phoenix Hill project just down the street.) Builder needs something? Submit an SUP. Need something else? Submit another SUP. Don't uphold the SUP? Pay no fine. (Reference the unbuilt PTO tunnel for the arrival of 7,100 employees.)

One of the City's/Planning Commission's continuing arguments is that the single-family houses do not belong in this area with all the existing townhomes. Eileen Fogarty, Planning & Zoning Director, said, "It's difficult to make an argument against rezoning." We offered that perhaps it would at some point be a welcome diversion if there was a less dense dwelling on this site (without changing zoning) rather than the rows and rows of townhomes starting to pop up on Duke. Since we were not allowed to speak again at this public hearing, we provided alternatives/photos of such homes already in existence in Arlington, and a letter, for consideration. We hand-delivered this to each of the Planning Commission members' homes the night before the hearing. That was met with "nice, but not appropriate for this space." So we'll approve rezoning, special variances for setbacks rejecting our own rules, and put in what WE think is nice losing 80-90 trees, increasing the noise level, and pollution, and worsening traffic but "not a measurable increase." When we say in our letter to the City/Planning Commission that there will be a loss of 80-90 trees (according to the builder's own site rendering) the builder THEN tells Planning Staff that THEY will SAVE 83 trees. At no time did they say they would SAVE 83 trees until we put into a slide presentation for the Planning Commission hearing Oct. 7 that they would destroy 80-90 trees. How can you save what you marked on your rendering you would be removing?

CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS ISSUE IS SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15 AT 9:30.  
IT IS

OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE THAT WE HAVE EVERY HOMEOWNER PRESENT WHO SIGNED THE NO-BUILD PETITION. CITY COUNCIL PUTS MUCH WEIGHT ON THAT.

PLEASE COME AND SUPPORT US NOVEMBER 15! WE NEED YOU! This has been a long hard effort and we want to finish well. We will continue to offer our best to support what you've told us is important to you, but we can't do it without you.

A handful of us have continually lobbied Planning Commission and City Council members through letters, e-mails, and on-site meetings. We are told now is the time to promote that LARGELY. Please feel free to send an e-mail to any of the City Council members with your comments to support any of the above views. Go to:

<http://ci.alexandria.va.us/city/amacc/>  
scroll to the bottom, and select the red "click here."

Thank you,  
Diane & Richard Kain  
Quaker Village Homeowners

Source: Cindy Gurne, Communications Officer, Seminary Hill Association

***Please notify us if you would like your name removed from our mailing list.***

***For additional information about SHA, and contact information for officers and area representatives, visit: [www.seminaryhillassn.org](http://www.seminaryhillassn.org)***

emailed to Council 11/11/03

16, 17, 18

11-15-03



<SHAssociation@aol.com>  
m>

11/10/2003 08:11 PM

To: undisclosed-recipients;;  
cc:  
Subject: Duke Street Development

Subject: Letter from our neighbors re. development of **Duke Street** property

Action: We urge you to contact City Council with your opinion

From: Frank Putzu, President, SHA

---

In spite of all the opposition to the proposed Carr (Quaker Ridge) development provided by 3 different homeowner/civic associations, numerous long-time area residents, and land-use attorneys, and our arguments brought forward for the last 6 months about Duke St. gridlock, recurring traffic accidents, disappearing greenspace bringing more noise and pollution, the 6 members of the Commission (the Chair was absent) each spoke in their "what a good project" mode, voting unanimously for the change to the City's Master Plan (joke), rezoning from single-family to high-density, and Special Use Permit variances to serve the developer. This was also in spite of the fact that one member stated she "must have received 75 faxes & e-mails today" opposing the development. Unbelievable!!

Two years ago City staff formed a partnership with the developer and has worked with THEM to bring about what THEY want. When the builder's attorney was asked if the builder would be willing to go from 25 to 22 units, the attorney lamented they had already given up so much starting out with 31! The report from Traffic & Environmental Services last night said additional traffic provided (by 50+ cars) "would not be a measurable increase." For who? Remember that the next time you can't turn left from Ft. Williams Parkway onto Duke because of the cars in gridlock, some of them waiting to turn left into Colonial Heights OR into the new Carr development (and there will still be NO traffic lights at these intersections to help out) or when you're trying to get to Telegraph, Old Town, Rt. 1, 495...

The City Staff/Planning Commission mantra is and has been "I see nothing wrong with it--looks like a pretty good project to me" for all building. The clincher was that just YESTERDAY the developer closed a deal with the 6th hold-out single-family house (nearest one to Arell) where, if you can believe it, the owner will move "next door" to a new Carr townhouse while her old house remains on the lot. And THIS promotes beautification of Duke? This is because her house was not included in the developer's original plan submitted to the City. When asked by the Commission what was planned for this site, the attorney said, "Well, er...uh...more townhouses." When asked how that fit with the current number of townhouses recommended for THIS plan, the attorney did not have a ready answer and mumbled something about they would deal with that at a later date. Absolutely. No sense upsetting the apple cart when you're about to close the deal. The Commission member smiled slightly and said, "Maybe even open space?" knowing that would never be a consideration. That's because the developer KNOWS they'll build on it and add more than is even currently agreed upon by the City! Another

Commission member said that if an application came back to them to build more on this site he would "certainly not be in favor of that." Does that mean he will vote FOR but not be in favor OF?

The City of Alexandria is the 11th densest city in the country while the staff has NO PLAN for density, for traffic, for the rights of the citizens of Alexandria. 5 single-family homes are rezoned for a 400% increase in that density. The Master Plan is changed for what reason? The City Staff said building higher-density at this site is consistent with the higher density further out Duke St. (There were MULTIPLES of Special Use Permits we are told by a veteran land-use attorney with the Phoenix Hill project just down the street.) Builder needs something? Submit an SUP. Need something else? Submit another SUP. Don't uphold the SUP? Pay no fine. (Reference the unbuilt PTO tunnel for the arrival of 7,100 employees.)

One of the City's/Planning Commission's continuing arguments is that the single-family houses do not belong in this area with all the existing townhomes. Eileen Fogarty, Planning & Zoning Director, said, "It's difficult to make an argument against rezoning." We offered that perhaps it would at some point be a welcome diversion if there was a less dense dwelling on this site (without changing zoning) rather than the rows and rows of townhomes starting to pop up on Duke. Since we were not allowed to speak again at this public hearing, we provided alternatives/photos of such homes already in existence in Arlington, and a letter, for consideration. We hand-delivered this to each of the Planning Commission members' homes the night before the hearing. That was met with "nice, but not appropriate for this space." So we'll approve rezoning, special variances for setbacks rejecting our own rules, and put in what WE think is nice losing 80-90 trees, increasing the noise level, and pollution, and worsening traffic but "not a measurable increase." When we say in our letter to the City/Planning Commission that there will be a loss of 80-90 trees (according to the builder's own site rendering) the builder THEN tells Planning Staff that THEY will SAVE 83 trees. At no time did they say they would SAVE 83 trees until we put into a slide presentation for the Planning Commission hearing Oct. 7 that they would destroy 80-90 trees. How can you save what you marked on your rendering you would be removing?

CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING ON THIS ISSUE IS SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15 AT 9:30.  
IT IS

OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE THAT WE HAVE EVERY HOMEOWNER PRESENT WHO SIGNED THE NO-BUILD PETITION. CITY COUNCIL PUTS MUCH WEIGHT ON THAT.

PLEASE COME AND SUPPORT US NOVEMBER 15! WE NEED YOU! This has been a long hard effort and we want to finish well. We will continue to offer our best to support what you've told us is important to you, but we can't do it without you.

A handful of us have continually lobbied Planning Commission and City Council members through letters, e-mails, and on-site meetings. We are told now is the time to promote that LARGELY. Please feel free to send an e-mail to any of the City Council members with your comments to support any of the above views. Go to:  
<http://ci.alexandria.va.us/city/amacc/>  
scroll to the bottom, and select the red "click here."

Thank you,

Diane & Richard Kain  
Quaker Village Homeowners


Source: Cindy Gurne, Communications Officer, Seminary Hill Association

***Please notify us if you would like your name removed from our mailing list.***

***For additional information about SHA, and contact information for officers and area representatives, visit: [www.seminaryhillassn.org](http://www.seminaryhillassn.org)***

RICHARD R. G. HOBSON  
99 N. QUAKER LANE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304

November 13, 2003



**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

The Mayor and the City Council  
Of the City of Alexandria, Virginia  
And Members of the City Council  
c/o Ms. Jackie Henderson, City Clerk, and  
Clerk of Council  
Room 2300 – City Hall  
301 King Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Re: Protest provision pursuant to Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria to applications of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in Rezoning Application No. 2002-005 and Development Site Plan Amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications, scheduled for public hearing by the City Council on Saturday, November 15, 2003 but it should be dated November 13, 2003

Dear Mayor Euille and Members of the City Council:

On behalf of the Seminary Hill Association, Inc. ("SHA") and the landowners whose names are signed to the enclosed petitions, I hereby transmit in a timely fashion prior to noon on Friday, November 14, 2003, to the City Clerk and to you the petition as authorized in Section 9.13 of the Charter and Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance, in protest against the applications specified in said petition. There are 30 numbered petition sheets enclosed which are filed on behalf of SHA and 74 owners in Quaker Village (54 of the 55 homes), 8 on Tupelo Place and one in Colonial Village. On behalf of the landowners whose names are signed to the enclosed petition, I assert that presumptively the land so owned by them constitutes at least twenty percent (20%) of the land within three hundred (300) feet of the boundary of the line affected by the proposed changes as contained in the opposed applications but request that the City Staff calculate and verify that presumption as provided in Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance. The complexity of the calculations and land areas that are publicly owned and hence excluded leaves unclear whether or not the twenty percent (20%) has been achieved.

Please note that the Quaker Village Homeowners Association, Inc. has executed the petition by both its President and its Vice President.

In the event that the twenty percent (20%) has not been achieved, please receive these petitions nonetheless as the expressed opposition to the subject applications of the petition signers.

I request that the City Clerk date-stamp and return to the deliverer of this letter a copy thereof to document its timely delivery.

Unfortunately, I will not be present at the public hearing on November 15, 2003 but Seminary Hill Association, Inc. will be represented by Mr. Jack Sullivan, its Treasurer, and/or Mr. Frank Putzu, its President as well as other members of its Board of Directors.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Dick Hobson", written in a cursive style.

Richard R. G. Hobson  
(Board member and designated representative of  
SHA)

RRGH/gpa

Enclosures

Cc: Members of the City Council  
Mayor William D. Euille  
J. Howard Middleton, Esquire, Attorney for the Rezoning Applicant  
Mr. Jack Sullivan  
Mr. Frank Putzu  
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kain  
Ms. Barbara Ross (with enclosures)  
Ms. Eileen Fogarty  
Ignacio Pessoa, Esquire

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:


<u>Morteza Elyaderani</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>MORTEZA ELYADERANI</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>Street address of land owner</u> 1 Arell St	<u>9/16/03</u> Date signed
<u>M. Elyaderani</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Margam Elyaderani</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>Tax Map number of parcel owned</u> 061.01-03 lot 1	<u>4/16/03</u> Date signed
<u>Janet E. Gitterman</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Janet E. Gitterman</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>Street address of land owner</u> 11 Arell St Alex, VA 22304	<u>9/27/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>Tax Map number of parcel owned</u> 061.01-03-6	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

 (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Norman Kuntz 2 Acre Ct  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of  
land owner


8-26-03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner


61-01-02-15  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

 (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Henry Sienkiewicz 20 Acre Ct  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of  
land owner

26 Aug 03  
Date  
signed

 (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Judith Schwartz 24 Acre Ct  
Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

Oct 5/03  
Date  
signed

 (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Caitlin Macintosh 16 Acre Ct  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of  
land owner

10/5/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61-01-02-8  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_  
Street address of  
land owner

\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned



\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

 (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	John E. Eisman Printed Name of Owner	3 HRELL CT Street address of land owner	10/19/03 Date signed
 (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	[illegible] Printed Name of Owner	6101-03-2 Tax Map number of parcel owned	10/19/03 Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u><i>Dina Vizzaccaro</i></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Dina Vizzaccaro</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>7 Arell Ct.</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10/17/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61-01-03-4</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

<u><i>Jack Umphrey</i></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>JACK UMPHREY</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>9 ARELL CT, ALEX 22304</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9/11/03</u> Date signed
<u>ONLY OWNER</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>        </u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-5</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>        </u> Date signed
<u><i>Richard Mierzejewski</i></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>RICHARD MIERZEJEWSKI</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>77 ARELL</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9-25-03</u> Date signed
<u>        </u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>        </u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-11</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>        </u> Date signed
<u><i>Maryam Salim</i></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>MARYAM SALIM</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>17 ARELL</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9/27/03</u> Date signed
<u>        </u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>        </u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-24</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>        </u> Date signed
<u><i>Patricia Benedict</i></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>PATRICIA BENEDETTI</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>#6 ARELL CT ALEX VA 22304</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9/28/03</u> Date signed
<u>        </u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>        </u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-02-13</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>        </u> Date signed

## LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.


OWNERS:

Diane J. Kain (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Diane F. Kein  
Printed Name of Owner

12 Arell  
Street address of  
land owner

10/15/23  
Date  
signed

 (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Richard A. Kain  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-02-10  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

10/15/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (signature of owner)

JAMES T. WEITE  
Printed Name of Owner

Street address of  
land owner

10/18/08  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-3  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Printed Name of Owner

Street address of  
land owner

Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Printed Name of Owner

Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Printed Name of Owner

Street address of  
land owner

Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

Printed Name of Owner

**Tax Map number  
of parcel owned**



Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>MONICA LARRIEU</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>15 ARELL CT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10/19/03</u> Date signed
<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>JORGE LARRIEU</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-8</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>10/19/03</u> Date signed

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed






____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Laurie J. Hersh</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>18 Arell Ct.</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-02-7</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>JEFFREY T. BANDY</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>10 ARELL CT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>ELLEN L. BANDY</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-02-11</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Ronald J. Fike</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>8 Arell Court</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u></u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Margaret A. Hogue</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-02-12</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u>C Lee Ware</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>C. Lee Ware</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>22 Arell Ct</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9/27/03</u> Date signed
<u>Thomas A. Ware</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Thomas A. Ware</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-02-5</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>9/27/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

## LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

Robert L. B. (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Robert L. Page  
Printed Name of Owner

26 Acll  
Street address of  
land owner

9/23/03  
Date  
signed

Gill M. Page (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Jill M. Page  
Printed Name of Owner

26 Arell  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

9/23/03  
Date  
signed

Louise V. Page (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

LOUIS V PAGE  
Printed Name of Owner

47011 Ct  
Street address of  
land owner


9/23/03  
Date  
signed

Francine Page (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

FRANCISCA PAGE  
Printed Name of Owner

4 Anell Ct  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

9/23/03  
Date  
signed

 (signature of owner) \_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)

Kenneth Belk  
Printed Name of Owner

53 A-11 4  
Street address of  
land owner

10/16/03  
Date  
signed

Beth J (signature of owner) (SEAL)

Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-23  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

Date  
signed

Betty Petrilli (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Betty Petrill  
Printed Name of Owner

13 Arrell Ct  
Street address of  
land owner

10-18-03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-7  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u>Antonio Jimenez</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	ANTONIO JIMENEZ Printed Name of Owner	28 ARELL CT Street address of land owner	9/13/03 Date signed
---	--	--	---------------------------

<u>ONLY OWNER</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	61.01-02-2 Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
--	-----------------------	---	----------------

<u>Kathleen L. McBride</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Kathleen L. McBride Printed Name of Owner	14 Arell Ct Street address of land owner	9/13/03 Date signed
---	--	--	---------------------------

<u>Lot # 48</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Lot # 48 Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
--	-----------------------	---	----------------

<u>C. Mahin</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	CLAUDE MAHIN Printed Name of Owner	47 Arell Ct. Street address of land owner	9-13-03 Date signed
--	---------------------------------------	---	---------------------------

<u>61.01-03-36</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	61.01-03-36 Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
---	-----------------------	--	----------------

<u>Jack Hinden</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Jack Hinden Printed Name of Owner	21 Arell Ct. Street address of land owner	9-14-03 Date signed
---	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------


<u>Kasim King</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	Kasim King Printed Name of Owner	21 Arell Ct. Tax Map number of parcel owned	9/25/03 Date signed
--	-------------------------------------	---	---------------------------

**LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION**

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

<u></u> (SEAL)	<u>Carol H. Gilbert</u>	<u>29 ARELL COURT</u>	<u>3 Oct 03</u>
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	<u>61-01-03-30</u>	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed

_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed




_____ (SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)	Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

 (signature of owner) (SEAL)	<u>THOMAS J. FLORES</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>31 ARELL CT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/19</u> Date signed
 (signature of owner) (SEAL)	<u>KATHRYN M. BACHMAN</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>061.01.03.031</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>9-19-03</u> Date signed
 (signature of owner) (SEAL)	<u>Teresa Toth</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>27 ARELL CT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10/15/03</u> Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>061.01.03.029</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

Victor I. Culver (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Victor I. Culver 35 ARELL CT.  
Printed Name of Owner 8/31/03  
Street address of land owner Date signed

Johanna M. Culver (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Johanna M. Culver 61.01-03-33  
Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number of parcel owned 8/31/03  
Date signed

Franklin P. Dixon (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Franklin P. Dixon 37 Arell Ct  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner 8/31/03  
Date signed

Rhea R. Dixon (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

RHEA R. DIXON 61.01-03-41  
Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number of parcel owned 8/31/03  
Date signed

Rebecca Y. Gordon (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Rebecca Y. Gordon 41 ARELL CT  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner 9/1/03  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_ 61.01-03-39  
Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number of parcel owned  
Date signed

Helene H. Haloway (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

HELENE HALLOWAY 43 ARELL CT.  
Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner 9/1/03  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_ 61.01-03-38  
Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number of parcel owned  
Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

<u>Marcia A. Sarrazin</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Marcia A. Sarrazin</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>39 Arrell Ct</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10/16/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-40</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

W. James Giddis (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

W. JAMES GIDDIS  
Printed Name of Owner

45 ARELL CT  
Street address of  
land owner

9/1/03  
Date  
signed

Pat Schwallie Giddis (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

PAT SCHWALLIE-GIDDIS  
Printed Name of Owner

45 ARELL CT  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned  
61.01-03-37

9/22/03  
Date  
signed

Robert L. Haines (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

ROBERT L. HAINES  
Printed Name of Owner

23 ARELL CT.  
Street address of  
land owner

9/8/03  
Date  
signed

K. Bjelland (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

K. Bjelland  
Printed Name of Owner

23 ARELL CT.  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned  
61.01-03-27

9/19/03  
Date  
signed

Carl Hens (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Carl Hens  
Printed Name of Owner

514-1111  
Street address of  
land owner

9/8/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-34  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

Suzanne Scoville (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

SUZANNE SCOVILLE  
Printed Name of Owner

59 ARELL CT.  
Street address of  
land owner

9/19/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-20  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned


\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

 (signature of owner) (SEAL)	<u>SUSAN RIGNEY</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>49 ARELL</u> Street address of land owner	<u>9/14/03</u> Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-35</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

Donna D Collins (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

DONNA D COLLINS  
Printed Name of Owner

57 ARELLA  
ALEX VA  
Street address of  
land owner

9/3/2003  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-21  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

Christina Estrada (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Christina Estrada  
Printed Name of Owner

57 ARELLA  
Street address of  
land owner

9/3/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-20  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

Brenda Yager (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Brenda Yager  
Printed Name of Owner

61 ARELLA  
Street address of  
land owner

9/14/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-19  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

Betsy A Fitzgerald (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Betsy A Fitzgerald  
Printed Name of Owner

65 ARELLA  
Street address of  
land owner

9/14/03  
Date  
signed

John S. Allen (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

John S. Allen  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-17  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned


9/12/03  
Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

X  (SEAL) (signature of owner)	ALANCIA WYNN Printed Name of Owner	63 ARELL CT Street address of land owner	10/22/23 Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	61.01-03-18 Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u>James M. Morris</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>JAMES M. MORRIS</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>69 ARELL CT.</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-15</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

<u>Joan C. Higgins</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>JOAN C. HIGGINS</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>71 ARELL CT.</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u>(only owner)</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-14</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

<u>Donna Gettel</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>DONNA GETTEL</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>67 ARELL CT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u>Robert Gettel</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>ROBERT GETTEL</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>61.01-03-16</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed

<u>Diana T. Cangelosi</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>DIANA T. CANGELOSI</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>81 ARELL</u> Street address of land owner	<u>8/26/03</u> Date signed
<u>(ONLY OWNER)</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>N/A</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>LOT 9</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

\\REA\164895.1 61.01-03-9

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

<u>Mrs. Crystal Williams</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Crystal P. Williams</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>73 Apple Ct Alex Va</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10-15-03</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Michael K. Williams</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>73 Apple Alex Va</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned <u>061.01.03.013</u>	<u>10-15-03</u> Date signed
<u>Shirley Brown</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>Shirley Brown</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>33 Apple</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10-16-03</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>[Signature]</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>061.01.03.032</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>[Signature]</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>[Signature]</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Street address of land owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>[Signature]</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>[Signature]</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>[Signature]</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Street address of land owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Date signed
<u>[Signature]</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>[Signature]</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>[Signature]</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>[Signature]</u> Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

X <u>Mary Ryan</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>MARY RYAN</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>75 ARLECT</u> Street address of land owner	<u>10/29/03</u> Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>61-01-03-12</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

Jackie Rustigian (SEAL) Jackie Rustigian 79 Arell Court 10/16/2003  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner Date signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL) \_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner 61.01-03-10  
Tax Map number of parcel owned Date signed

Jackie Rustigian (SEAL) Jackie Rustigian 79 Arell Court 10/16/2003  
(signature of owner) Vice President Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner Date signed  
QV HOA

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL) \_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner 61.01-03-42  
61.01-02-1  
Tax Map number of parcel owned Date signed

Mary E Scanlan (SEAL) M. E. SCANLAN 19 ARELL 10/30/03  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner Date signed

\_\_\_\_ (SEAL) \_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner 61.01-03-25  
Tax Map number of parcel owned Date signed

Janet Kresslein (SEAL) Janet Kresslein 25 Arell 10/30/03  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner Street address of land owner Date signed

Joe Kresslein (SEAL) Joe Kresslein 25 Arell 10/30/03  
(signature of owner) Printed Name of Owner Tax Map number of parcel owned Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

## OWNERS:

x <u>Rosalyn Bellis</u> (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	<u>Rosalyn Bellis</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>42 Carriage House Circle</u> Street address of land owner	<u>Nov 12, 03</u> Date signed
x _____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>60.07-03-49</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

*Quaker Village Homeowners Association, Inc.*

By *Bob Page* (SEAL)  
(signature of owner) *PRESIDENT*

BOB PAGE  
Printed Name of Owner

26 Ash  
Street address of  
land owner

11/12/03  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

61.01-03-42  
61.01-02-1  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

*ALL LAND OWNED BY THIS CORPORATION*

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of  
land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of  
land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of  
land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number  
of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date  
signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

Kristen K. Clark (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Kristen K. Clark  
Printed Name of Owner

3570 Tupelo Pl.  
Street address of land owner

4/11/10  
Date signed

Thomas H. Clark (SEAL)  
(signature of owner)

Thomas H. Clark  
Printed Name of Owner

3570 Tupelo Pl.  
Tax Map number of parcel owned.

4/11/10  
Date signed

001.01-01-15

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number of parcel owned

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street address of land owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature of owner) (SEAL)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Owner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tax Map number of parcel owned


\_\_\_\_\_  
Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

 (signature of owner) (SEAL)	<u>3606 TUPELO PK.</u> <u>VIRGINIA SHACKLETT</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>Street address of land owner</u>	<u>10-30-03</u> Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	<u>061.01-01-16</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner) (SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

✓ <u>Glenwood Clark</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	✓ <u>GLENWOOD CLARK</u> Printed Name of Owner	✓ <u>3608 TUPELO PL.</u> Street address of land owner	✓ <u>11/04/03</u> Date signed
<u>Myrtle C. Clark</u> (SEAL) (signature of owner)	<u>MYRTLE CLARK</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>061.01-01-19</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	<u>11/4/03</u> Date signed

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---------------------

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---------------------

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Street address of land owner	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------

____ (SEAL) (signature of owner)	____ Printed Name of Owner	____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	____ Date signed
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	---------------------

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

**TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA**

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:


✓ <u>Jon G. Parvin</u> (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	✓ <u>JON G. PARVIN</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>3610 TUPELO</u> Street address of land owner	✓ <u>11/3/03</u> Date signed
✓ <u>Darrell Kucaly</u> (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	✓ <u>Darrell Kucaly</u> Printed Name of Owner	<u>060.02-03-13</u> Tax Map number of parcel owned	✓ <u>11/03/03</u> Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Street address of land owner	_____ Date signed
_____ (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	_____ Printed Name of Owner	_____ Tax Map number of parcel owned	_____ Date signed

LANDOWNER PROTEST PETITION

TO: THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA,  
VIRGINIA, c/o THE CLERK OF THE COUNCIL, CITY HALL, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

In accordance with the provisions of Section 9.13 of the Charter of the City of Alexandria, and of Section 11-808 of the Zoning Ordinance of that city, the undersigned landowners do hereby protest against an application for a motion to amend the boundaries of the zone, to change the zone or to amend the terms of any adopted conditional zoning proffer under the rezoning application of Carr Homes, L.L.C. or any successor to such applicant in rezoning application No. 2002-0005 and development site plan amendment and SUP Development Application No. 2002-0048 or any amendment of said applications whether to a more restricted or less restricted use or other amendment of said applications. The undersigned landowners are owners of land within 300 feet of the boundary of the land affected by such proposed changes.

OWNERS:

 (signature of owner)	(SEAL)	GAIL FREY JORDAN Printed Name of Owner	3614 TUPLO ROAD ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304 Street address of land owner	11/5/03 Date signed
SOLE OWNER				
_____	(SEAL)	_____	060.02-03-12	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Street address of land owner	Date signed
_____	(SEAL)	_____	_____	_____
(signature of owner)		Printed Name of Owner	Tax Map number of parcel owned	Date signed


16,17,18  
11-15-03  
MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048



- 
- An aerial photograph of the UCLA campus. The main building complex is visible, including the iconic Campanile tower. The campus is surrounded by lush greenery and trees. The image is oriented horizontally on the page.

# Master Plan/Zoning

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048



☐ Townhouse Zones (RB, RT)

☐ Zones that allow Townhouses (CG, CL, CSL, CRMU/H)

- Townhouse use is compatible with surrounding residential, multi-family, and commercial uses
- RB zoning compatible with zoning of adjacent townhouse properties

- Proposed Density: 11.2 du/ac
- Colonial Heights: 10 du/ac
- Quaker Village: 11.2 du/ac
- Recommended Density by Staff and the Planning Commission: 10.04 du/ac

# Quaker Ridge

---

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

## Initial Concerns

- Traffic
- Number of Units
- Topography
- Open Space
- Tree Preservation
- Units Facing Duke St.
- Parking





# Quaker Ridge

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

## Original Site Plan - 11.4 du/ac

- Minimal tree preservation
- No buffer
- No consolidated open space
- Backs of townhouses on Duke St.
- 13 units adjacent to Quaker Village



## Applicant's Proposal

- 28 units
- 43,512 sf (43.59%) open space

## Staff Recommended Plan

- 25 units
- 50,671 sf (46%) open space

# Quaker Ridge


---

MPA # 2003-0004

REZ # 2002-0005

DSUP # 2002-0048

## Site Plan Recommended by Staff and Planning Commission



- Reduction of 3 units for a total of 25 units (10.04du/ac)
- 83 trees preserved along north boundary adjacent to Quaker Village townhomes
- 7,000 sf additional open space with loss of three units

• 25 units

• 50,671 sf open space or approximately 46%

# Quaker Ridge

---

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

## Community Concerns

- Traffic – Circulation
- Parking
- Buffer
- Density
- Rezoning
- Marine Clay Soils – Runoff

# Community Process

---

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

February 2003

3 citizen  
meetings

- Initial meeting with adjoining residents/associations
- Revisions requested

May 2003

5 citizen  
meetings

- Revised site plan submitted
- Colonial Heights Homeowners' Association supports proposal subject to staff recommendations

October 2003



1 citizen  
meeting

- Staff continuing to meet with Quaker Village
- Planning Commission hearing
- Adjacent property added

November 2003

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

---



20' - 30' Setback  
10' - 20' Tree Save Area

# Quaker Ridge

---

MPA # 2003-0004

REZ # 2002-0005

DSUP # 2002-0048

## Planning Commission Recommends Approval Subject to Staff Conditions:



- Provision of 12,000 sf publicly accessible open space
- Preservation of mature trees 23" to 30" in caliper
- Underground utilities along Duke St.
- Wider sidewalks/street trees on Duke St.
- Eliminate curb cuts from 4 to 1 on Duke St.
- Eliminate 3 units: 28 to 25 units
- Increased open space by 7000 sf/Increased buffer adjacent to Quaker Village
- Higher quality building design/materials, Buildings facing Duke St.

# Quaker Ridge

---

MPA # 2003-0004  
REZ # 2002-0005  
DSUP # 2002-0048

## Conclusion



16,17,18 - Present by Richard Kane

16,17,18  
11-15-03

**Quaker Village and Supporters' Position on:**  
**Master Plan Amendment #2003-0004**  
**Rezoning #2002-0005**  
**Development Special Use Permit #2002-0048**

**Alexandria City Council Meeting**  
**November 15, 2003**

# Guiding Principle

## **“A Community-Focused Planning Process”**

*“The opportunity is to change the City’s manner of dealing with land use development moving from an essentially reactive mode to one that is considerably more ‘proactive’ and that works to achieve community goals and values.”*

- City of Alexandria Plan for Planning, Department of Planning and Zoning, 2001-2005, June 8, 2001

# Topics

- Introductions – who we are
- City of Alexandria developments
- Master Plan – Traffic – Safety - Density
- Process – Citizen Involvement
- Response to proposed CarrHomes, LLC development and City staff
- Our recommendations

# Who We Are

■ Quaker Village Homeowners Association

With Support From

■ Seminary Hill Association

■ Seminary Ridge Association

■ Alexandrians 4 Sensible Growth

# City Development

## Approved

- U.S. Patent and Trademark complex and surrounding properties
- Phoenix Mill townhomes – South side of Duke St. just west of Ft. Williams parkway - completed
- Skate park at Quaker/Duke intersection - completed

## Proposed

- CarrHomes, LLC – Quaker Ridge
- Quaker View (recommended disapproval – pending City Council)
- Four Single-family homes on Wiecking property adjacent to Quaker Village on the north
- Cooper-Dawson proposed re-subdivision adjacent to Wiecking property
- Large single-family homes on Presbyterian Church property
- Eisenhower Connector

# Master Plan Erosion

- ***Staff Analysis: Proposed townhouse development is an appropriate use given adjoining townhouse developments on east, west and north boundaries, and multi-family and commercial uses to the south***
- Master plan (and QV original plan) supports blended single-family and townhomes. A townhome development in place of single-family homes is in opposition to current Master Plan and zoning
- Master plan was designed to protect adjacent and nearby single family homes on/or having access to Tupelo and Quaker Lane

# Master Plan Erosion

- “Fuzzy Math” - City Staff and Applicant claim a reduction from 31 to 25
- Reality Check – Increased density from 5 to 25 - 400%
- What is our objective as a city for density?

# Master Plan Erosion

- *Applicant traffic “study” deems impact insignificant*
- The impact of other developments is yet to be seen on Duke St.
  - PTO office – 7100 commuters
  - Construction on/around Duke St.- Wilson Bridge, Rte 1/Beltway, Telegraph Rd/Beltway
- *“...you’re already at a level of service that is F-minus anyway It’s a parking lot.” –*

Richard Baier, Director of Transportation and Environmental Services, City of Alexandria, “Traffic Forecast: Much More Pain Before Any Gain”, *Washington Post*, August 21, 2003

# Safety, Health, Quality of Life Factors

- Traffic patterns, traffic safety and congestion
- Environmental Issues
  - Air and noise pollution
  - Removal of existing screening/buffer
  - Groundwater impact
  - Increase in heat index due to removal of green space
  - Wildlife displacement – variety of birds and other small animals
- Structural integrity of existing developments
- City electrical infrastructure/power grid
- Adequate Infrastructure

# Traffic

- Quaker and Duke are already a problem
- One of Alexandria's busiest intert intersections
  - Many accidents – A 3 car accident in the last week in front of the Fire Station.
  - Other accidents observed by nearby residents and members of the Planning Commission
  - Every additional car makes a difference
- Additional multiple trips (not just at rush hour)
  - “...you're already at a level of service that is F-minus anyway. It's a parking lot.” Rich Baier, Director of Transportation and Environmental Services, City of Alexandria. *Traffic Forecast Much More Pain Before Any Gain, Washington Post, August 21, 2003*

# Accident October 19, 2003



# Planning/Density

- What is the City's plan for the Duke St. corridor?
- What is the City's transportation plan for the entire city?
  - Density?
  - Traffic?

# Density of Alexandria

Persons per acre 1990 Census

■ New York	37.3	■ Minneapolis	10.2
■ San Francisco	24.6	■ Cleveland	10.1
■ Chicago	18.7	■ Seattle	9.8
■ Boston	18.0	■ St. Louis	8.9
■ Philadelphia	17.1	■ Cincinnati	7.0
■ Miami	16.0	■ Portland, OR	6.0
■ Baltimore	13.1	■ Pittsburgh	9.8
■ Detroit	11.3		
■ Los Angeles	11.8		
■ Alexandria	11.0		
2000 Census +15% to 12.7			

# Density of Alexandria

- “...many jurisdictions have had to address the belief that the economic benefits to be accrued from development outweigh those attributable to open space. ...Research and empirical evidence indicate, however, that this is not true. All things considered, development is not always the highest and best use for a piece of property.”

Alexandria Open Space Plan

# Process – Citizen Involvement

- Despite developers consultation with City staff the communities were not involved for a year
- Government should be the advocates for the citizens in defense of the master plan
- Making minor changes when major changes are called for by the citizens
- Planning Commission Public Hearing closed, but developer, their attorney, and City staff were able to speak

# Process – Citizen Involvement

- Developer met with City staff far more than the communities are able to
- City officials advised us to make the “best deal”
- Planning Commission members informed us that they were advised by the developer we were fragmented when we were not
- You, our elected representatives should protect our neighborhoods from change that is detrimental

# Current Quaker Village Buffering and Screening



# Response to Proposal

- ***10-foot “conservation area” along northern and western perimeter***
- Counter to City’s open space objectives
- Proposal calls for removal of approximately 80-90 trees, including large and mature trees
- Remaining trees run risk of irreparable damage by heavy construction efforts
- If trees are lost the developer only needs to replace the total caliper measurement
- Proposal does not guarantee long term conservation

# Response to Proposal

- Inadequate visitor parking (meets city minimums, but will cause problems for adjoining homeowners)
- Inadequate buffer
- Too close to Duke St. 50 instead of 75 feet
- Too Dense – Why 400%? Why not have a plan limiting density from 0% increase to 200%?
- Now the proposal is not even complete due to the additional property coming under agreement

**City of Alexandria Plan for Planning,  
Department of Planning and Zoning, 2001-  
2005, June 8, 2001**

*“Without area plans, permit processing takes place in reaction to individual applications. Lacking a broader context for the proposal, this process frequently leads to acrimony, disappointment and conflict. The department is today committed to solving neighborhood land use issues by having plans in place in those areas of most urgent need, prior to development applications.”*

# Recommendations

- All proposed changes in the Master Plan for new, additional developments on Duke Street placed on hold until
  - PTO completed and, increased traffic burden of 7100 commuters is evaluated and addressed.
  - Completion of a city-wide transportation plan is processed and approved
  - A community-focused planning process is established, communicated to residents, initiated and (specific to this development) completed

# Recommendations

- Deny this proposal – Wait for the studies to be done and a significantly less dense proposal in accordance with a well considered revised Master Plan
- You, our representatives need to protect our neighborhoods – we trust you to do that
- The Master Plan is the written documentation of the protection upon which the residents rely

