

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 2004

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: PHILIP SUNDERLAND, CITY MANAGER *PS*

SUBJECT: PROPOSED ACTION PLAN TO PROTECT PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED IN THE OPEN SPACE PRIORITY LIST

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

ISSUE: Consideration of proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

- (1) Receive the proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan (Attachment I) and Summary Matrix (Attachment II). The Action Plan proposes a number of actions to be taken to protect some or all of the open space characteristics of the properties included in the Open Space Priority List which Council adopted last June. The Action Plan also sets out the recommended time frame for these actions to take place, and recommends the issuance of \$10.0 million in general obligation bonds for open space acquisitions;
- (2) Schedule a Public Hearing on the proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan for Saturday, October 16; and
- (3) Following the Public Hearing, at the October 26 legislative meeting, adopt the proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan, and instruct City staff to begin implementation of the adopted Action Plan.

BACKGROUND: On June 22, 2004, Council adopted a list of "priority" properties that the Open Space Steering Committee had identified as the most significant open space sites in Alexandria. (This "Open Space Priority List" of properties is on pages 5 through 10 of Attachment 3 to the report of the Open Space Committee which is attached to this memorandum as Attachment III.)¹

On June 22, Council also instructed the City Manager to provide to Council in the fall an Open Space Priority List Action Plan -- i.e., a plan of action which, as to each property on the adopted Open Space Priority List, provided recommendations regarding the following:

¹ On June 22, Council also adopted the recommendations of the Committee that related to the process and criteria to be used in the future for adding, or removing, properties from the Open Space Priority List.

- a. the actions that could be taken (either by the property owners or the City, or both) to protect the property's open space characteristics;
- b. the timing of these protective actions;
- c. the anticipated City cost, if any, of the protective actions, as well as any ongoing operation and maintenance costs resulting from the actions; and
- d. if applicable, the manner of financing the actions which, for some properties, could include financing the actions through the issuance of general obligation bonds, whose debt would be paid from a portion of the revenue generated by the one cent real estate tax dedication.

The Open Space Priority List, which Council adopted on June 22, places properties into three categories: "Immediate Priority," "Priority" and "Other Important Sites." Two properties are listed in the "Immediate Priority" category: a series of parcels along the waterfront between King and Duke Streets, and property along the waterfront behind Hunting Towers (now Hunting Point) to be used as an alignment for the Mount Vernon bike trail. Four properties are listed in the "Priority" category: a part of the Seminary Forest property between Braddock Road/Ivor Lane and Seminary Road, Clermont Cove, various parcels adjacent to Monticello Park, and the George Washington Masonic Memorial site. Four other properties are listed in the "Other Important Sites" category: the northeast corner of Seminary and Beauregard, a site at Lloyds Lane and Russell Road, a site at Valley Drive and Braddock Road, and the Second Presbyterian Church property.

Since this past June, open space preservation actions have occurred with respect to three of these ten properties on the Open Space Priority List. Council has approved, and allocated \$750,000 for, the acquisition of approximately five acres of the Seminary Forest site. Land use actions by Council have resulted in the preservation as open space of about one acre at the Lloyds Lane and Russell Road site. Land use actions by Council have resulted in approximately 20% percent of the Second Presbyterian property, or about 1.2 acres, being dedicated as public open space.

DISCUSSION: Attachment I contains the proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan. It recommends various actions (or reflects the actions already taken) for the protection of the most important open space characteristics of the ten properties on the Open Space Priority List. It also divides these properties into three "timing" categories depending upon the need for "short-," "mid-" or "long-term" protective actions.

Two properties are recommended in the Action Plan for short-term action:

- (1) **Waterfront Properties:** acquisition of the seven parcels along the waterfront at 200, 204, 208, and 210 Strand Street, 0 Prince Street, and 1 and 2 King Street; and
- (2) **Mt. Vernon Trail Property:** acquisition of an appropriate public access easement over a linear strip of property behind Hunting Towers (1204-1206 South Washington Street) which can be used as an alignment for the Mount Vernon Trail.

1 **Waterfront Properties.** These seven parcels total 2.112 acres, and contain a current aggregate
2 assessed value (which reflects the fact that title to the properties is in dispute and that they are the
3 subject of litigation initiated by the federal government) of \$8.353 million. The Old Dominion
4 Boat Club (ODBC) parking lot (2 King Street) is seen by staff as having the highest priority of the
5 Waterfront Properties to be acquired. This is due to its location relative to the river, its location
6 at the foot of King Street, and its relationship with and adjacency to Waterfront Park.
7

8 The Action Plan recommends taking these actions for the Waterfront Properties:
9

- 10 • Begin and pursue the process for acquiring these properties, except for the
11 property at 1 King Street that is occupied by the Old Dominion Boat Club
12 building. This action will include obtaining an appraisal of the properties,
13 discussing their sale with their respective owners, and eventually either reaching a
14 voluntary sale of the properties or initiating condemnation proceedings in court (an
15 action that would require specific Council authorization at a later time). As to the
16 property at 1 King Street, we recommend that staff initiate discussions with ODBC
17 and, based on these discussions, present a recommendation to Council at a later
18 date.
19
- 20 • Begin and pursue a planning process for the Waterfront. The recommended study
21 area is the area bounded by Queen, Union and Wolfe Streets, and the Potomac
22 River. The product of this process, among other things, would be
23 recommendations to the Planning Commission and Council regarding the use or
24 uses of the Waterfront Properties that the City is acquiring. We envision this
25 planning process, if approved by Council, beginning early in 2005 and running for
26 12-15 months.
27

28 The anticipated cost of these Waterfront Properties actions is as follows:

- 29 • \$10-15 million, or possibly more, to acquire the properties
- 30 • Site development costs, such as bulkhead repair and construction -- to be
31 determined during the planning process
- 32 • Ongoing maintenance costs -- to be determined during the planning process.
33

34 **Mt. Vernon Trail Property.** The Action Plan recommends obtaining this easement as a short-
35 term priority action. This easement for the future trail alignment would provide a waterfront
36 connection for the existing Mt. Vernon Trail, which is designated as part of the Potomac Heritage
37 National Trail System. Negotiations have begun with The Virginia Department of Transportation
38 (VDOT), which currently owns Hunting Towers (Hunting Point). These negotiations include the
39 Woodrow Wilson Bridge project, the National Park Service, and City staff. It is our intention to
40 bring closure to these negotiations before the end of the year and before the sale of the Hunting
41 Towers (Hunting Point) property, by obtaining an appropriate easement along the desired trail
42 alignment.
43

44 Specific actions for the Mt. Vernon Trail Property are:

- 45 • Continue negotiations on securing the easement necessary to construct a trail
46 adjacent to the Potomac River at Hunting Towers (Hunting Point) with access to

1 the Mt. Vernon Trail, including environmental permit modifications, wetland
2 mitigation if necessary, written approvals from VDOT, Army Corp of Engineers,
3 National Park Service, and Virginia DEQ.

4
5 The anticipated City cost of these actions are:

- 6 • Donated easement (no cost)
- 7 • \$10,000 a year to maintain the easement
- 8 • \$250,000-\$500,000 to construct the desired trail and provide, at another location,
9 new wetlands to offset those removed by the trail construction.

10
11 The Action Plan places four properties on the Open Space Priority List in the mid-term action
12 category. These are: **Monticello Park Area Properties** (306 & 312 Beverly, 3104, 3104B,
13 3106 & 3106A Russell Road); the **George Washington Masonic Temple Property** (101
14 Callahan Drive); the **Seminary/Beauregard Property** (5101 Seminary Road); and the
15 **Braddock/Valley Property** (2416 & 2430 Ridge Road, 1101 & 1103 Braddock Road, 2419
16 Valley Drive).

17
18 These sites represent properties that the City should begin discussing protection measures with
19 the property owners related to developing a plan for the protection of their most important open
20 space characteristics. The methods to achieve this protection include purchase options, rights of
21 first refusal, and different forms of easements. It is not anticipated that we will make any effort to
22 acquire the Monticello Park properties or the Braddock Valley properties. In general, all of the
23 sites above represent significant locations for future open space protective actions, although
24 efforts need to be undertaken now to prepare for these more permanent actions. See Attachment
25 I for additional discussion of these mid-term action properties.

26
27 The Action Plan places one property on the Open Space Priority List in the long-term action
28 category. This is **Clermont Cove** (200 Clermont Avenue). It is placed in this category because,
29 although it is privately owned, there are numerous restraints that makes it development unlikely at
30 this time.

31
32 **FISCAL IMPACT:** The City expense to acquire the short-term action properties is estimated to
33 be in the range of at least \$10-15 million. Site planning, design and site development (not
34 applicable for all sites) would be an additional not-as-yet determined cost. Maintenance of these
35 properties will require an estimated \$50,000-\$100,000 per year, depending on the uses to which
36 they are put. For instance, intensive maintenance operations, such as highly landscaped areas,
37 would require higher levels of funding estimated to be in the range of \$30,000-\$45,000 per site
38 per year. Planning, design and site development costs for each of the properties will be dependent
39 on the specific program and amenities that are implemented for each location and would be
40 coordinated through the Capital Improvement Projects process.

41
42 Potential expense related to the recommended protection measures for the mid-term action
43 properties is estimated conservatively to be in the range of \$5-8 million. Maintenance costs
44 would be limited to the properties that the City would assume care of. In the case of conservation
45 easements provided by the owners, maintenance expense would not occur if the owner maintained
46 the property while these protective measures were set in place. In addition, the right of first

1 refusal does not obligate the City to maintenance expenses until the City has purchased the
2 property. Based on recommendations of the current plan, yearly maintenance expense would be
3 approximately \$30,000-\$45,000 per year and pertain to some sites only, and is based on minimal
4 levels of maintenance for open space and parkland.
5

6 The recommended actions for the short-term and mid-term properties are contemplated to be
7 funded from a number of sources. First, if federal and state funds can be obtained, then those
8 sources may be used. However, it is likely, given the federal and state budget situation, that
9 nearly all of the costs of acquiring open space, obtaining easements and negotiating options and
10 rights of first refusal will need to be financed with City funds. The primary source for City funds
11 will be cash capital or open space bond funds which derive from the 1-cent in dedicated real estate
12 tax revenues. These revenues can be used to directly finance cash capital acquisitions (this is the
13 method used in the FY 2005-FY 2010 Capital Improvement Program) or can be leveraged as debt
14 service for open space bonds which Council can authorize.
15

16 I recommend that for the planned November 2004 general obligation bond sale, Council authorize
17 (see the general obligation bond issuance docket item) the issuance of \$10 million in open space
18 bonds as part of the overall City bond issue. This level of open space bonds, coupled with over
19 \$4 million in FY 2004 and FY 2005 cash capital funds from the dedicated 1-cent in real estate tax
20 revenues, will provide a total of over \$14 million in open space acquisition funds. This should be
21 sufficient to carry the City until the end of calendar year 2005, which is when the next bond sale is
22 planned.²
23

24 In the event that the \$10.0 million in open space bonds is not sufficient to cover open space
25 acquisition needs over the next year, then a number of options are open to the City: (1) some of
26 the over \$4.0 million in remaining FY 2004 and FY 2005 open space cash capital funds could be
27 utilized, (2) an advance from the planned FY 2006 bond sale could be authorized, or (3) bond
28 funds could be reallocated from other City capital accounts where project implementation might
29 be delayed.
30

31 **ATTACHMENTS:**

- 32 Attachment I. Open Space Priority List Action Plan
33 Attachment II. Open Space Priority Site Matrix
34 Attachment III. Open Space Steering Committee Report (July 2004)
35

36 **STAFF:**

- 37 Mark Jinks, Assistant City Manager
38 Kirk Kincannon, Director, Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities
39 Eileen Fogarty, Director, Planning & Zoning
40 Aimee Vosper, Supervisor Landscape Architect, Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities
41 Barbara Ross, Consultant, Planning & Zoning

² In a related matter, as to the City's open space use tax assessment policy, staff has discussed the matter with the Park and Recreation Commission and the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee, and we plan to bring a proposal to Council before the end of the calendar year.

Proposed Open Space Priority List Action Plan

Timing Category I: Short-Term

Short-Term Time Frame: Sites listed as the top priorities and deemed to have special issues and concerns regarding the status of the properties.

Waterfront Properties: 200, 204, 208 & 210 Strand, 0 Prince Street, 1 & 2 King Street

Staff regards these waterfront properties as one of the two highest priority areas in the City for protection. Of these specific sites identified, staff regards the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) parking lot (Strand Street) as the highest priority of the waterfront properties to be acquired. This is due to its location relative to the water, the relationship and adjacency to existing Waterfront Park and its location at the foot of King Street.

1. Specific actions and recommendations for these sites are:

- Begin and pursue the process for acquisition of all these properties, except for the property at 1 King Street that is occupied by the Old Dominion Boat Club building. This will entail obtaining an appraisal of the properties, discussing their sale with their owners, and eventually either reaching a voluntary sale of the properties or initiating condemnation proceedings in court. As to the property at 1 King Street, staff will initiate discussions with ODBC and, based on these discussions, present a recommendation to Council at a later date.
- Begin and pursue a planning process for the Waterfront study area. The recommended study area is the area bounded by Queen, Union and Wolfe Streets, and the Potomac River. The product of this process, among other things, would be recommendations to the Planning Commission and Council regarding the use or uses of the Waterfront Properties that the City is acquiring. We envision this planning process, if approved by Council, beginning early in 2005 and running for 12-15 months.¹

2. The anticipated City cost of the action:

- \$10-15 million acquisition cost
- Site development costs, such as bulkhead repair and construction -- to be determined during the planning process
- Ongoing maintenance costs -- to be determined during the planning process

¹ We do not envision any changes to the City marina or many of the privately developed properties in the study area. We have included the marina and these private properties in the study area in order to present a proper context in which to plan for the Waterfront Properties and the privately-owned properties in the area that are south of Prince and east of Union.

1 Mt. Vernon Trail Easement: 1204-1206 S. Washington Street

2 Staff regards this easement as the second highest priority in the City for protection. This
3 easement for the future trail alignment, would provide a waterfront connection for the
4 existing Mt. Vernon Trail, which is designated as part of the Potomac Heritage National
5 Trail System. Negotiations have begun with The Virginia Department of Transportation
6 (VDOT), which currently owns the property. These negotiations include the Woodrow
7 Wilson Bridge project, the National Park Service, and City staff. It is the desire of the
8 City to bring closure, in the form of a trail and easement along the waterfront, prior to the
9 sale of the property.

10
11 1. Specific actions for the Mt. Vernon Trail Property are:

- 12 • Continue negotiations on securing the easement necessary to construct a trail
13 adjacent to the Potomac River at Hunting Towers (Hunting Point) with access to
14 the Mt. Vernon Trail, including environmental permit modifications, wetland
15 mitigation if necessary, written approvals from VDOT, Army Corps of Engineers,
16 National Park Service, and Virginia DEQ.

17
18 2. The anticipated City cost of these actions are:

- 19 • Donated easement (no cost)
20 • \$10,000 a year to maintain the easement
21 • \$250,000-\$500,000 to construct the desired trail and provide, at another location,
22 new wetlands to offset those removed by the trail construction.

23
24 **Timing Category II: Mid-Term**

25
26 **Mid-Term Time Frame:** Timing associated with this category indicates that although measures
are to be initiated, and in some cases, underway, property status may not be in current jeopardy
of loss.

27
28 Monticello Park Area: 306 & 312 Beverly, 3104, 3104B, 3106, 3106A Russell Road

29 Parcels adjacent to Monticello park are hilly, with mature tree canopy. Migratory bird
30 habitat contiguous to the habitat of Monticello Park. The area is an important natural
31 resource and is known for migratory bird stop-over habitat in this region. Discussions
32 have been initiated with property owners through the Northern Virginia Conservation
33 Trust (NVCT).

34
35 1. Specific actions and recommendations for these sites are:

- 36 • Continue the dialogue with the property owners for the protection of the land
37 through conservation easements in coordination with NVCT.

38
39 2. The anticipated City cost of the action:

- 40 • No maintenance costs probable

41
42 George Washington Masonic Temple: 101 Callahan Drive

43 A nine (9) acre portion of the overall 36 acre site is one of the largest green open space
44 sites in the City, that currently does not allow public access. The Open Space Steering

1 Committee's Report recommended that a full suite of tools be utilized to facilitate
2 protection and possible public access. This site is suitable for various levels of recreational
3 activities. This Action Plan recommends that the City enter into a dialogue with the
4 Property owners to explore various options and relationships that would facilitate possible
5 public access, or at the very least, the preservation of the open green space.
6

7 1. Specific actions and recommendations for this site are:

- 8 • Meet with the property owner to assess the direction of the GW Temple board
9 regarding long term plans for the green space.
- 10 • Begin a dialogue with the property owners to explore the right of first refusal.
- 11 • Undertake an internal Open Space Use Study for the 9 acres within the next 18
12 months to research uses in relation to various protection measures for this site.
13

14 2. The anticipated City cost of the action:

- 15 • Right of first refusal monetary compensation
- 16 • Maintenance costs (TBD)
17

18 Seminary/Beauregard: 5101 Seminary Road

19 This site, which currently has an ongoing commercial enterprise on it, is situated between
20 two City-owned parcels of land in the west end of the City. Staff believes that this area,
21 identified in the Open Space Plan as deficient in recreational services, could possibly
22 become a neighborhood park. This Action Plan recommends that the site be reviewed and
23 researched in relationship to its surrounding open space and neighborhood properties.
24

25 1. Specific actions and recommendations for this site are:

- 26 • Conduct an internal Open Space Use Study of the area to determine the long term
27 feasibility of a neighborhood or recreational use possibility on the site and
28 adjoining City owned land.
- 29 • If determined feasible for such use, discuss with property owner obtaining a right
30 of first refusal
31

32 2. The anticipated City cost of the action:

- 33 • Maintenance and capital costs (TBD)
34

35 Braddock/Valley/Ridge: 2416 & 2430 Ridge, 1101 & 1103 Braddock Road, 2419 Valley Drive

36 Staff initiated discussions as to the potential of a public access easement within the
37 properties listed. The specific Resource Protection Area and Timberbranch headwaters
38 make these properties a valuable natural resource within the City. This Action Plan
39 recommends continued progress toward the possibility of protection and easement
40 acquisition.
41

42 1. Specific actions and recommendations for these sites are:

- 43 • Continue the dialogue with the Property Owners and the Northern Virginia
44 Conservation Trust to secure city easements and conservation measures to protect
45 and provide public access to these sites.
46
47

- 1 2. The anticipated City cost of the action:
2 • Donation or unknown monetary compensation
3 • Maintenance costs of \$10,000 year
4

5 **Timing Category III: Long-Term**
6

7 **Long-Term Time Frame: Priority Sites identified that are not in jeopardy at this time.**
8

9
10 Clermont Cove: 200 Clermont Avenue

11 This site includes a significant Resource Protection Area. This limits the potential
12 development.
13

- 14 1. Specific actions and recommendations for the site are:
15 • This site should be reviewed and assessed in relation to the East and West
16 Eisenhower Small Area Plans, and as development plans are discussed or
17 submitted.
18
19 2. The anticipated City cost of the action:
20 • Acquisition costs (TBD)
21 • Maintenance (TBD)
22

23 *****
24

25 The following properties on the Open Space Priority List adopted by City Council in June 2004
26 have been effectively removed as a result of City Council actions and approvals.
27

28 Seminary Forest, between Braddock Road/Ivor Lane and Seminary Road

29 The City Council has approved the acquisition of this five acre property as permanent
30 open space.
31

32 Lloyd's Lane/Russell Road: 1901-1910 Russell Road

33 A portion of the site was secured as a Conservation Easement through the land use
34 development process.
35

36 Second Presbyterian Church: 1400 Janney's Lane

37 Approximately 1.2 acres of this six acre site will be dedicated to the City for open space as
38 part of the development conditions.
39

OPEN SPACE PRIORITY SITE MATRIX

September 21, 2004

Sites:	Acreage	City Real Estate 2004 Assessment	Possible Use	Potential Protection Measures	Acreage Under Review	Potential Acquisition Cost	Manner of Financing	Timing of Measure	Status
1 <u>Waterfront:</u> 200, 204, 208 & 210 Strand, 0 Prince, 1 & 2 King.	1.97 ac.	\$7,648,600	Enhanced Parkland	Acquisition	1.97 ac.	\$10-15 mil.	Open Space Bonds/ Cash Capital	Short-Term	Talks initiated
2 <u>Mt. Vernon Trail Alignment:</u> 1204-1206 S. Washington.	5 ac.	\$4,500,000	Trail Alignment	Donated Easement	5 ac.	\$0	Donation	Short-Term	Talks initiated
3 <u>Ivor Lane:</u> 4575 & 4609 Seminary.	6 ac.	\$1,500,000	Park Area, Trail	Acquisition	5 ac.	\$750,000	Open Space Bonds/ Cash Capital	Near Completion	Near Completion
4 <u>Clermont Cove:</u> 200 Clermont.	14.5 ac.	\$4,560,000	Natural Area	Acquisition or Conservation Easement	14.5 ac.	To be Determined	Open Space Bonds/ Cash Capital	Mid-Term	To be Initiated
5 <u>Monticello Park Area:</u> 306 & 312 Beverly, 3104, 3104B, 3106, 3106A Russell.	4.55 ac.	\$3,242,000	Natural Area	Conservation Easement	2 ac. +/-	\$0	n/a	Mid-Term	Initiated with NVCT and REC
6 <u>GW Masonic Temple:</u> 101 Callahan.	9 ac. in review	\$23,459,300 (entire 36 ac. site)	Active Recreational	Public Access or Future Acquisition, right of first refusal	9 ac.	To be Determined	Open Space Bonds/ Cash Capital	Mid-Term	To be Initiated
7 <u>Seminary/Beauregard:</u> 5101 Seminary.	.32 ac.	\$536,500	Neighborhood Park	Acquisition, right of first refusal	.32 ac.	To be Determined	Open Space Bonds/ Cash Capital	Mid-Term	To be Initiated
8 <u>Braddock/Valley/Ridge:</u> 2416 & 2430 Ridge, 1101 & 1103 Braddock, 2419 Valley.	3.90 ac.	\$3,567,000	Public Natural Area	Donated or Purchased Conservation Easement	2 ac. +/-	\$0	n/a	Mid-Term	Initiated by P&Z and REC & NVCT
9 <u>Lloyd's Lane/Russell Rd.:</u> 1901-1910 Russell.	1.97 ac.	\$1,600,000	Conservation Easement	Donation	.36 ac.	n/a	Donation	Approved	Approved
10 <u>Second Pres. Church:</u> 1400 Janneys.	6.07 ac.	\$6,350,000 Based on Appraisal	Pocket Park	Donation	1.16 ac.	n/a	Donation	Approved	Approved

ALEXANDRIA
OPEN SPACE



Alexandria Waterfront

**OPEN SPACE
STEERING
COMMITTEE
REPORT**

JULY 2004

I. THE OPEN SPACE STEERING COMMITTEE

The Open Space Steering Committee is composed of citizens who volunteer their time in order to assist the city government with the implementation of the City's Open Space Plan. Created in October 2003 by the City Manager, the Committee was asked to:

educate the public, engage in outreach activities and begin the process whereby the city identifies and prioritizes property sites for potential acquisition and other means of protection.

The members of the Committee include the chairpersons and representatives of the Planning Commission, the Environmental Policy Commission and the Park and Recreation Commission, as well as citizens.

Co-chairs Judy Guse-Noritake, Chair, Park and Recreation Commission

Eric R. Wagner, Chair, Planning Commission

Members: Cynthia Degrood, Environmental Policy Commission

William Dickinson, Citizen

Bruce Dwyer, Citizen

Glenn Eugster, Citizen

Mark Fields, Archaeology Commission

Bill Hendrickson, Park and Recreation Commission

Kenyon Larsen, Chair, Environmental Policy Commission

Richard Leibach, Planning Commission

Ellen Pickering, Citizen

J. Lawrence Robinson, Planning Commission

By borrowing the expertise of other Commissions, the work of the Committee gains insights into the specialized areas of, for example, the environment, recreation needs, and planning and development goals. Likewise, we have been supported by senior level personnel from the Department of Recreation Parks and Cultural Activities, the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Department of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Office of Historic Alexandria. Without the assistance and guidance of key staff and Commission representatives, our Committee would have had difficulty accomplishing its mission.

We have met ten times since our inception in October 2003, always at 7:00 a.m., before members must start their workdays, and leaving evenings free for our Commission and family responsibilities.

II. RECENT OPEN SPACE ADVANCES

The City of Alexandria has taken great strides in its open space efforts over the past few years. About four years ago, public concerns had began to surface about the quality and quantity of open space in the community. These concerns had been raised at the Planning Commission, the Park and Recreation Commission and the Environmental Policy Commission, in different contexts. Citizens were asking questions about the care we were giving natural resources, where new ball field sites would come from and the amount of open space planned as a part of new developments. The chairs of these respective commissions came together to forward a notion that a comprehensive open space plan addressing all these aspects needed to be undertaken. The City Council and the City Manager agreed and allocated funds to retain a professional planning firm to lead this effort.

Open Space Plan

Over the course of a year or more, public meetings were held throughout the City to solicit ideas and information from all of the neighborhoods. GIS maps were produced which illustrate the current open space situation as well as trends in growth and other factors that might influence the development and implementation of an open space plan. Though it was no surprise, a picture soon emerged of a city that grew facing the river, with its back to the neighborhoods, which had sprung up behind that important zone of commerce as the centuries slipped by. No overall plan for parks and green space-no plan for the relief of urbanness-had ever been considered, and it seemed almost too late.

The Open Space Plan proposed to trace a broad, green line around the City, drawing on the two channelized "runs" that defined the boundary of Alexandria at the north and the south, joined by pieces of trails and possible linkages to the Potomac waterfront on the east. The protection of our stream valleys, the natural resources they contain, and the connections they provide are the highest priority in this plan. This Green Crescent, a zone of hope and possibilities, strung with pieces of trails and gems of parks, is now the backbone of a plan to connect our City and its neighborhoods.

At the end of a long and full process of discovery and community discussion, last spring the three commissions forwarded recommendations to Council to accept the Open Space Plan as a part of the City's Master Plan. After conducting a public hearing at which broad support was expressed, the City Council voted unanimously to make the plan a formal part of the Master Plan for the City in May 2003, not six weeks after the ink was dry and the finished product was delivered. One of the realities which the plan pointed out very clearly was that in the next ten years, our small and bounded City of seemingly few opportunities needed to protect an additional 100 acres of meaningful open space. The cost to do so is high.

Open Space Funding

The availability of open space funds at both the state and federal levels has been slowing in the past few years. Enlightened, undaunted, and realizing that no one was going to save us but us, a proposal was forwarded during the annual budget process to allocate one cent of the real estate assessments to a dedicated open space fund, to be used for the acquisition of easements or land in fee simple.

City Council has voted unanimously for this one-cent allocation, and it must be voted upon each year.

There was much discussion last summer about how to start the implementation of the Open Space Plan. As a first important step, an MOU was signed with the Northern Virginia Land Trust (NVCT) to investigate and execute easements with private landowners which had been identified by the Plan or through other opportunities. The City Manager asked the Open Space Steering Committee to serve for another interim two-year period as a citizen-based group to help guide the implementation process (see Attachment 1). Several citizens knowledgeable in land conservation were added (see Attachment 2). Staff from the relevant departments were asked to continue their work to assist in the work of the Committee. This Committee has been charged with forwarding a recommendation as to a permanent citizens' structure, in order to guide the continued work on open space at the end of the two-year period.

The first year is nearly up, and the Steering Committee is forwarding this report to the City Council to highlight some of the progress that has been made. The group has used the Open Space Plan over the past year as a roadmap to objectively: rank the top priority sites in the City, to look for further opportunities and to refine ranking criteria. A healthy public debate has ensued about what land to save and how to spend the money that has been set aside. The whole level of awareness and discussion across the community about open space has been raised to a very high level, and headed into the second year of implementation, we are

hopeful that several of the highest priority purchases and easements will be put in place.

In the end, in the span of just a few short months last spring, the Open Space Plan was made a part of the City's Master Plan, dedicated funds were allocated, an implementation group of knowledgeable citizens on these issues had been assembled, an MOU with NVCT had been signed and staff had been assigned. Work has begun in earnest. We will debate what to save for years to come, but we are well on our way to saving something. It has been a remarkable journey and only now are we beginning, with some perspective, to understand what it is that we have accomplished.

The Open Space Plan and our ability to implement it is the direct result of a wonderful community debate and a City Council which moved to embrace a better future for this City. It is quite remarkable that in a few short years, we have come to this moment where we can engage in a debate about what to acquire first.

III. COMMITTEE ACHIEVEMENTS

By meeting generally once a month, and twice a month this spring, the Committee has successfully worked on several implementation steps called for in the Open Space Plan. The Committee established a mission statement early on:

To thoughtfully improve, maintain, and expand the open space, parks, natural resources, urban landscapes and recreational areas of Alexandria, through public and private partnerships, into the premier urban open space system in the metropolitan area and to serve as an example to the United States.

A. Outreach

The Committee has also developed a series of outreach materials and organized meetings with civic associations and other groups to deliver the open space message. Its specific efforts include:

- Brochures. Committee members worked with staff to develop the attached brochures for dissemination to the public. One brochure focuses generally on the benefits of open space. The second is more technical and outlines the benefits but also the methods for preserving land with easements.
- Web Presence. The Committee has arranged with the City to have the Open Space Plan, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, downloadable open space brochures, and contact information posted on the City's website, providing the public with maximum access to information.
- Civic Association and Commission Meetings. Committee members have volunteered their time to attend a number of meetings, including meetings of the North Ridge and Old Town civic associations, the Federation of Civic Associations, and the Archaeological Commission. Members explained the City's emphasis on open space, the benefits of open space, and the variety of options available, including easements and donations, for protecting citizens' private property. Additional civic association discussions are scheduled for the coming year.
- Easement Seminar. On March 27, the Alexandria Historical Restoration and Preservation Commission, the Open Space Steering Committee, and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust joined forces to sponsor a public seminar on the methods by which property owners can preserve land. Discussion included different types of easements, tax credits and other benefits, and donation techniques.

- Developer, Attorney, Investment Advisors Meeting. Additional meetings are scheduled for the near future with representatives of the development, real estate and investment communities, in order to heighten awareness about the benefits of open space for the private sector developer and investor.

B. First Year Milestones of the Open Space Plan

The Open Space Plan outlines the City's work to be achieved in advancing open space initiatives over the first seven years after the Plan's adoption, and has stated targets for Year 1, Years 2-3, Year3-5, Years 5-7. The City has met all of its Year 1 goals, including creating the citizen committee and defining a strategy to identify at risk properties needing protection. The City has also hired a part-time grants writer for the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities. And the Planning Department's work on planning for special areas of the City and on individual developments has elevated and addressed the open space issue in new development areas. By beginning the work of an Urban Forestry Plan, updating its Chesapeake Bay regulations, and focusing a planning effort on the Potomac River waterfront, the City has also begun work on items slated for future years.

C. Prioritization of Open Space Sites

The most difficult Committee undertaking has been to fulfill the City Manager's request to find and prioritize open space properties which present opportunities for the city either to preserve or protect our existing resources, or to create new ones.

The Committee's identification process has been guided by the selection criteria listed under Goal 2 of the Open Space Plan and in the Committee's Open Space Priorities and Opportunities List. These criteria constitute the factors that the Committee used to assess candidates for open space in making its recommendation to the City Manager and City Council.

Working through the efforts of a subcommittee, a long list of potential properties was presented for review by the Committee. The subcommittee identified its top ten Priority Sites for the Committee's consideration, providing extensive information regarding acreage, ownership, assessment and open space or natural features of each top site. Through discussions at a series of Committee meetings, the full group applied the criteria from the Open Space Plan to the group of priority sites to establish a methodology with which to rank open space sites.

The attached "Open Space Priorities and Opportunities" report (Attachment 3) contains the Committee's recommendations as to the most important sites in the City that require attention, either in the form of acquisition or another protection method, so that their open space values are not lost. This separate report also states the criteria used by the Committee in reviewing and evaluating potential open space sites, and provides pertinent information regarding those sites that received the Committee's recommendation.

The Committee's recommendations include a list often proposed "Priority Sites" and group those properties into three categories, based on how they were ranked under the evaluation criteria (see Attachment 3, pp. 5-10).

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Immediate priority: | Waterfront properties
Mount Vernon Trail section |
| Priority: | Ivor Lane/Seminary Forest connection
Clermont Cove
Monticello Park expansion
Masonic Temple |

Other important sites: Seminary/ Beauregard
Braddock / Valley Ridge
Lloyds Lane
Second Presbyterian

In the Committee's view, these are the ten sites in the City that most warrant the Council's consideration for acquisition or other protection measures.

Attachment 4 is a chart with the evaluation criteria applied by the Committee to these ten properties, and Attachment 5 contains individual graphics depicting these sites.

In addition to identifying these ten "Priority Sites," the Committee also has compiled (a) an "Open Space Opportunities List" (see Attachment 3, pp. 11-16), which contains properties that are potential acquisition/protection candidates, but require further evaluation, (b) a list of "Trails Opportunities" (see Attachment 3, pp. 17-19), which contains potential sites deserving attention for trail (walking and/or bicycling) connectivity, and (c) a list of "Additional Opportunities" (see Attachment 3, pp. 20-22), which contains a number of additional properties and opportunities that require additional review and evaluation before becoming acquisition/protections candidates.

IV. PROCESS AND CRITERIA RECOMMENDED FOR FUTURE ADDITIONS TO LIST

The Committee has assembled and organized a list of candidates for close attention as priority sites. The Priority Sites have been carefully reviewed and assessed. In the years ahead, each of the other sites in the Committee's "Open Space Priority and Opportunities" lists should be evaluated for its potential for open space value and assessed against appropriate criteria. In addition, it is the intent of the Committee to invite civic associations and citizens to add to the Committee's lists other parcels of land that are important in their neighborhood. One of the tasks of the Committee over the next year will be to collect information about and sort through these properties (i.e., those identified by the public and those now listed by the Committee but not as "Priority Sites"), and with staff assistance, to make recommendations about additional Priority Sites for the City. The Committee may also be asked by City Council or the City Manager to make recommendations on individual parcels that are suggested to them by citizens.

To effectively deal with each of these circumstances - the Committee's own list of many parcels, citizen and civic associations' suggestions, and individual properties the Committee is asked to review - the Committee and the City must establish a consistent approach to determining which of the many candidates are true Priority Sites for action by the City. We therefore are including here a proposed set of criteria and process to guide all of us in the future.

Criteria

The criteria listed in Goal 2 of the Open Space Plan have been critical to the Committee's effort to assess potential open space sites and to be consistent in its consideration of differing properties with a wide range of attributes. The Committee has discussed the issue of criteria at length and, while satisfied with the criteria it has been using, it notes that important criteria are also listed under Goal 9 of the Open Space Plan. Given the length of the plan, its conceptual approach, and the potential for differing interpretations, the Committee determined that there is value in restating the Open Space Plan criteria in a differently articulated Form. The existing criteria, for example, focus on whether the property is adjacent to an existing open space property, capturing and emphasizing that value. In its new rendition, the Committee has captured that value issue, but expanded it and added others to ask the principal open question: What is the open space value of the proposed site? In addition, as pointed out by Committee members and by

Council, the existing criteria do not address the following questions:

1. Will the benefits identified above be shared by everyone in the City/city-wide?
2. Does the benefits provide open space in a neighborhood or area that is deficient in open space?
3. Is the site identified in the Open Space Plan or the RP&CA Strategic Master Plan or does it otherwise meet the goals of those plans?
4. What is the cost of acquiring the property or otherwise protecting the benefits identified?
5. Is there an urgent need to protect the site because of an immediate threat or potential loss of historical, cultural, natural or recreation resource?
6. Is there a way to develop the site and keep the open space values of the property?

While these questions do not relate to the Open Space *value* question, they are important ones for the City Council and the community in any decision about whether to buy or otherwise act to protect a particular site, and how. Therefore, the Committee's restated criteria (Attachment 6) incorporates the first three questions, which can be used as part of or in addition to the "value" criteria. The remaining three questions are important factors and circumstances that must be considered in the ultimate City decision, to acquire or otherwise protect, but are not true criteria by which to judge a site's importance for protection.

Process

In addition to criteria, there should be an established process by which the City determines whether to add a particular site to the "Priority Sites" list in the future. There are two types of situations that require a procedural approach.

1. Development of Committee's Recommended 2005 "Priority Sites" List. After the approval by Council of a 2004 "Priority Sites" list, the Committee hopes to continue its work assessing potential open space sites by taking several steps over the next year. It intends to invite additional suggestions from the community to add to its existing "Open Space Opportunities" list, in order to ensure that important neighborhood sites are not overlooked. It also hopes to hold a public work session with the public to explain its program, to solicit additional site suggestions and to hear from the public generally about its methodology. From the larger list of candidates, including the "Open Space Opportunities" sites and additions from the Committee and the community, it then plans to spend several months reviewing, assessing, and applying criteria to this larger group, in order to revise the "Priority Sites" list and recommend the revised list to the City Manager in 2005. That recommendation will be a proposed "Priority Sites" list for 2005, which may add sites to the 2004 list, reorder it or otherwise alter it.

The Committee's process will include the following procedural steps and timeline:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| July 2004: | Committee will send letter to civic associations and other groups inviting their suggestions for sites with open space value to be considered as part of the Committee process. A nomination form will be included. |
| Sept-Oct: | Committee will hold public work session to solicit input on the nominated and any other open space sites, and ways to evaluate sites for inclusion on the "Priority sites" list. |
| Oct-Feb: | Committee will review, assess, and distill the open space candidate sites and create a 2005 "Priority Sites" list. |
| Feb 2005: | Committee will propose its 2005 "Priority Sites" list to City Manager". |

2. Addition of Sites to "Priority Sites" List Outside of Committee Process. The Committee suggests that the City adopt the following process for adding to the "Priority Sites" list a site that is suggested outside of the regular Committee process. With the benefit of the recent debates about the Second Presbyterian site, the Committee believes it is important that there be such a process so that all participants know what to expect.

- a. The recommendation that a site be added to the "Priority Sites" list must come from City Council;
- b. The recommendation should be vetted through the Open Space Steering Committee, in order to create consistency in approach and to ensure the recommended site is reviewed in the same manner as properties already on the "Priority Sites" list;
- c. Staff should be asked to gather important background information to assist the Committee and Council make a decision; and
- d. The Open Space Steering Committee should make a recommendation to the City Manager who forwards it to Council; and
- e. City Council should hold a public hearing on the issue and decide whether to add the site in question to the "Priority Sites" list.

V. OPEN SPACE STEERING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its work over the last year, the Committee recommends that Council take the following steps:

1. approve an Open Space "Priority Sites" list, as recommended by the Committee, after a public hearing;
2. approve the Committee's proposed criteria and process for revising and adding properties to the "Priority Sites" list;
3. renew its commitment to the "one cent set aside" for open space;
4. renew its agreement with the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust for another year; and
5. explore options for capitalizing the money represented by the one cent allocation in order to obtain additional monies right away for purchasing and protecting land for open space.

Attachments

1. CMO memo to Council, September 18, 2003
2. CMO letter to Committee member, September 11, 2003
3. Open Space Priorities and Opportunities list
4. Ranking chart of "Priority Sites"
5. Graphics of "Priority Sites"
6. Recommended Criteria for Open Space "Priority Sites" List



OPEN SPACE PRIORITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES

**PREPARED BY
THE ALEXANDRIA OPEN SPACE STEERING COMMITTEE**

INCLUDES:

- **PRIORITY SITES**
- **OPPORTUNITY SITES LIST**
- **TRAILS OPPORTUNITIES**
- **ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES**

JULY 2004

The Alexandria Open Space Steering Committee was asked by the City Manager as a part of our work in this first year to develop a list of sites in the City that merit attention because they, contain open space features that convey public benefit to the community. A subgroup of the Steering Committee spent several months doing on the ground investigations of potential candidate sites. A list of these sites follows but they are offered with several caveats.

First, it should be noted that information given relative to any of these properties is from publicly available sources and as a group of citizens with limited access to information and resources, we cannot verify the accuracy of specific descriptions, ownership or characterizations that are related in this document. We recommend that further work be done by City staff to verify these details as each property becomes ripe for consideration.

Second, we note that the Open Space Plan adopted by the Alexandria City Council in the spring of 2003 specifically addresses a need to develop strategies and goals for the protection of a number of important open space sites that are held by private citizens or institutions. We have included some such sites in this document and know that doing so may cause questions and raise concerns with some property owners. Our intent in listing these sites is to underscore that they possess characteristics that are important to the overall character of our community and that there is a full range of conservation tools available if the owners choose to preserve these aspects of their property. These property owners are being contacted by mail about their inclusion on this list.

This report is the recommendation by the Open Space Steering Committee which begins a process of review by the Alexandria City Council and the public related to opportunities for preserving open space within the City. The report is not intended to imply that City Council will take specific action on any of the specific properties that the report identifies below. Rather, the report's listing of properties is only a recognition that the properties are viewed by the Committee as possessing important open space values and as representing valuable open space resources.

The properties listed in this document are only those that seemed obvious to us for inclusion in this first iteration. We note that this Steering Committee has been in operation only since October of 2003 and in the intervening time we have worked to lay important groundwork for the broad scope of the open space agenda in this community. We expect that this candidate list will change over time, with properties being removed for some reason and others being added. As an example, many oversized properties, especially not for profit institutional lands such as churches, schools, and utilities, were not identified here because we had no basis to believe they might be developed to their zoned potential in any time soon. We fully expect that candidate sites will be offered from all parts of the City by members of the community over the coming years and we welcome that. In particular we urge creative thinking in the whole of our community, particularly in areas of the City where there seems to be little in the way of open space assets, to help us to find places and ways to reclaim open space. We also expect that unforeseen opportunities will arise and sites not on this list will merit attention.

The Steering Committee encourages the City to move forward to protect the most important public aspects of each parcel using the full range of tools, including right of first refusal, easements, beneficial development, etc. If parts of these sites are developed, the open space aspects should drive that development process as a prime consideration. Real estate matters in Alexandria are currently very volatile and consequently create a very complicated dynamic. Timing, cost, availability of public resources, location of property, opportunities for partnerships with others, engagement of the public in site selection and negotiations leading to property sale are all factors that must be considered by the City Council in reaching final parcel decisions.

In this document we have set out to identify, describe, and group potential future open space properties consistent with the criteria specified in the recommendations of the Alexandria Open Space Plan.

Goal 2 of the Open Space Plan recommends using the following selection criteria for identifying privately-owned land suitable for acquisition or other protection by the City for parkland/open space use:

1. Privately owned land near or adjacent to existing parks and trails
2. Near or adjacent to existing schools
3. Near or adjacent to natural resource areas
4. At street endings to provide neighborhood linkages
5. Next to institutional properties with extensive open space, valuable natural resources, and/or potential public access
6. Adjacent to or linking existing or proposed trails or greenways
7. Small lots in dense urban neighborhoods for pocket parks, gardens, green spaces, and playgrounds
8. Lands with significant trees, sloping-terrain, and other natural resource features
9. Properties with known or potential historic or cultural significance
10. Lands in areas identified in the Needs Assessment as those with a high need for open space
11. Excess rights-of-way
12. Open space and trail connections adjacent to or linking open spaces, natural areas, greenways and trails in Arlington, or Fairfax Counties

Search Approach

To most efficiently review the entire city, a subcommittee was assembled and broke the city into several sections for on-the ground review.

For protection opportunities, we documented seven "considerations," or necessary pieces of information, to help evaluate and group properties. This level of information is not provided for all of the opportunities sites listed. The seven categories are presented below and are noted in the footer on each page for reference:

- A. The property location and address;
- B. A description of the property, including unique environmental features that are observable;
- C. Descriptions of all development;
- D. Parking availability;
- E. Possible future uses;
- F. Property assessment, if available; and
- G. Comments, if appropriate.

The following factors did, to some degree, limit the searches conducted:

- Winter weather limited the ability to visit each site.
- Limited information was available about properties that were not "inside" the Open Space Plan "Green Crescent" or adjacent to existing parks/open space areas.

- We did not have historical or recent information for every property.
- Unknown "situational" information about current owner/developer plans or intentions might significantly change priorities for purchase or easement.
- We did not ask owners or other knowledgeable individuals about each property's situation or probable disposition.
- We could not trespass on to the properties.

General Open Space Observations

Denser areas of the City, such as Del Ray and Old Town, are noticeably absent of neighborhood pocket parks. Park and open space re-greening, (that is creating parks or open space from land that currently may have another commercial or residential use) is essential in established neighborhoods. Infill development of some over-zoned properties will fundamentally change the open space ambiance and character of neighborhoods such as Seminary Hill and Northridge/ Beverly Hills. One of the biggest challenges to implementing the concept of the continuous "Green Crescent", which is a foundation of the Open Space Plan, will come from potential opposition to public open space connector trails and the attendant easements that might be required for these routes on private property in residential neighborhoods. Yet trails and pedestrian connections are imperative for the long term and easier to achieve than other open space goals.

Organization of this Report

Open space opportunities are presented in four groups:

1. Priority Sites

This list of properties, representing all areas of the City, was selected by the subcommittee for close consideration and scoring by the full Committee. They are either listed in the Open Space Plan or otherwise present themselves as obvious priority sites. As priorities, these properties were discussed individually by the Committee and scored based on the selection criteria under Goal 2 of the Open Space Plan.

2. Open Space Opportunities

In addition to the Priority Site list, the subcommittee listed a large number of additional sites in the City which are worthy of attention because of their potential open space features. Many of these sites have not been reviewed as closely as the ones on the Priority Sites list, but should be reviewed in the future by the Committee. We expect this list to grow as community input is sought in the coming year.

3. Trails Opportunities

Trail segments are listed separately from the above categories because they deserve special attention. Achieving connections through the City for non-vehicular travel is one of the central goals of the Open Space Plan. Many of the trail connections or new segment opportunities listed in this document are included in either the Open Space Plan or the Bicycle Transportation and Multi-use trail Master Plan, adopted by City Council in 1998.

4. Additional Easement and Reclamation Opportunities

This group of additional land areas deserving attention is comprised of a variety of open space opportunities. They are smaller areas and may not need immediate attention. However, they are known to Committee members, have been discussed in the past, and have not escaped our attention. "Reclamation" opportunities are areas owned by the City that may simply need improvements or encroachment evictions to become usable public open space areas.

The Priority Sites are listed in their ranked order, following Committee action based on the Open Space Plan criteria. The properties listed in the other categories are not presented in any particular order. The Open Space Steering Committee recognizes that the City cannot purchase or acquire easements on all of the properties described in this document. Thus, this report lists as many recommended options for City consideration at this time. We expect this list to change, evolve and grow over time. We also expect that some of these properties will be developed in whole or in part and that all tools available, from easements to partial purchase and good planning, will be brought to bear on them in order to preserve the important open space attributes we now enjoy.

I. PRIORITY SITES

The following is a list of "Priority Sites" that the Committee recommends for City Council consideration. Our listing of these properties is based upon our view that the properties possess very important open space values, and that the City, working with the property owners, should explore the alternative means that may be available to achieve the preservation of those values.

The following ten properties were selected by the Committee for special consideration. They were proposed by a subcommittee as priorities, and researched individually. They were then discussed by the full committee and scored according to the selection criteria included under Goal 2 of the Open Space Plan. The ten sites are grouped, based on their scores, into three categories: Immediate Priority, Priority and Other Important Sites.

IMMEDIATE PRIORITY

These two sites are considered the highest priority for attention. Both listings relate to the City's waterfront, which is our key open space and recreation asset, and represent a value to the City as a whole. The Committee's message to the City here is that immediate action is warranted.

1. **Waterfront Lots -Seven+lots on Potomac River**
 - A. Addresses: 200 Strand; 204 Strand; 208 Strand; 210 Strand; #0 Prince St.; 1 King St.; 2 King St.
 - B. #210 Strand is an abandoned boat house; 200, 204, and 208 Strand is a parking lot; #0 Prince is a gun shop and an office for the "Dandy" boat; 1 & 2 King Street are owned by the Old Dominion Boat Club.
 - C. #0 Prince has a former restaurant/club on pilings, with ground level rented for office space for the Dandy and Marianne dinner boats; 1 King St. has a private boat club, restaurant; 2 King St. has private parking lot.
 - D. Private or public parking lots are on most lots. Street parking and public parking on Strand.
 - E. Fulfills Goals 4 and 10 of the Open Space Plan -conservation and expansion of riverfront and links and expands the waterfront trail. Potential boating launch. opportunities (e.g., kayaking, canoeing). In the event full fee acquisition were possible this could complete green framing of the Torpedo Factory blocks to offset future development on Robinson Terminal properties north and south parcels.
 - F. City 2004 assessments: #0 Prince (\$650,700); 210 Strand (\$382,200); 200-208 Strand (\$953,900); 1 King (\$2,212,000); 2 King (\$1,541,000). All parcels have a clouded title and are in a court suit with the Federal govt.
 - G. #0 Prince and 210 Strand are highest priority, acquire others with purchase or land swap. Would complete a coordinated waterfront park and walkway system. Has benefits for the entire city and tourism market.

2. **Mount Vernon Trail Waterfront Alignment**
 - A. 1204-1206 South Washington Hunting Point Apartment Complex. Map # 083.02-01-04 & 07
 - B. Area is included within 2 parcels. It is on the waterfront side of the apartment buildings with Potomac River frontage of 653 ft. The other sides are adjacent to Porto Vecchio (247 ft.) and Jones Point wetlands. In Potomac River flood plain. Approximate 5 acres. Zoned RC. Currently owned by VDOT which plans to sell entire property in 2005.

- C. Included within this area are tennis courts, swimming pool, parking lot, driveway, temporary 9-foot wide asphalt Mount Vernon path, and temporary construction trailers.
- D. Nearest public parking is on South Royal Street. Future parking will be available at Jones Point.
- E. Permanent alignment along waterfront for Mount Vernon Trail and possible pedestrian paths closer to waterfront. Currently there are plans in this specific area to reconstruct wetlands as mitigation for some lost to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project. We strongly suggest a joint planning effort with those parties involved in the bridge project to find a creative way to accomplish both goals: the wetlands and this trail.
- F. Appropriate for easement. 1206 Washington (no apartment building) 2004 assessment is \$1.3 million. 1204 Washington "land only" 2004 assessment is \$3.2 million.
- G. Easement with public access is appropriate.

PRIORITY

This group includes strong candidates for priority attention and, depending on resources and threat level, a variety of tools may be appropriate for one or more of these sites, including partnerships, bargain sales, donations, easement, beneficial development, and outright acquisition. However it is done, the City should move over the next year to protect open space values for which the properties in this group have been cited.

3. Wide Trail/Park -Between Ivor Lane and Seminary Road

- A. 4575 & 4609 Seminary Rd; and one large unnumbered open space track attached to and east of the Seminary Forest Apartments.
- B. Many large trees and heavy vegetation. Refuge for urban wildlife. Cited in Open Space Plan for a north/south trail from Braddock to Seminary by fire station.
- C. Area zoned R-8. City owns two lots already (fire station, vacant lot). Owners of Seminary Forest Apartments own the large 6+ acres.
- D. Parking on Braddock/Ivor end not a problem. Parking near fire station may be across Seminary Rd.
- E. Trail within long park.
- F. 2004 assessment is \$1.5 million.
- G. Recent land sales and inquiries by developers to Planning and Zoning Dept. make this imminent.

4. Clermont Cove

- A. 201 Clermont Avenue occupies land behind office and warehouse buildings between the 4600 block and the 5000 block of Eisenhower Avenue on the south and the railroad tracks on the north Map # 069.00-01-15.81
- B. Area occupies about 15 acres, 100 feet wide and 3/4 mile long. It is heavily wooded and includes several Resource Protection Areas (RPAs). Appears to be one of the largest natural wooded areas in the city. Contains wildlife, including fox, deer, and other small mammals. Zoned UT. Currently owned by Norfolk Southern, or its successor.

- C. Two requests for use and development have been unsuccessful since 2000: 1. Seven story building and parking garage for 500 rental units and 2. VDOT highway construction staging yard. No current development proposals pending.
- D. All nearby parking is in private lots associated with nearby warehouse/commercial uses.
- E. Retain as natural area in the short term. Longer-term uses could include a nature park with trails to provide both access to the interior of the site and a pedestrian and bike link between east and west Eisenhower Avenue and nearby offices.
- F. 2004 assessment is \$4.6 million.
- G. Right of first refusal, acquisition or an easement with public access trail. Some streambank restoration may be necessary if acquired.

5. Monticello Park Area

- A. 312 Beverly, a lot behind 306 Beverly, and 3104, 3104B, 3106A, & 3106 Russell.
- B. Hilly with lots of oaks and mature canopy. Fences separate properties from Monticello Park. Migratory bird habitat contiguous to the habitat of Monticello Park. Could not access because private property.
- C. One property (3104B) is vacant (no frontage, 1.3 acres) and owned by the same person as 3104 (1.6 acre lot, but with a house on it). 306 (lot behind) and 312 Beverly are along the east side of Monticello Park. 306 (lot behind) is 0.5 acre and 312 is 0.26 acre.
- D. Street parking.
- E. The park is an important natural area and area known for migratory bird stop-over habitat in this region.
- F. Russell Rd. properties are \$7-12/sq. ft. Beverly properties are \$3-4/sq. ft.,
- G. 306 Beverly (lot behind) is adjacent to 3104B, making the total cluster development nearly 4 acres. The park is known as an important stop over for migratory bird species and as such is a well known and important bird watching location due to the dense congregation of migratory warblers and other rare birds found here during the migration season.

6. George Washington Masonic Memorial

- A. George Washington Memorial Association -King St. and Callahan Drive; 101 Callahan Dr..
- B. The area of approximately 9 acres of open land behind the Temple is situated on a large terraced hill with grass and landscaping. The site abuts the American Water Company land and reservoir.
- C. An archaeological dig site is currently being excavated on the back 9 acre lot at the location of the old Dulaney Mansion.
- D. A large parking lot is located on the back side of the temple.
- E. Large back 9 acres could meet recreational needs for this area of Alexandria. Currently, access is restricted, but public can access grounds around the Temple itself.
- F. The total Masonic Temple land, 36 acres, is assessed at \$23,459,300 and zoned R-5.

- G. A full suite of tools should be considered on these nine acres, starting with a right of first refusal, and looking at easements and full purchase of some portion.

OTHER IMPORTANT SITES

Each of these other sites contains important open space attributes. The first is listed because it includes the only large undeveloped City-owned parcels in the western part of the City. Although ultimately an active recreation area at this location may not be feasible, its location and the potential to combine it with other nearby properties merits serious attention. The remaining three lots are existing open sites in residential areas which should be reviewed to determine how best their open space attributes can be retained, which may include a combination of protection along with existing or future development.

7. Seminary/Beauregard

- A. Three (maybe more) properties at the northwest corner of Seminary Road and Beauregard Street. Property #1 is the corner right of way property; property #2 is 5101 Seminary Rd; and Property #3 is 5143 Seminary Rd.
- B. Major Intersection with traffic lights. Flowing north along Beauregard from the property is a wooded intermittent stream. Mostly flat vacant land. Trees to the south end of lot on Beauregard. Several properties around the corner are undeveloped, including two down Beauregard that have a wooded intermittent stream.
- C. Two of three properties (#1 and #3) owned by City. Property #1 was originally acquired for the widening of Beauregard Street and is to be enhanced with landscaping as a condition of CDD for Winkler Development. Property #2 contains Potomac Dry Cleaners, parking area and nearly surrounds the corner property. Property #3 is a fairly level lot with a few small trees.
- D. No parking on street; possible parking at the end of nearby cul-de-sac or on dry cleaner parking area.
- E. Park in West End of City.
- F. Property #1 (corner lot) is 47,670 sq. feet and City owns it; property #2 is approximately 14,000 square feet and assessed at \$536,500; property #3 is 24,784 square feet and assessed at \$203,400.
- G. Good prospect for open space, as two of the three lots are already owned by the City.

8. Lloyds Lane/Russell Road Park

- A. 1904-1910 Russell Road. Northwest corner of Lloyds Lane and Russell Rd.
- B. Many large, specimen trees. Wetland area (former pond/creek) at front of property with an intermittent stream running along the north property boundary. Adjacent to other large, overzoned parcels to south, east and north across W. Windsor at the St. Stevens/St. Agnes grade school. Highlighted on Figure 15 (OS Opportunities) of the Open Space Plan.
- C. One large home and tennis court on property. Circular driveway in front of home and driveway back to tennis court. Proposed development by current owner would put three new residences, one replacing the existing home. Proposed development

would protect many of the large trees on the hillside and protect the wooded corner parcel at Lloyds and Russell with the spring.

- D. If circular drive kept, parking off street, otherwise only street parking.
- E. Potential for nearly 3 acre park in an area of the city with no parks nearby. Another large, undeveloped parcel exists directly across Lloyds lane that could expand the park.
- F. Sold for \$1.6 million to developer in Spring 2003. Probably sell \$2.5 million to cover lost profits. \$20/sq. ft. estimated to buy from developer.

9. Braddock/Valley/Ridge

- A. 2416 & 2430 Ridge Road.
- B. Wooded hillside with many trees and understory -best appreciated from Braddock Road view. Timber Branch stream runs through the property. Has high natural resource value.
- C. Zoned R-8. Property includes five separate parcels, includes 3.9 acres, and has two large homes on it facing Ridge Road. Some private land may not be developable due to slope and Timber Branch resource protection area on the property.
- D. Limited street parking.
- E. Public natural area.
- F. Land assessed at \$3.5 million (all five parcels).
- G. Donated or purchased easement should be explored for those portions that could be developed.

10. Second Presbyterian Church -North Quaker/Janneys Lane

- A. 1400 Janneys Lane. Property of the National Capital Presbytery. 6.07 acres (237, 895 sq.ft).
- B. A number of historic and specimen trees on property.
- C. Zoned R-20. Current structures include a house built 1910 (in disrepair) and a brick auxiliary church building built early 1960s (in good repair). Under current zoning could yield up to 12 lots. Ten lots and a public road, are being proposed by a developer. The developer has indicated it would donate 1.1 acres of open space in the form of two of these lots located at the corner to the City. Historic and specimen trees will remain.
- D. Parking is available now on two church parking lots on site. Under proposed development plan, parking will be removed and all residences will have ample off street parking. Public parking will be permitted on the interior public street.
- E. The developer and current owner have worked with the Planning Department to preserve the most important public aspects of the site including specimen trees and keeping the site open at the corner. The applicant is willing to deed 1.1 acres at the corner to the City with no outlay of city funds. Although this particular area does not lack for open space, its location is at the geographic center of City and its proximity to other open institutional land nearby merited attention in the Open Space Plan. If the City were to acquire it, the design and use of the full site and the two existing structures would have to be evaluated in relationship to the Park and Recreation Strategic Plan and Needs Assessment.

- F. Assessed value (04) -\$2,807,900. Based on a recent appraisal for the City, the fair market value of the site is deemed to be \$6.3 million. A higher price may be necessary to acquire the entire site given the contract purchasers' profit expectation.
- G. At the request of City Council and the City Manager, the Committee ranked this property under the goals criteria. Although it is included in this priority site list because it is cited in the Open Space Plan, when evaluated in relation to the other priority sites, it received the lowest score. The proposed site plan for eight houses with a one acre open corner of open space satisfies the goals of the Open Space Plan. The Committee does not recommend that the City acquire the property.

II. OPEN SPACE OPPORTUNITIES LIST

The list that follows contains a number of properties around the City which merit close examination as open space candidates. They are listed in no particular order and we know more investigation will be required for many of these parcels. This list is also not exhaustive. We had more candidates ourselves and we expect and will ask for and certainly will welcome proposed additions from the community. Each of these on this list will also need to be weighed carefully against appropriate criteria.

As the Open Space Steering Committee and the community at large adds to this list and works through a criteria and ranking process, we expect some of the opportunities found here to rise in importance for consideration. In addition, threats and opportunities we cannot anticipate at this time may also make some of these sites rise to the top for consideration. We hope the City will have a thoughtful process in place to afford opportunity in these cases, without foreclosing action on the identified and agreed-upon priority sites.

1. Del Ray Corner Community Garden

- A. Numbers 1 & 7 East Del Ray are located at the southeast corner of Del Ray Ave and Commonwealth Ave.
- B. Two adjacent lots on the corner at a 4-way stop. Just over 1/3 acre.
- C. No impervious cover.
- D. Street parking, unrestricted on opposite side of Del Ray.
- E. Passive use.
- F. \$21-24/sq. ft. (\$300,000 total).

2. King Street to Rosemont Neighborhood Path

- A. 2723 King Street First Christian Church (rear portion). Map # 052.02-06-06
- B. Deep (784 ft.) lot that connects King Street to Summers Drive cul de sac. Back 100 feet of lot is wooded area with a short, but steep, slope. 2.6 acres. Zoned R-8.
- C. Church building and driveway on front portion of lot. Parking lot and playground on middle portion of lot.
- D. N/a
- E. Two uses: 1. Neighborhood path (on driveway and through wood) to connect King Street /Janneys Lane area and Rosemont. Path has been used for years for cut through pedestrian traffic and as a safe route to school. There are currently no official pedestrian or bicycle routes connecting these neighborhoods between Scroggins and Walnut, a distance of about 3/4 mile. 2. Back 100 feet of lot is a nice wooded area suitable for preservation as open space.
- F. Property assessment for 2004 is \$2.1 million for entire site.

3. **Forest Behind Beth El Temple -Col. Ellis Ave.**
 - A. 3832 and 3834 Seminary Rd. Owned by Carrier Keating and Patricia Ruffner.
 - B. Total of 3.1 acres. Historically drained to Strawberry Run until interrupted by Seminary Ridge development.
 - C. R-20 zoning. No CBA or RPA or wetland designations. Site plan submitted about 6 years ago but withdrawn. Home on the property fronting Seminary Road. City installed a storm drain system in lower areas.
 - D. Street parking or provided by Beth El Temple.
 - E. Small walking park. Potential for easements.
 - F. 2004 assessment \$2.3 million for property with house.
 - G. Would change the character of the Seminary Ridge neighborhood if developed.

4. **Alexandria Water Co -Duke St., Abutting GW Masonic Memorial**
 - A. 2505 Duke St. on the southwest side of the George Washington Masonic Memorial.
 - B. Zoned UT (utilities) adjacent to property zoned R-5. Open space areas on property.
 - C. Maintenance and administrative office buildings exist on the property, as well as a large, currently unused reservoir. D. Parking lot on site.
 - E. Public open space. Could be combined with purchasing the back part of the GW Masonic Memorial property to make a larger public open space.
 - F. Unknown -assessed by State Corp.
 - G. It should be addressed as part of any open space opportunity on the GW Masonic Memorial. A right of first refusal could be a good tool here.

5. **Strawberry Hills/Tarleton Area Neighborhood Park .**
 - A. 4214 Duke Street at southwest corner with South Gordon Street Map # 060.01-02- 02
 - B. Area is triangular on 1 & 1/3 acre with 174 feet of frontage on Duke Street. Mature trees border the property along Duke and Gordon Streets. Ground slopes off from trees to provide a bowl like effect and buffer from Duke. Zoned R-2-5. Currently owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia.
 - C. A parking lot and driveway mostly take up the site. The parking lot appears to be unused and may have been used by the adjacent Verizon Building when it had a much larger workforce.
 - D. Street parking is available on Gordon and use of the site could include a parking lot. As a neighborhood park, most visits would be by foot or bike.
 - E. Neighborhood park with uses best determined by local residents. Park would provide urban relief in a densely populated area on busy Duke Street.
 - F. Assessment for 2004 is \$987,200.
 - G. Acquisition or perhaps explore a trade with the State.

6. Mt. Vernon/Del Ray Community Gathering Place

- A. Two options (see descriptions 1 & 2 below): (1) Southeast corner of Mt. Vernon & E. Del Ray and vacant parcel south on Mt. Vernon (201 E. Del Ray and 2207 Mt. Vernon); and (2) the parcel next to the city parking lot at the southeast corner of E. Oxford and Mt. Vernon (2309 Mt. Vernon).
- B. (1) Two adjacent parcels; one vacant (1st south of intersection on east side of street); and one developed. Vacant parcel used for dancing/music at Art on the Avenue. One old oak and a medium-old blue spruce. (2) Parcel next to (south of) the City parking lot is 2958 ft². No significant natural features, but is a good central location and is next to the Del Ray Farmers Market.
- C. (1) One structure on corner lot (occupied by Bean Creative Web Services).
(2) One dwelling built in 1920 covers about half the lot.
- D. (1) Street parking only; (2) City parking lot next to lot.
- E. (1,2) Potential community square, gathering area. In heart of Del Ray neighborhood.
- F. (1) Assessment unknown, but over \$20/sq. ft. (2) 2004 assessment = \$230,500.
- G. Second option is being considered by the Mt. Vernon Planning Committee as a high priority.

7. Mirant Power Plant

- A. On the Potomac River, north of Old Town.
- B. Large industrial plant.
- C. Huge coal piles and power plant. In time (undetermined) this plant will likely convert to different fuel source and the operational foot print of the facility could be greatly reduced, as much as 50%, presenting a critical waterfront open space opportunity.
- D. Critical opportunity at some point for potential park, neighborhood ball fields, paths, trails, boating facilities.
- E. Street parking only, unless purchased. F. Price Unknown.
- G. There is no current indication of change of ownership and/or operation which might result in a decrease in the footprint of the operation which would allow for open space creation. High priority if Mirant decides to close down.

8. Forest Behind Free Methodist Church -Polk Ave. at Buzzard's Gap

- A. Portions of 4915 and 4901 Polk Ave.
- B. Forested steep slope with large trees and wildlife. Adjacent to private open space conservation area protected by recent Pickett Ridge development approval. Natural resource areas.
- C. Zoned R-20. If church sold, could be developed for 4-5 residences.
- D. On street and school parking.
- E. Nature trail and natural public open space surrounding trail. Easement approved as part of the Pickett Ridge development.

- F. Assessed at \$8.19 per square foot. Purchase price would be between \$300,000 and \$500,000. Might consider purchasing a "right of first refusal" option from church.

9. Finks Property -Southview Terrace

- A. 720 Southview Terrace
- B. Two lots zoned R-5 -large sloping back yards leveling at the bottom. Lot #1 is 41,103 sq. ft. and Lot #2 is 14,036 sq. ft.
- C. House on Lot #1 -Lot #1 abuts a triangular lot on Moncure and Southview.
- D. Driveway and street parking.
- E. Potential passive park and gardens. City could acquire lot #2 and portion of Lot #1 or look into easement options on both or just Lot #1.
- F. Lot #1 assessed at \$830,800; Lot #2 = \$278,900. Price per square foot = \$20.13.

10. Inner City Urban Park

- A. 724, 726, & 728 North Patrick Street at the southwest corner with Madison Street across Patrick from the Charles Houston Recreation Center Map # 054.04-05-02, 03, 04.
- B. 724 and 726 Patrick total 6600-sq. ft. and are vacant. 728 Patrick is 3649-sq. ft. with a building. Combined area is 10200-sq. ft. Zoned CSL. Rest of block is zoned RB. Site location and proximity to recreation center, but is separated from it by busy Route 1.
- C. Small brick 1800 sq. ft. building.
- D. Limited street parking in the area; visits would be by bike or foot.
- E. Neighborhood park. Park would provide urban relief in a densely populated area. Charles Houston Rec. Center property has limited space and the building will soon be undergoing renovation.
- F. Assessment for 2004 on all 3 lots totals \$782,000. Property is currently on the market.
- G. Alternatives for an urban park in the area of the city are at nearby undeveloped properties on the northeast and northwest comers of Columbus and Madison. 735 and 736 Columbus (Map # 054.04-08-01 & 02) combined have an area of 6200 sq. ft. and assessed value of \$500,000. Adjacent St. Joseph's Church owns lots. 9700-sq. ft. parcel assessed at \$773,800 at 805 Columbus (Map # 054.04-02-08) owned by Beulah Baptist Church. The church also owns 2 adjacent parcels totaling an additional 7200 sq. ft. and assessed at an additional \$578,000.

11. Yates Properties – King Street Across from Janneys

- A. 2525, 2605, 2705, 2705A, 2705B King Street
- B. Two historic homes (2525 and 2605) built in 1819 and 1870, respectively. 2525 is mostly grassy with some trees and slopes down to the east and abuts another lot in Rosemont. 2605 is mostly grassy and slopes down to a property on Summers Drive and West Masonic View. Other lots are also grassy with some trees. All undergrowth has been cleared on all properties.
- C. All lots are zoned R-8. Homes are built on 2525, 2605, and 2705. Lot sizes are: 2525 = 108,130 sq.ft.; 2605 = 86,858 sq. ft.; 2705 = 20,530 sq. ft.; 2705A = 21,043 sq. ft.; 2705B = 7,013 sq. ft.
- D. Street parking.
- E. Passive manner due to the topography. Lots at 2525 and 2605 have historic houses and these could have private easements. Passive, privately-owned open space
- F. Assessed values are totals (lot and home): 2525 = \$2,303,800; 2605 = \$927,000; 2705 = \$612,300; 2705A = \$292,500; and 2705B = \$43,900.
- G. Strong easement opportunities.

12. Ball Property -604/604A Janney's Lane

- A. Two adjacent properties owned by William and Patricia Ball III.
- B. Out lots with Janneys Lane entrance. Large lot with house and sloping wooded area towards East Taylor Run.
- C. Zoned R-8. House with driveway. 604 is 90,387 sq. ft; 604A is 3,947 sq. ft.
- D. Parking.
- E. Urban forest and natural resource area. Easement to protect trees and terrain.
- F. Assessed at: 604 = \$1,993,100; 604A = \$18,100.

13. Arlandria Urban Playground

- A. Property is on west side of Commonwealth Ave. between Reed Ave. and W. Glebe. A church is to the south and an electrical substation is to the north.
- B. Vacant land. Grassy area between town home parking lot and Commonwealth.
- C. Vacant. Less than a half acre.
- D. Parking at townhomes and on Commonwealth.
- E. Two other tot lots and Cora Kelly School are very near to this lot.
- F. Unknown.

14. Hufty Property- 214 West Alexandria Ave.

- A. 214 West Alexandria Ave. Can be partially viewed from Russell Road at elevated sidewalk.
- B. Hidden, mostly-wooded lot with many large trees.
- C. Historic home built in 1890. Lot is 59,513 sq. ft. Property is only directly accessible from a small frontage on Alexandria Ave.

- D Onsite parking. Street parking.
- E Urban forest and tree canopy. Natural resources. Easement. It has no frontage other than Alexandria Ave.
- F Total assessment = \$1,071,200.

15. 2627 Foster Avenue.

- A. 2627 Foster Avenue. Foster is a short dead end street off Fairbanks Avenue off Seminary Road in the far West End of the City.
- B. The property is gently sloping with a house (954 sq. feet) situated on the left end of the property. The house was built in 1950. The property is the last lot on the dead end street, with few trees.
- C. Property zoned R-12.
- D. Driveway. Parking at the end of the street.
- E. Potential small passive park area. Good candidate for easement.
- F. Lot size is 20,602 sq. feet. Current assessment is \$335,200 for property.
- G. Open space in West End of the City.

III. TRAILS OPPORTUNITIES

"Connecting Alexandria's Neighborhoods" with multi-use paths is one of the objectives of the Open Space Plan. Following is a list of potential sites for trail connectivity. Sites may be owned by a governmental entity, or could be candidates for easements or acquisition. Excluded are on-street bike routes. Meetings with neighborhood groups may identify more opportunities, and are needed relative to the inclusion of any future sites into the City's Multi-Use Trail and Bicycle Transportation Master Plan. Future additions would come before City Council through a separate process related to proposed additions in the master plan.

Non-City owned properties

1. Make permanent the temporary Mt. Vernon Trail alignment at Hunting Towers' waterfront. Property is owned by VDOT. (See Priority Site history #2 for detail.)
2. King Street to Rosemont connection path at the First Christian Church. Property is privately owned. (See Opportunities List #2 for detail.)
3. Buzzard's Gap/Pickett's Ridge. This trail would provide a safe and short route connecting schools and neighborhoods and extended between Pickett Street and Polk Avenue. City Council approved an easement on private property on February 24, 2004.
4. Between Seminary Road and Braddock Road behind the fire station would be an extension of the Buzzards Gap route to get to Ft. Ward Park on land that is a part of the Seminary Forest Apartments property. (See Priority Site history #3 for detail.)
5. Dartmouth Road between Crown View Drive and Skyhill Road is currently dead-ended and needs a path. Walkers currently make their way around a fence. Property is privately owned.
6. Trail between the end of Francis Hammond Parkway and Forest Park has been used for many years. A stream runs along FH Pkwy so this land is in an RPA. However, it is not clear from the site if the path is on city or private land.
7. Stevenson Park to Yoakum Parkway to connect this city park to condo community. Steep terrain would make this a difficult project. Private property.
8. Potomac Yards Linear Park and trail is to be funded and constructed by the developer.
9. Potomac Yards to Potomac Greens pedestrian bridge over rail line has been subject of potential change in approved plans. Local neighborhood concerns have been raised about public access from the proposed bridge.
10. Hooffs Run Bridge needed at the southern boundary of the Alexandria Sanitation Authority (ASA) Plant. Reconstruction of previous trail along the ASA southern boundary is included in WWB Plan. Previous trail through ASA is no longer feasible. Alexandria Bike Plan identified need for bridge in 1998. Private, public, and ASA property.

11. East Eisenhower development plan contemplates trails along Mill Race and Hooffs Run.
12. Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project has off--street bicycle and pedestrian trails and side paths included in plans for Jones Point, Washington Street, US Route 1, and Telegraph Road. Plans need to be implemented.
13. Develop a pedestrian trail along the back of the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority Cameron Run Regional Park and the City Animal Shelter. NVRP A and City property.
14. Include a trail in the future as part of a natural stream reclamation of Backlick Run west from Booth Park to the City line. Private property.

City-owned property

15. Open the Mt. Jefferson Greenway in Del Ray between Raymond and Jeff Davis Highway. This is city owned property that is currently fenced off. A connecting Trail proposal was rejected in 1998 bike plan because of promises made by city officials in years past that it would not be developed. Probably only reclamation by City. A former WO&D railroad track. The Greenway extension northwest is problematic, since the city has already allowed development to occur in the fonner railroad right-of-way.
16. Complete Tarleton Park trail by placing a gravel path across 200 feet of grassy area. Neighbors have been favorable to this path improvements but have concerns about the number and frequency of city vehicles using the paths and they fear improvements would promote city vehicle use.
17. Construct a path from Raleigh Avenue to connect to Holmes Run, Foxchase Shopping Center with Foxchase Apartments and other neighborhoods.
18. Path and bridge or weir across Holmes Run at Chambliss would make a safe neighborhood connection and join with Fairfax County planned trail running west to Columbia Pike.
19. Build a trail underpass for the Holmes Run trail to avoid a dangerous street crossing at Beauregard.
20. Build a short trail to connect the backside of Ft. Ward Park to Van Dorn Street.
21. Complete trail loop on the south side of Backlick Run in Ben Brenman Park.
22. Bike Path Easement on North Commonwealth. On the last quarter mile Commonwealth, ending at Four-Mile Run, a green strip of land exists in all but a short spot from the intersection of Reed Ave. This green strip is on the east side of Commonwealth, opposite of the school. This is a very popular commute route for Alexandria residents into the District. A bike path in this green strip would keep

bikes off the roadway, which is barrow in front of the school. This may be city right-of-way, or be done with an easement from Jack Taylor and the new townhome development on their western property lines (past their fences).

23. 2619 Randolph. Connects the Mt. Jefferson Greenway with Randolph. Could be nice bike access to Greenway if completed.

IV. ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

This section includes additional sites and opportunities that require attention and research. Reclamation opportunities are those involving public land that needs to be reclaimed because private uses have been allowed to encroach over the years, depriving the public of the benefits of open space.

1. Reclamation Opportunity at Francis Hammond School. Referred to sometimes as "Death Valley", this area west of the school is currently an athletic area for schools and Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities. Some storage on the property and signs indicate restricted use.
2. Russell Road easement opportunities exist in several locations on the west side of the street between Alexandria Country Day School and Braddock Road. Four parcels on the west side of Russell Road, north of St. Stevens/St. Agnes school and south of Woodland Terrace are overzoned. An easement (or easements) would protect these wooded areas as open space. These parcels connect to wooded portions of St. Stevens/St. Agnes and the proposed park one more block south. Lloyds lane parcel (see description above) is in this stretch of Russell Rd. Another parcel exists on Russell and Lloyds lane on the southwest corner of that intersection. The parcel is approximately 1acre.
3. 4817 Peacock Ave. Wooded glade surrounded by steep slopes. Zoned R-20 and approximately 1.25 acre. Could act as a buffer against new Pickett Ridge development. Easement candidate.
4. 150 South Gordon Street has a nice open space next to a residential area and across for Tarleton footpath that is part of a lot with an industrial building on it suitable for an easement for a neighborhood park and permanent buffer for residential area.
5. 1301 Powhatan Street 6541-sq. ft. vacant lot owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia.
6. 460 Strathblane Place one acre lot with 1860 Civil War house and adjacent 4638 Strathblane place 3/4 acre vacant lot
7. 1201 Key Drive. Wooded corner lot. Approximately 2.2 acres zoned R-20. Easement candidate.
8. Corner lot on southeast corner of Russell and Rosecrest Ave. Small triangular lot. Would make nice small native plant and tree garden. Most likely an easement opportunity.
9. Scroggins lots on southeast side of street. At least eight oversized lots with homes located along Scroggins Lane. Because of zoning, these are possible infill locations.
10. Oakland Terrace oversized lots. Several oversized lots could be infilled due to zoning.
11. Additional old homes on oversized lots (year built):
 - 1001A Janneys Lane (1840)
 - .403 W. Masonic View (1850) .418 Summers Dr. (1890)
 - .614 W. Braddock Rd. (1900) .1203 Orchard St. (1910)
 - .622 W. Braddock Rd. (1910) .2203 Scroggins Rd. (1901)
 - .1200 Russell Rd. (1900)

12. CLARENS

- A. 318 North Quaker Lane. Owner since 1994 is V. Thomas Lankford.
- B. 3.5 acres. Hill with House on top of rise and several outbuildings. Broad lawns, large caliper trees and historical structure on property built circa 1814-16. An 1850's school operated by Rev. George Smith, US military hospital and James M. Mason -a pre Civil War member of Congress. Mason drafted the fugitive slave law and Chairman of the US Senate foreign relations committee. During the War Mason was emissary to Great Britain of the Confederate States of America and involved in the "Trent" affair. Former Confederate President Jefferson Davis visited Clarens in 1870 for his final meeting with Mason and CSA General Samuel Cooper. CSA General Robert Lee also visited Clarens. Subsequently a girls school. Latter owned by William G. Thomas. Upon his sale of the property in the late 1980's, the property was subdivided (see 310 Quaker Lane).
- C. Zoned R-20. Tract was subdivided in 1968 creating the current 3.5-acre Clarens and adjacent 1.1 acre 310 Quaker lane property. It could not be ascertained if conservation, subdivision or historical easements exists on the house or land.
- D. Not applicable
- E. Clarens is an important architectural and cultural resource for the City of Alexandria and deserves high priority for protection of the structures, trees and land.
- F. Property is currently assessed at \$3.1 M (land -\$1.3).

13. THE COTTAGE

- A. 502 Quaker Lane, access from Trinity Drive and garden plot (3550 Trinity Drive). "The Cottage," early 19th. Century house. All properties are owned by Charles Hooff Jr. 502 Quaker Lane property (with the cottage) is 77,941 sq. ft. Side garden lot (3550 Trinity Pr.) is 26,943 sq. ft.
- B. Beautiful trees surrounding the house and old boxwood in adjacent garden.
- C. Zone R-20.
- D. N/A
- E. "The Cottage" is an important architectural and cultural resource in the City of Alexandria and deserves high priority for protection of the structure, trees and land.
- F. Assessment for 502 Quaker Lane is \$1.2M (land -\$792,300) and Trinity Dr. property \$ 418,900.
- G. Appropriate for a conservation and historical easement.

14. POTOMAC YARD DEVELOPMENT

Buy additional acreage either to create a real "central park" in this development, or to add to the active field acreage already allocated in the planning process (7 acres shared with the School Board for a potential school site).

City State and federal government owned properties

In our review of parcels as candidates for open space consideration, many properties were identified with city and state ownership. We recommend a thorough review of property records to better identify government owned properties where a mutual open space interest may be served. Examples:

- 4214 Duke Street at southwest corner with South Gordon Street owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- 1301 Powhatan Street at the northeast with Bashford Lane owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Reclaim public land that has been encroached upon

There are many parcels of city land and rights-of-way that have been encroached upon by private landowners, thus effectively removing land from the city's open space inventory. Reclaiming these lost parcels is an enforcement issue that would not require use of any open space acquisition funds, yet could add considerably to the open space inventory. It would also demonstrate to city residents that the city places a high priority on its open space and public land, which belongs to all our citizens. We underscore the recommendation contained in the Open Space Plan that the city undertake a project to identify these encroachments and reclaim them as public open space. Examples:

- 2655 Duke Street at the corner with West Taylor Run Parkway. Encroachment by a commercial establishment using what may be RPA land as a parking lot. Taylor Run Citizens Association reported this about 2 years ago.
- W & OD right-of-way in Del Ray.
- Yates Gardens by Jones Point Park.

**Recommended
Criteria For Open Space “Priority Sites” List**

1. To what degree does the property provide the public with benefits related to human values and experience?
 - a. To what degree does the property include trail connections or open space adjacent to or linking open spaces, natural areas, greenways and trails?
 - b. To what degree does the property meet an identified need for active or passive recreation?
 - c. To what degree is the property, or does the property contain elements or attributes, of known or potential historic or cultural significance?
 - d. To what degree does the property provide an opportunity to expand existing open space resources, such as parks, schools or institutional or private open spaces?
 - e. To what degree does the property provide an opportunity for pocket parks, gardens, green spaces or playgrounds?
 - f. To what degree does the property provide visual relief (light, air and green space) from the built environment?

2. To what degree does the property provide green infrastructure, including the protection of natural resources?
 - a. To what degree does the property provide for the protection of natural areas and maintain natural ecological processes?
 - b. To what degree does the property provide for the protection of habitat and support of native species?
 - c. To what degree does the property provide opportunities for improving the quality of air and water resources?
 - d. To what degree does the property provide the opportunity for stream restoration or preservation?
 - e. To what degree does the property include stands of mature trees?
 - f. To what degree does the property provide for the development or protection of wetlands?

3. To what degree will the benefits identified above be shared by or available to everyone in the City/city-wide?
4. To what degree will the open space benefits identified above be available to a neighborhood or other area of the City that is particularly deficient in open space?
5. Is the site identified in the Open Space Plan or the RP&CA Strategic Master Plan; if it is not, then to what degree would it, if acquired or protected as open space, meet the goals of those plans?

**Open Space Steering Committee
Criteria Matrix**

**Ranking Chart
Priority Sites**

Criterion	Sites									
	1. Waterfront	2. Mt. Vernon Trail	3. Seminary/Beauregard	4. Second Presbyterian	5. Ivor Lane	6. Lloyds Lane	7. Masonic Memorial	8. Ridge Road/Valley Drive	9. Monticello Park	10. Clermont Cove
1. Proximity to existing parks and trails.	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	3
2. Proximity to Schools.	1	1	1	1½	3	1	1	1	1	1
3. Proximity to natural resources areas.	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3
4. At street ending to provide neighborhood linkages.	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	1	3	1
5. Next to institutional properties with extensive open space.	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3
6. Adjacent to or linking existing/proposed trails, greenways.	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	1	1	3
7. Small lots in dense urban areas for pocket parks.	3	1	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	1
8. Land with significant trees, stopping terrain.	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
9. Properties of known historic value or cultural significance.	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	1
10. Areas with a high need for open space.	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	2
11. Open space and trail connections to Fairfax and Arlington counties.	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Total Score	29	27	18	16 ½	25	18	21	17	22	24