


City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 4, 2007

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JAMES K. HARTMANN, CITY MANAGER 

SUBJECT: REVISED LIST OF PROPOSED POCKET PARK SITES

ISSUE: Revised list of Proposed Pocket Parks Sites in the City of Alexandria.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

- (1) Receive the revised list of proposed 2007 Pocket Park Sites included within this report;
- (2) Schedule a public hearing on Saturday, February 24, 2007, on staff's pocket park recommendations, including the revised list of pocket park properties; and
- (3) Following the public hearing:
 - a. adopt staff's list of Pocket Park Sites, as the list of primary pocket park properties in Alexandria that the Council intends to consider for possible future acquisition by the City;
 - b. request staff, after a public hearing and the approval of the revised list of 2007 Pocket Park Sites, to proceed with the work to further achieve the goals of the City's Open Space Master Plan.

BACKGROUND: In September of 2005, the Open Space Steering Committee (OSSC) submitted to City Council a report and recommendations on the approved 2004 Pocket Park Program, Pocket Park Nominations (Attachment 1). At the September 20, 2005, public hearing City Council deferred action on the plan and asked staff to conduct additional outreach to the property owners included on the list, and to address concerns and questions from property owners. Council also requested staff to remove all properties from the pocket park list for any of the property owners who indicated they did not want to be included on the list. Included in this report is a updated list of the nominated pocket park sites, which is a revised version of the original nominations presented to Council in September of 2005. Property owners who indicated no interest in selling to the City were removed from this updated list. For the related context of the list, this update also informs Council on the implementation steps staff have taken since

approval of the Pocket Park Program in March, 2005. Finally, in recognition of the prospective nature of the proposed pocket park site list, the title of the list has been updated from "2004" to "2007."

PRIOR ACTIVITY:

A number of years ago, as part of City Council open space discussions, a need was highlighted for pocket parks in the City and the need to address the concern of small, local pocket park proposals, competing with larger sites for priority or funding. As a result of these discussions, the Open Space Steering Committee proposed a program for the separate consideration of potential pocket park sites in relation to the overall Open Space acquisition process.

On February 14, 2005, City Council received the proposed Pocket Park Program and ranking criteria from the Open Space Steering Committee and scheduled a public hearing on March 12, 2005 for public comment. Following the public hearing, City Council approved the Committee's recommended Pocket Park definition, criteria for selection, its procedure for nominations, and the recommendation that a minimum goal of 20% of the City's annual open space money be used for acquisition of Pocket Parks. Staff then wrote to all civic associations in the City, explaining the program and including the Pocket Park criteria and a nomination form. The deadline for nominations was extended to April 15, 2005, in order to allow sufficient time for interested groups to participate.

While the pocket park program was developed and reviewed, the OSSC continued to receive additional nominations and take actions related to the City's general Open Space Program. A number of the properties nominated for this program met the criteria for the separate Pocket Park program, and upon approval of the pocket park program were moved to the list of nominated pocket park sites for consideration. In June, 2005 staff and the OSSC assessed the nominated properties based on the approved criteria. Resulting from this review, a ranked list was developed of the sites that best met the pocket park criteria. This ranked list was submitted to City Council in September, 2005.

On September 20, 2005, based upon concern expressed by some property owners at the public hearing to review the pocket park list and recommendations, City Council deferred this item. Staff was instructed at that time to conduct further analysis of each pocket park site, specifically to determine the availability of the sites and the interest of the current property owners. Staff was also asked to conduct outreach to property owners to alert them of the opportunity to keep their property on or to remove their property from the Pocket Park List. It was requested that all such properties be removed from list and owners notified of opportunities for potential conservation easements or right of first refusal. Following these actions, staff was directed to develop an updated list of properties and to add new properties brought to the attention of staff by the property owners. This list provides information related to the sites including the property size and ranking by the OSSC, the 2006 real estate assessed value, and estimated yearly maintenance costs for each property.

PROPOSED 2007 POCKET PARK SITES

Based on the analysis of the list described above, staff recommends that Council approve the Revised Pocket Park sites as follows: (1) initiate immediate discussions with the property owner related to potential acquisition; and (2) include sites to be considered for future discussions with interested property owners regarding possible acquisition in the future.

1. ***Pocket Park Site for Immediate Acquisition Consideration:*** After the September 20, 2005, public hearing, two property owners whose properties were not on the pocket park list previously submitted to City Council approached staff with interest in selling their properties to the City as part of the Pocket Park program. Staff and the OSSC assessed each property separately and determined that the two properties met the criteria for the program. One of the properties, 48 South Early Street, ranked very highly relative to both the new and the previously reviewed sites. Staff recommends that Council add this site to the 2007 Pocket Park Site list. The second property, 2711 Holly Street, is proposed to be added to the future consideration list below.

- a. 48 South Early Street

The property falls outside the 1/10 of a mile area of neighborhoods served by existing parks and within a RPA (Resource Protection Area). A community meeting was held and the surrounding neighbors of the property expressed significant interest in a park at this location. The City has received letters of support from the neighboring citizen groups and homeowners associations. The owner is willing to negotiate with the City for sale of this property, and the City has commissioned an appraisal as the next stage of this process.

- b. ***Pocket Park Sites for Future Consideration:*** As requested by Council, staff re-assessed the pocket park list submitted for public hearing on September 20, 2005, and removed all the properties with owners uninterested in selling. Further outreach was done to determine which property owners may at some time in the future be interested in discussions with the City regarding the strictly voluntary sale of their properties as part of the Pocket Park Program. All property owners on the original list had the opportunity to either have their property removed from the list or request that it stay on the list. The following list of properties (a more detailed description follows starting on page 5) are those of property owners who opted to remain on the list for future consideration:

- a. 2309 Mount Vernon Avenue
- b. 1 & 7 East Del Ray
- c. 2711 Holly Street (brought forward post-nomination deadline as discussed above)
- d. 11 Quaker Lane and 3327 Duke Street
- e. 724-728 North Patrick Street
- f. 1023 Duke Street (lease only)
- g. 30 Rosecrest Avenue
- h. 3500 Mount Vernon Avenue

i. 3540 Commonwealth Avenue

It is important to note that, by having their properties on this list, the owners of the sites listed above are at no time obligated to discuss or sell their properties to the City, and would participate in future property sale considerations related to the Pocket Park program only on a voluntary basis.

A list and description of the properties in both categories, including estimated maintenance costs, follows.

Updated Pocket Park Nominations 2005- 2006

Nominated Site	Property Size	Estimated Maint. Costs Per Year	2006 Assessment	Park Within 1/10 mile	Total Score (15 possible)
2309 Mount Vernon Avenue	2,958 s.f.	\$350-700 ^{1,2}	\$307,300	Yes, but edge of service area	15
1 & 7 East Del Ray Avenue	14,888 s.f.	\$1,715-3,430 ^{1,2}	\$644,900	No	15
11 Quaker and 3327 Duke Street	15,011 s.f.	\$1,725-3,450 ^{1,2}	\$504,080	Yes	13
724-728 North Patrick Street	10,279 s.f.	\$1,200-2,400 ^{1,2}	\$828,600	Yes	11
1023 Duke Street	2,743 s.f.	\$300-600 ^{1,2}	\$391,700	No	8
30 Rosecrest Avenue	8,031 s.f.	\$915-1,830 ^{1,2}	\$370,600	Yes	6
3500 Mount Vernon Avenue	13,880 s.f.	\$1,600-3,200 ^{1,2}	\$617,400	No	5
3540 Commonwealth Avenue	7,910 s.f.	\$900-\$1,800 ^{1,2}	\$283,800	Yes	5
* 2711 Holly Street	6,000 s.f.	\$700-\$1,400	\$169,800	No	12
* 48 South Early Street	17,424 s.f.	\$2,000-\$4,000	\$344,500	No	15

* Sites proposed by property owners and not initially reviewed by Open Space Steering Committee during the formal process, but subsequently reviewed in August, 2006.

^{1,2}Assumes maintenance costs ranges for the first two categories below:

Estimated Yearly Maintenance Costs Per Acre

- a. \$2,000 to \$5,000 Natural with low or no public use (includes streams, wooded areas, etc. with no to few plantings)
- b. \$5,000 to \$10,000 Turf/lawn with passive uses (includes benches, trash cans, etc. with plantings)
- c. \$10,000 to \$15,000 Active recreational uses and programming (includes playgrounds and small fields)
- d. \$15,000 to \$40,000 Heavy landscape/hardscape areas and active recreational fields/uses (includes athletic fields, Market Square level of landscaping, ball courts, etc.)

Description of Updated 2007 Proposed Pocket Park Site Properties

2309 Mount Vernon Avenue

The approximately 7,105 s.f. site, also known as the Mt. Vernon/Del Ray Community Gathering Place, is the parcel next to the city parking lot at the southeast corner of E. Oxford and Mt. Vernon (2309 Mt. Vernon). There are no significant natural features on the site that is in a central location next to the Del Ray Farmers Market. One dwelling built in 1920 covers about half the lot with an insurance agency office. The 2006 assessment was \$307,300. The current property owner indicated an interest in having the property remain on the Pocket Park List, but also indicated that the current lease would likely be renewed.

1 & 7 East Del Ray Avenue

The two adjoining properties, 8,625 and 6,263 s.f., are located on the corner of East Del Ray and Commonwealth Avenue and are currently vacant with residential zoning. The site is currently not served (within 1/10 mile) by any other parks. The properties were also nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association and identified in the 2004 Open Space Report. The 2005 nomination indicates that the site is ideally located along Commonwealth with many advantages for community use as it connects to the Commonwealth Ave. median open space and many nearby residents can walk to it. The community would like to see a tot-lot and/or community gathering area in this location. The community also proposed a contribution of a 6' Japanese Maple as well as time and effort for maintenance. The current property owner intends to develop the site, but indicated interest in the option remaining on the Pocket Park list up to, or until the site is developed.

11 Quaker and 3327 Duke Street

The vacant site (two properties) is located on the corner of Duke Street and North Quaker Lane. Combined, the size of the property is 15,011 s.f. The 2005 Pocket Park nomination indicates that the site would be used by the Seminary Hill and adjacent neighborhoods. It also states that this park would offer visual relief, could be walked to by many and is historically significant in commemoration of the history and significance of the development of the City. The community proposed that historic facts/education could be incorporated into park use, and that it could also

be used as an educational lab related to ecology and environmental balance. The Seminary Hills Civic Association strongly supports the acquisition of this site for a pocket park and has submitted to staff a number of ideas on how they could participate in maintenance and development. The site was recently sold by the owners of the adjacent property and has an approved site plan for development of an office building. A 2003 proposal by the owner for a residential/townhouse development was denied by the Planning Commission. The current property owner has indicated an intention to consider a number of options for the site, and therefore opted to remain on the Pocket Park list.

724-728 North Patrick Street

The site is located on North Patrick Street at the southwest corner with Madison Street and is across from the Charles Houston Recreation Center. 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. The site is in close proximity to the recreation center, but is separated from it by Route 1. Users would access the site by bike or foot. The 2005 nomination indicated that a park in this location could provide urban relief in a densely populated area. Assessment for 2006 on all 3 lots totals \$828,600. The current owner indicated to staff that the property can remain on the Pocket Park list for future consideration.

1023 Duke Street (Lease only)

The 2,743 s.f. vacant site is located at the corner of South Henry and Duke Streets and is currently used for parking. The owner, also the 2005 nominator for this property, is interested in leasing the site to the City for 5-10 years for use as a pocket park, returning the right to build on it to the owner after that time. The property and surrounding properties are zoned commercially and used mainly for commercial purposes. The location is not presently served by any parks within 1/10 of a mile and is the only site nominated in the southern part of Old Town. As the nomination was made the owner, no community support for a park in this location has been indicated to date.

30 Rosecrest Avenue

The 8,031 s.f. vacant site is located at the corner of Russell Road and Rosecrest Avenue. It is relatively flat with no trees, and is visible due to its corner location. It is surrounded by existing residential development. The property is currently signed "No Ball Playing." The 2005 nomination indicates that the site would be an ideal area for a park with benches and trees or for a tot-lot. The current property owners are considering different options for the site, and indicated an interest in remaining on the Pocket Park list for future consideration.

3500 Mount Vernon Avenue

The 13,880 s.f. site is located at the corner of Mount Vernon Avenue and West Glebe Road, zoned CDD#12. A financial institution and associated parking lot are currently housed on the property. The 2005 nomination indicates that the parcel would provide visual relief and opportunity for passive recreation and/or playgrounds. There are no parks within the 1/10 of a mile radius of park service. The site is currently operated as a local business institution and the

owner indicated that it was acceptable to remain on the Pocket Park list for future consideration. This nomination was from an individual with no community support indicated.

3540 Commonwealth Avenue

The site was mentioned in the 2004 Open Space Priority Report as an additional opportunity. Because it is 7,910 sq. ft., the OSCC recommended that it be considered as a pocket park in 2005. No additional community support information was received regarding this property. It is located nearby to the Cora Kelly School and is in an area well served by parks.

48 South Early (New since September 2005)

The 17,424 s.f. site is located south of Duke Street on South Early Street. The property was not included on the Pocket Park list submitted to City Council on September 20, 2005, but was brought forward by the interested owner of the site upon learning of the City's Pocket Park program. There are no parks within the 1/10 of a mile radius of park service. A stream bisects the property falling entirely within a Resource Protection Area (RPA), and therefore has few development options. The owner and surrounding community continue to express significant interest in the site's potential conversion to a park, and would like to see the site approved for immediate acquisition. The owner is willing to negotiate with the City for sale of this property, and it is listed in Section One, above.

2711 Holly Street (New since September 2005)

The 6,000 s.f. property is located off of Mount Ida Avenue on Holly Street. The property was not included on the Pocket Park list submitted to City Council on September 20, 2005, but was brought forward by the interested owner of the site upon learning of the City's Pocket Park program. The site is adjacent to a parcel containing a single-family home owned by the same owner, and is currently used in part as a side yard to that lot. The property owner has sought and obtained significant support from the surrounding neighbors for a park in this location and would like to see the site approved for immediate acquisition.

FISCAL IMPACT: Prior Council action set as a goal 20% of the 1 percent of real estate tax revenues set aside for open space acquisition as the annual financial target for the Pocket Park Program. It is not possible to predict with any precision the costs of acquiring, developing and maintaining pocket parks in the future, but 20% of the one percent open space set aside, should amount to approximately a half million dollars per year. Funds for the maintenance of the parks would need to be designated as part of future Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities operating budgets.

ATTACHMENT: Open Space Steering Committee Pocket Park Nominations

STAFF:

Mark Jinks, Deputy City Manager
Michele Evans, Deputy City Manager
Kirk Kincannon, Director, RPCA
Aimee Vosper, Landscape Architect Supervisor, RPCA
Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator, RPCA

EXHIBIT NO. 1

'2005 POCKET PARK NOM.
9-20-05 ~~25~~
9-13-05

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 7, 2005
TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL
FROM: JAMES K. HARTMAN, CITY MANAGER *J*
SUBJECT: OPEN SPACE STEERING COMMITTEE POCKET PARK NOMINATIONS

ISSUE: Report on the Open Space Steering Committee Pocket Park nominations.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

- (1) Receive the Open Space Steering Committee's 2005 pocket park ranked list (attached);
- (2) Schedule and conduct a public hearing for at Council's September 20 public hearing meeting on the Committee's pocket park rankings, including the list of all nominated sites; and
- (3) Following the public hearing:
 - a. approve and adopt the Committee's ranked list of pocket park sites, or an amended version of that list. This list will include the pocket park properties in Alexandria that the City intends to consider for future acquisition; and
 - b. request the City Manager, after its public hearing and the approval of the ranked list of 2005 pocket park sites, to provide to Council by November 2005 an Action Plan for the City acquisition of one or more of the properties on the City Council's list of 2005 pocket park sites.

BACKGROUND

Attached is a ranked list of the nominated pocket park sites reviewed by the Open Space Steering Committee in June of 2005 (Attachment 2). For the related context of the list, this memo also updates Council on the implementation steps it and the Committee have taken over the last two years related to the approved Pocket Park Program.

As part of its early open space discussions, Council highlighted the need for pocket parks in the City and the particular problem involved with small, local pocket park proposals, competing with larger sites for priority or funding. In June of 2004, Judy Guse-Noritake and Eric R. Wagner, the

co-chairs of the Open Space Steering Committee (OSSC), proposed that the Committee formulate a specific recommendation to Council on the subject of pocket parks. Subsequently, Council directed the Committee to create a separate category for pocket parks, prepare a process for pocket parks consideration in the Open Space nomination process and report to the City Manager, for subsequent discussion with Council, on the subject.

In March 2005, Council approved the Committee's recommended pocket park definition, criteria for selection, its procedure for nominations by neighborhoods, and its recommendation that a minimum goal of 20% of the City's annual open space funds be used for acquisition of pocket parks (see approved Pocket Park Program, Attachment 1). Staff then wrote to all civic associations in the City, explaining the program and including the pocket park criteria and a nomination form. The deadline for nominations was extended to April 15, in order to allow sufficient time for interested groups to participate.

While the Pocket Park Program was developed and reviewed, the OSSC continued to receive additional nominations and take actions related to the City's general Open Space Program. A number of the properties nominated for the general Open Space Program qualified for the separate pocket park program, and upon its approval, were moved to that list for consideration. A number of pocket park nominations were received and in June 2005, staff and the Committee assessed the nominated properties' appropriateness as pocket parks. Based on portions of the information provided within the pocket park nominations, the Committee used the approved pocket park criteria to review and develop a ranked list of 19 properties (a locational map is included as Attachment 4).

Highest Ranked Pocket Park Sites (received a score of 14 or better out of 15):

- 2309 Mount Vernon Avenue
- 1&7 East Del Ray Avenue
- 301 LaVerne Avenue

Highly Ranked Sites (received a score of 10-13 out of 15):

- 11 North Quaker/3327 Duke Street
- 707 Russell Road
- 2207 Mount Vernon Avenue
- 4214 Duke Street
- 724-728 North Patrick Street
- 805, 809, 811 North Columbus Street
- 150 South Gordon Street
- 901 North Saint Asaph Street

Lower Ranked Sites (received a score of 8 or less out of 15):

- 1023 Duke Street
- 209 Pine Street
- 101-103 West Mount Ida Avenue
- 30 Rosecrest Avenue
- 106 East Nelson Avenue.
- 3500 Mount Vernon Avenue
- 3041, 3011 and 3107 Mount Vernon Avenue
- 3540 Commonwealth Avenue

A list of the highest ranked properties shows those sites that best met the pocket park criteria (Attachment 2).

One of the critical criteria for pocket parks is the extent to which neighborhoods, property owners, or citizen groups are willing to participate in the responsibility for the acquisition and/or maintenance of the parks, in order to show their commitment to the City effort, and to defray important budget dollars. Some of the nominations received did not address this point in sufficient detail, and staff contacted each of the nominators in order to further explore the level of existing and potential commitment. Supporting information was provided for some of the nominated sites. Attachment 3 provides a basic description of each nominated property, including the extent to which the community demonstrated support for the site. (Attachment 3a provides additional information received after the April 15, 2005, deadline).

Prior to the September 20 public hearing, owners of these 19 parcels will be notified of the OSSC recommendations and the date, time and place of the public hearing.

FISCAL IMPACT: Once a list of pocket parks has been adopted by Council, staff will develop an estimate of the acquisition costs and return to Council later in the fall with an overall plan for acquisition of one or more of the sites. The OSSC recommends that the Council adopted goal of *20% of the 1 cent tax set aside for open space acquisition being set aside for the Pocket Park Program each year* be continued. This amounts to about \$500,000 annually. Given that some of these proposed sites carry a price tag more than the City could afford for a pocket park (i.e., 901 North Saint Asaph is assessed for \$7.2 million and the State is marketing the property for \$12.0 million), only some of these parcels are likely to be feasible to purchase. For new pocket parks, funds for the design and development of the parks would need to be provided in the City's Capital Improvement Program, and funds for maintenance would need to be included as part of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities operating budget.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment 1. City of Alexandria Pocket Park Program
- Attachment 1a. Criteria for Pocket Park Selection
- Attachment 2. Pocket Park Ranked Nominations, 2005 and 2004
- Attachment 3. Pocket Park Nomination Descriptions

- Attachment 3a. Additional Information Received After the April 15, 2005, Nomination Deadline
- Attachment 4. Map of Proposed Sites
- Attachment 5. Areas Served by Open Space Map
- Attachment 6. Existing Pocket Park Map

STAFF:

Mark Jinks, Assistant City Manager
Kirk Kincannon, Director, RP&CA
Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator
Aimee Vosper, Supervisor Landscape Architect

**CITY OF ALEXANDRIA
POCKET PARK PROGRAM
(Approved on March 12, 2005)**

The purpose of the Pocket Park Program is to enhance and expand the existing City of Alexandria public park system by ensuring a network of small scale park spaces designed to meet neighborhood needs. The concept of the "pocket park," also called "block park," also called "vest pocket park," has been incorporated in many jurisdictions' park programs as a way to create and provide additional community amenities in both residential and commercial areas. Specific parks range in their function from wild, woodland settings, to tot lots and man-made, urban environments.

1. *Pocket parks defined*

Council approved the Committee recommendation that the City define a pocket park as follows:

Pocket (block) parks are intended to meet the needs of residents or workers within about a tenth of a mile. Pocket parks are less than 20,000 square feet, with no minimum size. No parking is needed. Pocket parks may include such elements as small scale play equipment, public gardens, seating areas, passive open space, landscaped areas, important natural features, or trees.

The definition includes several important concepts. One aspect is that a pocket park is intended to be public. While limited in its defined service area, and ideally supported by volunteer citizen efforts, a pocket park is part of the City's official public park system. The tenth of a mile (528 ft.) service area is the current standard used by the City and is consistent with the one to two block dimension used in the Open Space Plan. The importance of the service area is to distinguish Pocket Park space from larger parks that serve an entire neighborhood or region of the City, or a City-wide parks that serves all of Alexandria.

The size of a pocket park is part of its definition. The fact that there is no minimum size is important, allowing very small spaces to be eligible. While there is no minimum size, it is also important that the space be small, less than 20,000 square feet of land area. Larger spaces begin to serve a larger population and other park needs. Parking is not part of the typical pocket park, because the park is designed to serve pedestrians able to walk the tenth of a mile or one to two block distance.

The definition includes uses anticipated in a typical pocket park, but has been written specifically so as not to exclude the occasional unusual situation. Most pocket parks may be passive spaces within residential or commercial areas, used for contemplation, relaxation, and walking, with landscaping and benches. The definition leaves open the possibility for other opportunities, however, in the appropriate setting.

In drafting the definition, the Committee reviewed the City's existing 24 pocket parks. The Committee also reviewed the two following maps (Attachments 1b&c), identifying pocket parks in the context of the City park system:

1. The "**Existing Pocket Park**" map shows existing pocket parks as well as other public parks in the City. It also shows, as to each, the 1/10th mile service area surrounding the parks. Finally, the density data from the 2000 census is shown on the same map, allowing an analysis of park location and population (Attachment 1c).
2. The "**Areas of the City Served by Open Space including Pocket Parks**" map shows pocket parks, other public parks, and other open spaces, both public and private, including private areas with and without public access. Again, the 1/10th mile service radius is highlighted, thus allowing a determination of the areas of the City for which no land is easily available for relief. The map answers comments from City Council and others about private amenities in apartment complexes, at schools, and in other forms that serves some of the population, even if public access is not permitted (Attachment 1b).

Existing parks and playground area are not part of and are not affected by the pocket park program. Those parks are managed, maintained and funded by the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities, as part of its ongoing parks program. The pocket park program as proposed here is new, and designed to add land to the City park system. There may be improvements to existing parks that are desired by a neighborhood, but they should not be confused with nominations and discussions about proposed pocket parks. For example, if there is a desire for a tot lot on an existing public park, that recommendation should not be part of the pocket park analysis and prioritization. The suggestion would be directed to the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities for consideration as part of its ongoing work.

2. *Criteria*

The criteria for judging potential pocket parks and prioritizing them is attached and includes the following elements: (Attachment 1a)

a. *Public benefit.* The recommended criteria focuses on the benefits to be derived from the use of the land as a park, citing as significant natural or historic features, the extent of the population to be served, and the fact that the users have no current alternative park land. This criterion requires that the City identify the public benefit or public value to be achieved by creating the pocket park.

b. *Use.* The criteria require that the proposed use of the park be identified and considered as part of the prioritization process. The criteria further stress the importance of the park being open and inviting to the public. The City should not support land for a pocket park if it is hidden,

hard to access and otherwise perceived as a private space only for use by its immediate neighbors.

c. *Neighborhood commitment.* Another important element in a potential pocket park is the degree to which the neighborhood is committed to its creation, and specifically with its acquisition, development and/or maintenance of the park. Because pocket parks are uniquely local in nature, and given the competition for resources, it is appropriate that those benefitting from this particular type of park show their commitment to it with their time, money and energy. While a neighborhood commitment and volunteer effort is only one of several criteria, the Committee believes strongly that pocket parks are particularly suited to a local effort to assist with the acquisition, development and/or maintenance of the park.

d. *Land status.* The criteria also include a review of the land itself, and a determination that it is appropriate for a pocket park. First, if the land is public, it may be capable of being converted to a pocket park use, but would not be a competitor for the prioritization for pocket park acquisition money. In addition, there may be alternatives to acquisition of private land that are appropriate for a pocket park. One landowner has already suggested that his vacant commercial property be leased by the City for at least ten years for use as a park while he foregoes development during that time. The City endorses creative means of establishing parks and includes a criterion to identify the status of the land being proposed. The cost or price of the land is not included as part of the criteria, because, as discussed previously with City Council, that issue is the province of City Council.

e. *Support for the park.* It is important that any pocket park recommended by the Committee to Council be one that has a broad base of support. The criteria therefore asks that the support for the park or its proposed use be identified, and if there is known opposition to it, that be identified as well.

f. *Geographical need.* Finally, it is important to provide parks in areas of the City that currently lack such amenities. The attached maps shows that there is currently service with some sort of park use for much of the City. Where park service is lacking, that fact should be part of the consideration in prioritizing new park opportunities. At the same time, there may also be good reasons for establishing a pocket park in an area of the City that already is theoretically served by other parks, where there is an agreed upon use, readily available land, and assistance with the acquisition costs. Thus, the notion of geographical need is included in the criteria, but is not the only determinative issue.

3. *Funding*

Council has approved the idea of setting aside an amount of money in each year's budget for pocket park acquisition, roughly equivalent to 20% of the 1 cent tax set aside for open space acquisition. Additional funds for the design and development of the parks must be made part of

the City's Capital Improvement Program, and maintenance funds, as part of the Department of Recreation, Parks, and Cultural Activities' budget, must be part of the City's operating budget.

To expand the ability to place pocket parks across the City, neighborhood "friends" groups should be supported, to assume the routine maintenance of these parks. Also, other mechanisms for cost sharing should be considered to acquire the parcels for these pocket parks, including contributions, easements, development exactions, city land swaps and use of the Development Fund. As a recent example, in both the Hennage and Postmasters development projects, pocket parks were included and helped create successful private development partnerships.

4. *Process*

The process for pocket parks is similar to but separate from the one the City has been using for priority open space sites. The Open Space Committee creates a separate list of Pocket Park priorities for City Manager consideration. The list will include ranked recommendations selected from nominations received from neighborhood groups, as well as additional nominations for areas of the City without nominations. In 2005, the Committee anticipated that pocket park nominations would be filed by March 30, and recommendations made to City Council, along with the Open Space Priority list for 2005, in June 2005¹.

The Committee will be making a recommendation to City Council regarding the nature and structure of a group to manage the open space efforts on a long term basis, which may be a mechanism similar to the Open Space Committee. As part of that recommendation, the Committee will address a specific mechanism for processing pocket park recommendations in the future.

It is important to note that with annual recommendations for open space priority sites as well as pocket parks, there will inevitably be out of cycle park and open space land proposals. If and when those occur, the Committee will not hesitate to forward its recommendations to the City Manager for consideration. The committee also intends to continue its outreach effort regarding the benefits of open space generally, and the specific rewards of donating land, easements and other interests for use as parks and open space.

¹Note: The timeline was changed based on City Council approval of the Pocket Park Program in March, 2005.

CRITERIA FOR POCKET PARKS SELECTION

(not listed in order of importance)

1. What is the benefit to the public from the proposed pocket park?
 - a. Are there important natural features, such as trees, water resources or habitat, to be preserved?
 - b. Are there important historic resources to be featured or preserved?
 - c. Will the park provide uses for a population without alternative sites?
 - d. How wide an area will be served by the park? Will it be used by more than just a few neighbors?

2. What is the proposed use of the park? Will the park be perceived as open and inviting to the general public? Will the park be compatible with surrounding uses?

3. To what extent has the neighborhood demonstrated a commitment to assist with funding or other contributions to the park?
 - a. initial acquisition
 - b. development, including equipment, furniture, plantings and "sweat equity."
 - c. long term maintenance
 - d. is a Friends of the Park organization proposed?

4. How available is the land for the park? (Without considering cost *per se*)
 - a. Is it already in public ownership?
 - b. If not in public ownership, is the owner willing to sell it?
 - c. If not for sale, is the owner willing to donate it, grant a permanent easement on it, or lease it to the city? Will the park be available in perpetuity and, if not, how practical will it be to convert the park use to private use at the end of that time.

** Approved Pocket Park Criteria #4 was not used in the scoring for these sites as all of the nominated properties are privately owned at this time, and criteria (4b) and (4c) will be pursued in the next phase of this program.*

5. To what degree does the nomination reflect broad support from the neighborhood to acquire and develop the park, and is there agreement about the specific type of use? Is there a known dissenting view?

6. Is there a need for a pocket park or additional pocket parks in the geographical area of the city where the proposed site is located?

Ranked List of Pocket Park Nominations

Pocket Park Nominations - 2005 Ranked List (15 possible points)¹

Nominated Site	Total Score	Square Feet	2005 Assessed Value
2309 Mount Vernon Avenue	15	2,958	\$ 265,100
1 & 7 East Del Ray Avenue	15	14,888	224,100
301 La Verne Avenue	14	4,200	31,400
11 Quaker and 3327 Duke Street	13	15,011	131,600
707 Russell Road	12	5,614	275,900
2207 Mount Vernon Avenue	12	8,663	227,600
4214 Duke Street	11	57,130	1,135,300
724-728 North Patrick Street	11	10,200	444,500
805, 809, 811 North Columbus Street	11	16,897	928,600
150 South Gordon Street	10	72,537	2,563,300
901 North Saint Asaph Street	10	56,319	7,121,000
1023 Duke Street	8	2,743	279,000
209 Pine Street	7	18,118	760,300
101-103 West Mount Ida Avenue	6	8,000	98,900
30 Rosecrest Avenue	6	8,031	285,100
106 East Nelson Avenue	6	10,800	982,600
3500 Mount Vernon Avenue	5	13,880	525,900
3041, 3107, 3111 Mount Vernon Avenue	5	6,600	168,400
3540 Commonwealth Avenue	5	7,910	179,400

¹2004 pocket park nominations not ranked

**Pocket Park Nomination Descriptions
2005 Nominations**

101-103 Mount Ida Avenue: The site consists of two adjoining properties, both 4,000 square feet, at the corner of Hickory Street and West Mount Ida Avenue. The site is currently vacant and flat with some overgrowth. The nomination indicates that the site is located along a major pedestrian route connecting Russell Road and Commonwealth Avenue and would be an ideal corner location for a tot lot and/or benches and trash cans. It was also indicated that any users would be able to walk to the park, and no parking would be required.

Staff Analysis: The property is currently owned by the adjacent property owner on Mt. Ida Avenue. The site was also nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association and identified in the 2004 Open Space Report. With significant community support, the City could consider purchasing one or both of the parcels and/or right of first refusal.

301 La Verne Avenue: The 4,200 square foot site is a substandard corner lot located at the corner of La Verne Avenue and Turner Road and is currently undeveloped. Applications for special use permits to improve the lot have nor been successful to date. The current owner is continuing to pursue development of the site and the community nominations note that immediate action may be necessary to preserve it as open space. It is noted that the site is located near existing trails.

The immediate neighbors within two blocks of the site have been interested for years in creating a park in this location, and most signed a petition attached to their pocket park nomination. The nominator indicated that the group are all long-term homeowners. All the neighbors she has spoken with, and who signed the petition, agreed that they would be active in developing and maintaining the park, including planting, mowing and fundraising for amenities. Existing trees provide necessary shade and reduce the need for purchasing and planting new trees. In the past two months, since Planning Commission denial, the site appears to have turned into a storage lot for the owners. Recently there has been digging and ground disturbance exposing the roots of the trees on the site (documented with photos by a neighbor). The nominator indicates that the location is ideal at the "T" intersection and sees significant foot traffic, including strollers and dog walkers. Though there is another park in fairly close proximity, it is used for a playground. This park would provide a more passive, quiet use for the neighbors (no one living in the immediate vicinity has young children).

Staff Analysis: The property owners have recently submitted another development proposal requiring special use permit approval to develop the property with a single-family house. The site is near the Mount Jefferson Park and Greenway with no other parks in the immediate vicinity. Nominations for this site were made by two groups of neighboring residents with a total of 17 petition signatures (for open space preservation). One group of residents (long-term home

owners in the nearby vicinity have indicated that they would be committed to a schedule of land maintenance, including: mowing, light gardening, weeding and trash pick-up.

707 Russell Road: The 5,614 square foot site is at the corner of West Masonic View Avenue and Russell Road and is currently vacant with a number of mature trees. The nomination indicates a need for a park along Russell Road to counteract the busy thoroughfare that the street has become. A small park with benches or a community garden park for children is proposed.

The nominator indicated that while the site is fairly close in proximity to Beach Park, the use proposed is different (more passive) and Beach Park cannot be seen or directly accessed from Russell Road. A nearby bus stop and significant foot traffic make this an ideal location for a pocket park. Rosemont Garden Club has a proven track record and would be active in developing and maintaining this space. There are a number of trees on the site, so new trees wouldn't be required. The Rosemont Civic Association and/or Garden Club has indicated that it would consider doing a fundraiser for benches and any other amenities, and would also consider a "Friends of...Park."

Staff Analysis: The site is currently privately owned by a trustee of the original owner and no recent activity is noted in City records. Maury Elementary School with Beach Park to the rear is immediately across the street, so the area is currently served with open space/parks. The site was nominated with unanimous support by the Rosemont Civic Association Executive Board.

1 & 7 East Del Ray Avenue (*Also nominated in 2004): The two adjoining properties, 8,625 and 6,263 square feet, are located on the corner of East Del Ray and Commonwealth Avenue and are currently vacant and are zoned residential. The parcel on the corner was used for a non-conforming furniture repair shop prior to being demolished. The second parcel is used for a private vegetable garden. The nomination indicates that the site is ideally located along Commonwealth with many advantages for community use as it connects to the Commonwealth Avenue median open space and many nearby residents can walk to it. A tot-lot and/or community gathering area is proposed. One individual nominator has volunteered contribution of a six foot Japanese Maple as well as time and effort for maintenance.

Response from the community (three individuals sent a response) demonstrates support for the park from the immediate neighbors. The site is already occasionally used as a park by people passing by and is a ideal due to its location at an intersection. The community would like to see a passive use park (no tot lot) with low-maintenance plantings with less grass. They state that the site would require very little other than clean-up for conversion, and indicated an interest in assisting with and contributing some landscaping. They also indicated that they would assist with maintenance. The corner of East Del Ray and Commonwealth has significant foot traffic, and there are no other nearby parks of this nature and with a passive use. It would also be attractive to the many people who drive by on a regular basis. Respondents believe that the owner does not wish to see the site developed with a building. Currently the lots are not maintained by the owner, but the next door neighbor helps out. A group of residents plan to speak to the owner regarding intentions for the site and possible acquisition. The neighbors have been in contact with the Master Gardner's Program. Though no commitment has been made, there seems to be interest. They are also interested in a "Friend's of...Park."

Staff Analysis: The site (two properties) is privately owned. The site is currently not served (within 1/10 mile) by any other parks. The properties were also nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association and identified in the 2004 Open Space Report. With significant community support, the City could consider purchasing one or both of the parcels and/or right of first refusal.

2207 Mount Vernon Avenue (*Also nominated in 2004): The vacant property is located on the east side of Mount Vernon Avenue between Custis and East Del Ray Avenues. It is bordered by commercially zoned and used properties. The nomination indicates that the site is flat and prominently visible by Mount Vernon Avenue street traffic, making it an ideal site for a small village square. In the past it has been used as a gathering space for Art on the Avenue and other special events, though it was recently fenced off.

Staff Analysis: The property is currently owned by a nearby owner of other commercial properties on the street and is nearby to a number of community businesses with heavy local foot traffic, including St. Elmo's Coffee and the Del Ray Dreamery. The site sits inside the 1/10 mile area served by parks and within five blocks of the Mount Vernon Community School and Recreation Center. The property was also nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association and identified in the 2004 Open Space Report. With significant community support, the City could consider purchasing the parcel and/or right of first refusal.

1023 Duke Street (Lease only): The 2,743 square foot site is located at the corner of South Henry and Duke Streets and is currently vacant. The owner, also the nominator for this property, is interested in leasing the site to the City for 5-10 years for use as a pocket park with the potential to build on it after that time. The property and surrounding properties are zoned commercially and used mainly for commercial purposes.

The owner of the site indicated continued interest in leasing the site to the City for 5-8 years with the intention of potential development in the future. He is unsure of community support for a pocket park at this location, but is going to contact the Old Town Civic Association and Eakin Youngentaub development across the street to assess their interest. He did not indicate that he was interested in contributing to the park development beyond establishing the lease.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently owned by Frank Fannon, who has indicated interest in leasing the property to the City for temporary use as a pocket park. It is currently used for parking. The location is not presently served by any parks within 1/10 of a mile and is the only site nominated in the southern part of Old Town. The nomination was made by an individual (the owner), with no community support or objections documented.

30 Rosecrest Avenue (*Also nominated in 2004): The vacant 8,031 square foot site is located at the corner of Russell Road and Rosecrest Avenue. It is relatively flat with no trees, and is visible due to its corner location. It is surrounded by existing residential development. The

property is currently signed: "No Ball Playing." The nomination indicates that the site would be an ideal area for a park with benches and trees or for a tot-lot.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently owned by a housing developer, and the size of the site would meet the current zoning requirements for development of a single family home, but there has been no recent activity documented development request. The property was also nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association and identified in the 2004 Open Space Report. With significant community support, the City could consider purchasing the parcel and/or right of first refusal.

106 East Nelson Avenue: The 10,800 square foot site is located on East Nelson Avenue, close to the corner of Wayne Street. It is currently developed with a single family home, zoned R-2-5. The nomination indicates that the parcel would provide visual relief and opportunity for passive recreation and/or playgrounds. The nominator indicated that there are no other parks in the immediate vicinity and this site is in a very "walkable" location with some trees. It could be used as a break in the block for neighborhood gatherings.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently owned and used for a single family home and the rear yard of the lot is not suited for any development, nor would it be accessible to the public. This nomination was from an individual with no community support indicated.

3500 Mount Vernon Avenue (at West Glebe): The 13,880 square foot site is located at the corner of Mount Vernon Avenue and West Glebe Road, zoned CDD#12. A financial institution and associated parking lot are currently housed on the property. The nomination indicates that the parcel would provide visual relief and opportunity for passive recreation and/or playgrounds. The nominator indicated that she attempt to get support from the community. She believes the Tenant and Workers Support Committee would support a park in this location. Specific comments include:

- The parking lot radiates heat in the summer with no relief and would better serve the community as a park with benches and perhaps a fountain.
- While it is close to Four Mile Run Park, there is little park relief in the immediate vicinity - all paved areas.
- The Tenant and Workers Support Committee does not think the site should be used as a parking lot.
- It could also serve as a park for Presidential Greens residents.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently operated as a local business institution and the owner has not indicated plans to sell. This nomination was from an individual with no community support indicated. The Arlandria Plan approved by Council contemplates a mixed use development on this and adjacent sites.

11 Quaker and 3327 Duke Street (moved from general open space priority list): The vacant site (two properties) is located on the corner of Duke Street and North Quaker Lane. Combined,

the size of the property is 15,011 square feet. The original nomination included the lot owned by the Church for required parking. This third lot was removed from consideration and due to the new size of less than 20,000 square feet, this property was moved from the general open space list. The nomination indicates that a pocket park would be used by the Seminary Hill and adjacent neighborhoods. It also states that this park would offer visual relief, could be walked to by many and is historically significant in commemoration of the history and significance of the development of the City. Historic facts/education could be incorporated into the park. It could also be used as an educational lab related to ecology and environmental balance. The nominating group strongly supports the acquisition of this site for a pocket park and has a number of ideas on how they could participate in maintenance and development. Also see additional information (Attachment 3a) received after deadline from the Seminary Hills Civic Association.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently owned by the owners of the adjacent property and has an approved site plan for development of an office building. Recently a proposal by the owner for a residential/townhouse development was denied by the Planning Commission. The owner could build the office building "by right," and has continued to express interest in further development of the site. The nomination came in from the Seminary Hills Homeowners' Association, but because it did not come in as a pocket park proposal, there is no indication of potential community involvement/commitment. The City could consider acquisition of right of first refusal, though current activity suggests this may not be acceptable to the site owner.

209 Pine Street (at Russell Road): The parcel contains a single family residence on the corner of Pine Street and Russell Road on an 18,118 square foot lot. The zoning is R-8 and the lot is larger than the required 8,000 square feet. The portion fronting Russell Road is vacant with mature oaks, American Holly, dogwood and miscellaneous other mature trees. The proposal indicates that the site would need little if any improvements and that maintenance could be provided by the nominator and other neighbors and would provide the surrounding community (Del Ray, North Ridge and Jefferson Park) with valuable open space, and being on Russell Rd. would also provide visual open space for all those that use it. The nominator believes that continued infill along Russell Rd. make this parcel a prized open space that could be lost to future development if not preserved now (the identical adjacent site was developed in 1999). The nominator intends to approach the immediate neighbors of the site, who have indicated support for a pocket park in this location to assess what and how they would contribute to development and maintenance. He personally is interested in assisting with both. There are two large trees on the site that could be preserved.

Staff Analysis: The site is currently privately owned by the owner and resident of the single family home. There are no current plans that show the owner intends to develop/subdivide the parcel, though it is possible under current zoning. The City would have to subdivide the lot for formal pocket park status. This could be a potential site for an open space easement. The nomination came in from an individual just before the deadline who believes he could obtain community support.

901 North Saint Asaph Street (ABC site): The property is the block bounded by First Street, North Pitt Street and North Saint Asaph Street. Half of the property contains a Giant Grocery store used by the neighborhood, the other half contains an ABC liquor store with a large parking lot. The nomination indicates that this lot is typically empty/unused. It is proposed that the ABC be relocated and then the City should build a pocket park comprising a garden, trees and other public amenities for a community gathering space.

Staff Analysis: While the entire site is 56,319 square feet, larger than the maximum pocket park size, the nomination indicates that only the portion used for the ABC should be converted to park, while the Giant should remain for community use. Development proposals have been submitted to the City for concept review. The nomination came in from an individual with no other community support identified. The State is currently marketing this property for \$12.0 million.

3041, 3107, 3111 Mount Vernon Ave. (Triangle Site - old gas station, Mandarin Inn parking): The nomination supports using the northern portion of the properties identified in the new Mount Vernon Avenue Area Plan as the "Triangle Site" adjacent to Vernon Square Offices. A strip of land along the north portion of at least three of the current parcels could be used to link up with the trails located on the former W&OD to the southeast across Commonwealth Avenue and to the northeast through the Virginia American Water Co. property to the current Glebe Rd. Railbed site. The proposal indicates a benefit to Potomac West residents as well as the City at large, especially those that will occupy the Potomac Yard area. The proposal also indicates interest in the City Adopt-a-Park program.

Staff Analysis: The Triangle Site is clearly denoted and planned for redevelopment in the Mount Vernon Avenue Area Plan. The eleven parcels in this area are currently underutilized and offer significant opportunity for redevelopment. The Plan recommends the coordinated redevelopment of these parcels, with a potential increase in floor area ratio, consistent with defined development standards for a quality multi-family development with publicly visible and usable open space. Using the north section of these parcels was not considered in the Plan's approval. The nomination came in from an individual just before the deadline who believes he could obtain support from the Del Ray Civic Association if necessary.

2004 Nominations

The following sites as potential pocket park sites. Only portions of those sites that are larger than 20,000 square feet are included.

2311 Mount Vernon Avenue: The approximately 7,105 square foot site, also known as the Mt. Vernon/Del Ray Community Gathering Place and nominated by the Del Ray Civic Association, is the parcel next to the city parking lot at the southeast corner of East Oxford and Mt. Vernon (2309 Mt. Vernon). There are no significant natural features, but it is in a good central location and is next to the Del Ray Farmers Market. One dwelling built in 1920 covers about half the lot with an insurance agency office.

724-728 North Patrick Street - Inner City Urban Park: The site is located on North Patrick Street at the southwest corner with Madison Street and is across from the Charles Houston Recreation Center. 724 and 726 Patrick total 6,600 square feet and are vacant. 728 Patrick is 3649 square feet with a building. Combined area is 10,200 square feet. The site is in close proximity to the Recreation Center, but is separated from the Center by heavily used Route 1. Visits would be by bike or foot. A park could provide urban relief in a densely populated area. The Charles Houston Recreation Center property has limited space and the building will soon be undergoing renovation.

805, 809, 811 North Columbus Street (Nominated in 2004 and added to the Pocket Park nominations by the OSSC in 2005): This site is located at the northeast corner of North Columbus and Madison Streets and is part of the Beulah Baptist Church property. The three vacant lots at this site total 16,897 square feet. The site was nominated in 2004 and added to the 2005 Pocket Park nominations list at the end of the review process by the OSSC. Due to the similarities of the sites, this property was then determined to be equal in ranking to the Inner City Urban Park site on North Patrick Street.

150 South Gordon: A portion of this site, located on the corner of South Gordon and Wheeler Avenue, appearing as the triangle of open space at the rear of the property was nominated. The entire site is 72,537 square feet and the maximum pocket park is 20,000 square feet. Staff noted that this is part of a commercial site that provides a buffer area for the neighborhood. Additional community support information was not received for the nomination, but it appears the neighborhood would like to insure that the buffer is maintained. The site is nearby to the 4214 Duke Street parcel and in an area well served by open space and recreation facilities.

4214 Duke Street: The parking lot portion of this site, located at the corner of Duke and South Gordon Streets, was nominated. The site is a commercial site owned by VDOT (Commonwealth of Virginia) and is a total of 57,130 square feet. Additional community support information was not received for the nomination, but as with the 150 South Gordon site, a buffer along Duke Street and South Gordon Street would be provided.

3540 Commonwealth Avenue: The site was mentioned in the 2004 Open Space Priority Report as an additional opportunity. Because it is 7,910 square feet, the OSSC recommended that it be considered as a pocket park in 2005. No additional community support information as received regarding this property. It is located nearby to the Cora Kelly School and is in an area well served by parks.

11 Quaker Lane and 3327 Duke Street - Quaker View

**Expression of Community Support for Proposed Pedestrian Park
at North Quaker Lane and Duke Street (Northeast Corner) ("Quaker View")**

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council of Alexandria, Virginia and Other Interested Parties
c/o Mr. Kirk Kincannon, Director, Department of Recreation Parks and Cultural Architects of the City of Alexandria

FROM: The Quaker View Park Stakeholder's Committee (as listed below)
c/o Richard R. G. Hobson, Esquire
rhobson@mcguirewoods.com

DATE: July 29, 2005

The following organizations, entities, individuals and residents located within the vicinity of the proposed Quaker View Park present the following elements of support for the proposed Quaker View Park, as a pedestrian-oriented public park, in the event that it is purchased and operated by the City of Alexandria.

I. Functional Goals for the Park

A. History

The Seminary Hill Association, Inc. ("SHA") is currently documenting historic buildings and history of the SHA membership area with funds from the Historic Alexandria

18 25

Foundation and the City of Alexandria. Research will include specific documentation of historic information relevant to the Quaker View Park – specifically in the following areas:

1. History of Little River Turnpike

Documentation of the major contribution that the Little River Turnpike (now Virginia State Route 236 and U.S. Route 50) made in the economic development of the port of Alexandria and (as one of the first toll roads) its agricultural hinterland. In addition to its economic contribution, this early transportation capital improvement served as a cultural and social link between Alexandria and the agricultural resources and rural residents as far west as Aldie, Virginia and by means of Alexandria's access to the sea, with other colonies and states of the Atlantic Seaboard and foreign ports.

2. Civil War Heritage – In addition, the foregoing historic research and investigation will document the Civil War era role that nearby fortifications and residences played in the approach, conduct and aftermath of the Civil War. This will include the history of an early pre-civil war school (the "Fairfax School") conducted at "CLARENS", a building still standing, on Quaker Lane and which was a school attended by Custis Lee and George Mifflin Dallas, among other notables. Fort Williams, an integral part of the federal defenses in Washington and Alexandria was located nearby at the crest of the Quaker Lane hill. The Civil War research will describe the role played by General Ashley Cooper, whose farm and residence adjoins the park. General Cooper was the senior Confederate military advisor to President Jefferson Davis throughout the war and retired thereafter to his nearby home on Quaker Lane. He was a friend of

General Robert E. Lee, who as a benefactor was responsible for construction of a post-war residence on the property for General Cooper.

The objective of the research and documentation would be to communicate the historic background of this particular community by appropriate interpretive and educational panels in the Park so that current residents and pedestrians will be informed of this local history. This research will also be integrated into teaching modules which support the Virginia's Standards of Learning initiative in history.

B. Educational and Natural Science Contribution

The landscape design plan is based on the premise that the park will serve as a learning resource for students and adults. Every effort will be made to integrate relevant History, English and Natural Resource Standards of Learning objectives to each component of the park.

1. Planting of native plants and shrubs with identity and description of their presence in the history of Virginia and the local environment.
2. Sponsorship of educational events with the Alexandria Public Schools.

C. Beautification of Duke Street

1. The Park would provide an oasis of green in a heavily traveled urban corridor. Bushes, trees and shrubs would contribute a welcome contrast to concrete, asphalt, multiple lane traffic medians and street lights with heavy truck and automobile traffic. Recent efforts have upgraded some commercial properties and under grounding of utilities has improved the streetscape but there is little greenery and no open space for restful contemplation.

D. Creation of an Opportunity for Spectators for Skate Park and Baseball Field Activity

1. The recent development of the skate park has substantially increased the recreational use of the site immediately across Duke Street from, and at a lower elevation than the Park site. Proper siting of benches would permit parents and visitors to the park to view and monitor activities at both the skate park and baseball field.

E. Encouragement and Enhancement of Pedestrian Use of Duke Street and Quaker Lane

1. There is already considerable pedestrian traffic along Duke Street and on Quaker Lane, including customers patronizing Alexandria Commons, particularly the Giant Food Store as well as other commercial use in the Commons and other retail uses on the south side of Duke Street. Encouragement and enhancement of such pedestrian use will both lessen competition for parking spaces, reduce local automobile traffic and exhaust emissions, and create an opportunity for pedestrians to break their journey from Alexandria Commons to residential development to the west along Duke Street. This Park will afford some opportunity for a pleasurable experience with children or pets and would help to build a sense of community in the area.

II. Potential Sponsor/Endorsers

A. Listed below are current and potential sponsors and supporters of the Park by specific categories of interest.

B. Overall Planning and Support

The following organizations and individuals have formed the initial Stakeholder's Committee to promote planning, and land acquisition and coordinate the various tasks that are part of the design, implementation and ongoing management of the Park.

Current participating members of the Stakeholder's Committee are:

Seminary Hill Association, Inc. – Representatives and Board Members:

Cynthia Gurne (telephone number: 703-461-9227) and
Dick Hobson (telephone number: 703-712-5437)

Quaker Village Homeowners Association:

Suzanne Scoville, President and
Diana T. Cangelosi, Representative

New Apostolic Church of North America, Inc. – Howard W. Miller, Pastor

Clover-College Park Civic Association – James Butler, Representative, Board Member
and Ginny Perry, Representative

Quaker Professional Square Condominium – Jennie Trapasso, Representative

Other Potential Stakeholders: JBG Rosenfeld Retail – Manager of Alexandria Commons, Quaker Hill Homeowners Association

Alexandria Public Schools – Wendy Sparrow, Coordinator of Habitat Gardens

B. Design and Maintenance

Once the property is acquired a team of experts in the field of engineering, landscape design and maintenance will be formed to begin the process of developing plans to convert the property into a park. In addition to experts, we will actively engage key stakeholders in the process. These stakeholders include k-12 students, businesses within walking distance of the park, public service departments and residents within walking distance of the park through their civic, homeowner, condo, property management or other representative group.

The following entities have offered an initial support of concept. It is anticipated that the Stakeholder's Committee will develop a plan that offers both financial and non-financial incentives to sponsors to encourage continuous support of the park.

Jim Luby, Manager of Hollywood and Vine and retired employee National Botanical Gardens, New Apostolic Church, Wendy Sparrow, Alexandria Public Schools and coordinator of habitat gardens.

III. Funding Sources

The Stakeholder's Committee has begun to address the issue of initial and continuous costs associated with the Quaker View Park initiative. We will pursue creating a non-profit foundation to facilitate a continuous funding option with incentives to support the educational and public purposes of the Park.

IV. Monitoring of Use of Park

The New Apostolic Church, Seminary Hill Association Inc. and Quaker Village Homeowners Association will appoint designated representatives who reside or work in the area in the immediate vicinity of the Park to monitor its use, report regularly to responsible City Staff and to help with maintenance.

V. Sharing of Litter control and Minor Maintenance Responsibilities

Seminary Hill Association will take the initiative in being a lead in participating in the City "Adopt a Park" program.

The foregoing is respectfully submitted:

The Quaker View Park Stakeholder's Committee

Quaker Village Homeowners Association

By: Suzanne Scoville
President

6
~~23~~

30


Seminary Hill Association, Inc.

By: Cynthia Gurne and Richard R. G. Hobson,
Representatives and Board Members

New Apostolic Church of North America, Inc.

By: Howard W. Miller
Pastor

7
~~24~~ 31




~~25~~

32

Pocket Park Nominations

- 2005 NOMINATION POCKET PARKS
 - EXISTING POCKET PARKS
 - EXISTING PUBLIC PARKS
 - PRIVATE OWNED WITH PUBLIC ACCESS
 - PRIVATE OWNED WITH NO PUBLIC ACCESS (AMENITY IS PROVIDED)
 - 1/10 MILE SERVICE AREA (328 FEET OR APPROX. 2.5 BLOCKS)
- CITY OF ALEXANDRIA
09/05

Not to Scale




**"POCKET PARKS"
AND IMMEDIATE AREAS SERVED BY PARKS**



- KEY**
- EXISTING POCKET PARKS
 - EXISTING PUBLIC PARKS
 - PRIVATE OWNED WITH PUBLIC ACCESS
 - PRIVATE OWNED WITH NO PUBLIC ACCESS (AS PART OF A DEVELOPMENT)
 - SERVICE AREA FOR EXISTING PUBLIC PARKS





CITY OF ALEXANDRIA
11/7/06

Not to Scale








EXISTING POCKET PARKS
WITH CITY DEMOGRAPHICS BASED ON
YEAR 2000 CENSUS BLOCK CENSUSES

KEY

-  EXISTING PARKS
-  ST. ROADS
-  EXISTING POCKET PARKS
-  EXISTING POCKET PARK - 100' W/ 100' W/ 100' AREA

Population Density
People per Acre

-  0-10.00
-  10.01 - 20.00
-  20.01 - 30.00
-  30.01 - 40.00
-  40.01 - 65.00

Not to Scale



CITY OF ALDHAMORA 7/26/04

27 34

EXHIBIT NO. 2

8:9
9-20-05

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 14, 2005

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: JAMES K. HARTMANN, CITY MANAGER *J*

SUBJECT: UPDATED INFORMATION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE OPEN SPACE STEERING COMMITTEE 2005 RECOMMENDATIONS

ISSUE: Updated Information Concerning the Status of the Open Space Steering Committee 2005 Recommendations

DISCUSSION: On June 14, 2005, City Council received the Open Space Steering Committee's recommendations regarding the 2005 Open Space Priority nominations, with a public hearing to be scheduled on September 17, 2005, which was then rescheduled to September 20, 2005. In order to put the recommendations in context, the June memo also updates Council on the implementation steps it and the Committee have taken over the last two years, and updates Council on the status of its approved Priority Sites from 2004.

Following the June 14, 2005 hearing, staff sent notification letters to each of the property owners whose properties were designated in the report. The letters briefly described the Open Space Steering Committee process for review of nominated sites with potential open space value, and alerted the owners that a public hearing would be held (Attachments 1 and 2). Potential pocket park site owners were also notified of the hearing by letter (Attachment 3).

Staff subsequently received questions from several of the notified property owners with questions or concerns about their property's open space designation. Twelve calls were received, and three letters were received from property owners. One attorney, representing a property owner, requested a meeting to review the status of a listed property. That meeting was held on September 7. At that meeting, and in all other communications, staff responded to questions and sought to clarify any misunderstanding regarding potential City actions.

Over the summer, the public hearing date was changed from September 17 to September 20, 2005. Each property owner has been notified via mail of the rescheduled hearing date and time.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1. Open Space Priority Site Notification Letter

Attachment 2. Voluntary Conservation Easement Letter

Attachment 3. Pocket Park Notification Letter

STAFF:

Kirk Kincannon, Director, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

Attachment 1: Open Space Priority Site Notification Letter

July 5, 2005

Address

Dear Property Owner:

As you are aware, the goal of preserving open space has been identified as a top priority in the City of Alexandria by both our citizens and the City Council. In order to achieve that goal, the City created a citizen comprised Open Space Steering Committee to identify specific properties in the City which are attractive sites (or could be made attractive sites) with open space attributes, and which contribute (or could contribute) to open space values, environmental quality, and the beauty of the City. There are many means for protecting open space properties, including acquisition by the City, or the establishment of conservation easements.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know that the properties at ___ has been identified by the Open Space Steering Committee as one of 18 potential priority open space opportunity sites. The Committee's report has been provided to the City Council who has set the report for public hearing on Saturday, September 17, 2005*. After the public hearing Council will act to adopt the priority list in its current or amended form.

The Open Space Steering Committee report has been posted on the City's web site at (www.alexandriava.gov) under the City Council June 14, 2005 Action Docket. If you have any questions, or would like to learn more about the City's open space program, please call Laura Durham, Open Space Committee Coordinator in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities at (703) 838-5041.

Sincerely,

Kirk Kincannon, Director
Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

* Property owners were notified of date change to September 20

3

37

Attachment 2: Voluntary Conservation Easement Notification Letter

July 1, 2005

Address

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Sayers:

As you may be aware, the goal of preserving open space has been identified as a top priority in the City of Alexandria by both our citizens and the City Council. In order to achieve that goal, the City created a citizen-comprised Open Space Steering Committee to identify specific properties in the City which are attractive sites with open space attributes and which contribute to open space values, environmental quality, and the beauty of the City. Your property at ___ is a site which was identified by the Open Space Steering Committee as a property that would provide value to the City, if protected by a voluntary conservation easement. Such an easement can be on the part of the property which does not contain improvements, and would be permanent, but would only be established if you were willing to provide it. I want to emphasize the fact that the City's creation of an open space easement is totally voluntary in nature and is solely your decision as the property owner.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that your property address is on the list of five new proposed voluntary conservation easement properties which the Open Space Steering Committee has forwarded to the Alexandria City Council for their consideration. Council has scheduled a public hearing on Saturday September 17, 2005*, before acting to adopt this list in its current or amended form. Inclusion on the list does not change the voluntary nature of the program.

The Open Space Steering Committee report has been posted on the City's web site at (www.alexandriava.gov). If you have any questions, or would like to learn more about voluntary conservation easements, please call Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities at (703) 838-5041.

Sincerely,

Kirk Kincannon, Director
Recreation Parks and Cultural Activities

* Property owners were notified of date change to September 20

X

38

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION, PARKS
AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIESKirk Kincannon
Director1108 Jefferson Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3999Phone (703) 838-4343
Fax (703) 838-6344

September 5, 2005

Dear Property Owner:

As you are aware, the goal of preserving open space has been identified as a top priority in the City of Alexandria by both our citizens and the City Council. In March, 2005 the City adopted a new Pocket Park program and associated criteria as part of its overall Open Space Plan. The program is intended to help preserve and create neighborhood-oriented open space/parks throughout that the City, especially in currently underserved areas. The approved program allowed for citizen nominations of properties of 20,000 square feet in area or less for potential acquisition by the City. The City of Alexandria Open Space Steering Committee received and reviewed these nominations in the spring of 2005 and staff will be presenting their findings at the September 20, 2005 City Council Public Hearing.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know that the property at _____ was nominated and included in the Open Space Steering Committee's review. The Committee's findings will be provided to the City Council on September 13, 2005, who will then schedule the findings for public hearing on Tuesday, September 20, 2005. After the public hearing Council will act to adopt the pocket park list in its current or amended form. Properties approved by Council as potential pocket parks would then be considered for purchase by the City.

The Open Space Steering Committee findings will be posted on the City's web site at (www.alexandriava.gov) under the City Council September 13, 2005 Docket. If you have any questions, or would like to learn more about the City's open space program, please call Laura Durham, Open Space Committee Coordinator in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities at (703) 838-5041.

Sincerely,

Kirk Kincannon, Director
Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities

cc: Mark Jinks, Asst. City Manager

alexandriava.gov

5

39



8
9-20-05

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Office of the Governor

Sandra D. Bowen
Secretary of Administration

September 13, 2005

(804) 786-1301
Fax: (804) 371-0038
TTY: (804) 786-7765

The Honorable William D. Euile, Mayor
City of Alexandria
301 King Street, Suite 2300
Alexandria, VA 22314

Via Telefax (703-838-6433)

Re: 901 St. Asaph Street, Alexandria

Dear Mayor Euile:

This morning I received by fax a copy of a September 5, 2005, letter from Alexandria's Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities addressed to the Virginia Alcoholic Beverage Control Board and received by ABC, 9/12/05. This letter informs the Commonwealth for the first time that its St. Asaph property is being included in a list of Alexandria properties being presented to City Council as "potential pocket parks".

The Commonwealth's 901 St. Asaph property is over 56,000 square feet, considerably more than the 20,000 square feet maximum size contemplated by Alexandria in its "pocket park" program. The Commonwealth does not own or control the contiguous "Giant site" that makes up about one-third of the block. Moreover, as you know, the Commonwealth has actively marketed its property pursuant to instructions of the General Assembly. This effort to sell the property has included the City at every step to make certain the sale recognized the highest and best use of the land consistent with Alexandria's land use planners.

For all these reasons, we respectfully request that the 901 St. Asaph property be removed from consideration for the program. We are well along in our sale process and hope that this unexpected development does not have an adverse effect on our collaborative efforts.

Very truly and respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard B. Zorn".

Richard B. Zorn
Deputy Secretary of Administration

P.O. Box 1475 • Richmond, Virginia 23218

40

TRANSACTIONAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
UNDER STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONFLICT OF INTERESTS ACT
for Members of Alexandria City Council
and of Other City Boards and Commissions and for
City Officers and Employees
Virginia Code § 2.2-3115(G)

1. Name: William D. Euille

2. Member of: City Council _____ (City Office or Department)
_____ (Board or Commission)

3. Transaction: # 8 Docket/Agenda Item Sept. 20, 2005 Meeting Date
_____ (Other)

4. Nature of Personal Interest Affected by Transaction: I own property at
106 East Nelson Avenue, and am a member of the group of owners of property
nominated for possible acquisition under the City's Pocket Park Program.


5. I declare, in light of my above-described personal interest in the identified Transaction (check one of the following):

a. That I am required to disqualify myself from participating in the Transaction.

b. That, although I am not required to disqualify myself, I have nonetheless elected to disqualify myself from participating in the Transaction.

c. That I am a member of a business, a profession, an occupation or a group, all the members of which have a personal interest in the Transaction, and that I am able to participate in the Transaction fairly, objectively and in the public interest.


Sept. 20, 2005
Date


Signature 41

8 & 9
9-20-05

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2005
TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL
FROM: JAMES K. HARTMANN, CITY MANAGER 
SUBJECT: PROPOSED DEFERRAL OF OPEN SPACE AND POCKET PARK DOCKET ITEMS

I recommend that Council defer the Open Space and Pocket Park docket items (Docket Items # 8 and #9). This will enable staff to review the process that was used, confer with the Open Space Steering Committee and owners of property on the acquisition list and evaluate the acquisition, maintenance and other costs prior to Council consideration of these two docket items.

cc: Co-Chairs and Members of Open Space Steering Committee
Kirk Kincannon, Director, Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
Michele Evans, Assistant City Manager
Mark Jinks, Assistant City Manager
Aimee Vosper, Landscape Architect
Laura Durham, Open Space Coordinator
Jackie Henderson, City Clerk
Gloria Sitton, Deputy City Clerk

8e9
9-20-05



<brian.oconnell1@verizon.net>

09/14/2005 10:25 AM

Please respond to
<brian.oconnell1@verizon.net>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>

cc
bcc

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
Subject councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

Time: [Wed Sep 14, 2005 10:25:42] IP Address: [67.110.167.178]

Response requested:

First Name: Brian and Kaye
Last Name: O'Connell
Street Address: 718 Fontaine St
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22302
Phone: 703-836-7028
Email Address: brian.oconnell1@verizon.net

This regards the consideration of the City
acquiring a conservation easement on the
property at 724 Fontaine Street under the City's
Open Space program. We are the owners of that
property.

Comments: We are NOT interested in establishing a
conservation easement on 724 Fontaine Street
and would like it removed from further
consideration.

In a letter of September 1, 2005 we wrote to the
Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural
Activities, we expressed our dismay at how the

property was selected by the Open Space Steering Committee and no one from the committee or City staff advised of that proposal until AFTER the Committee made a report to the City Council on June 14, 2005.

8:9
9-20-05



<Katy_Cannady20@comcast.net
>

09/14/2005 04:49 PM

Please respond to
<Katy_Cannady20@comcast.net>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>

cc
bcc

Subject City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

Time: [Wed Sep 14, 2005 16:49:59] IP Address: [208.59.89.57]

Response requested: []

First Name: Katy
Last Name: Cannady
Street Address: 20 East Oak Street
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22301
Phone: 703 549-9386
Email Address: Katy_Cannady20@comcast.net

Dear Mayor Euille and Members of Council:

I will be away from Alexandria on September 20
so I am sending you my top two picks for open
space acquisition.

The first parcel is 602 Madison. We need to BUY
this parcel now. If we don't, the owner will have a
condo building in place before another year
passes. At present it is a pleasant grassy area
that could easily become a park. My
understanding is that this is the last portion of the
site of the Parker Gray High School that is not
covered over with new construction. We could put

45

a memorial or interpretive sign that gives the history of Parker-Gray School on the site. As far as I know there is nothing to commemorate Parker-Gray except the name on street signs.

Comments:

The 602 Madison site used to be part of a neighborhood that was all warehouses and low income housing. No one thought this was a community that was entitled to civic amenities such as parks. We can't amend the past neglect, but we shouldn't continue it either. Today the neighborhood is filling up with condos and new townhouses. No one has a front lawn or a back yard. If we really are serious about providing open space in neighborhoods which have none now, this is the place.

My home civic association in Rosemont submitted a list of possible pocket parks. I support acquisition of everything on the list which was carefully thought out. However, my top pick is the land behind the 400 block of Commonwealth Avenue that is a linear strip between Maple and Walnut. At least half of this land is already owned by the city. The entire parcel, including the city's, is not maintained at all. It has a coating of black top that is broken up with tall weeds growing through the cracks. It has looked terrible since before I arrived in Rosemont in 1996.

The city should be able to obtain the part in private ownership, a small unbuildable area over an encapsulated stream without much if any cost. The Rosemont Garden Club could be enlisted to do a lot of the labor of restoration into a nice little linear park. Right now the area is a civic disgrace.

889
9-20-05



<brian.oconnell1@verizon.net>
09/15/2005 08:59 AM
Please respond to
<brian.oconnell1@verizon.net>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,
cc
bcc

Subject City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

Time: [Thu Sep 15, 2005 08:59:37] IP Address: [67.110.167.178]

Response requested:

First Name: Wayne
Last Name: Christensen
Street Address: 722 Fontaine Street
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22302
Phone: 703-836-2351
Email Address: brian.oconnell1@verizon.net

I am sending this message on behalf of my
Father-in-Law, Wayne Christensen, who is an 85
year old retired gentleman who does not have
e-mail. My name is Brian O'Connell and I live next
door at 718 Fontaine Street.

Comments: Mr. Christensen was notified by the Director of
Recreation Parks and Culture that his property at
722 Fontaine Street has been identified by the
Alexandria Open Space Steering Committee for
possible voluntary conservation easement. Prior
to the letter of July 5, 2005 there was no contact
by the Open Space Steering Committee or City
staff to seek his views on the proposed action.

Mr. Christensen declines to have a conservation easement placed on his property and requests City Council drop further consideration of such a proposal.

Thank you,

**Brian O'Connell
on behalf of Wayne Christensen**



<jbutler@nachri.org>

09/18/2005 12:06 PM

Please respond to
<jbutler@nachri.org>

8:9

9-20-05

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,

cc

bcc

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,

Subject councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

Time: [Sun Sep 18, 2005 12:06:34] IP Address: [66.44.55.8]

Response requested: []

First Name: Jim
Last Name: Butler
Street Address: 406 Skyhill Road
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22314
Phone: 703-797-6018
Email Address: jbutler@nachri.org;butlers2@erols.com
Honorable Mayor, Vice-Mayor and Members of
Council:

Re: Pocket Park item on September 20 agenda

I am writing on behalf of the Clover-College Park
Civic Association Board of Directors. At our last
meeting we unanimously voted to support the
request for favorable consideration and approval
of the Quaker View Pocket Park at the corner of
Quaker Lane and Duke Street.(11 Quaker and
3327 Duke St.) We fully support this request
which has strong community backing and interest.

A working group of citizen activists, including leaders of civic associations, the church adjacent to the property and commercial interests along Duke St., support this request.

Comments:

The amended request provides both historic and educational components that the enhanced landscaping and planned displays would provide to make this site an attraction for both school children and adults. The plan is to preserve and display some of the history of this part of Alexandria, in cooperation with the history project coordinated through the Seminary Hill Association, and to provide opportunity for young people to learn not only of the history of the area but also environmental lessons from planned educational features about native plants and trees that are a part of this proposed small park. The site would provide an attractive view at this busy intersection and also greenspace as a transition from the commercial properties immediately to the east on Duke Street and the condominium and residential sections to the north and west on Quaker and Duke.

We urge you to authorize funding for this proposed park. Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Butler, President
Clover-College Park Civic Association

8

9-20-05



Ellen Pickering
<elpickering@juno.com>

09/18/2005 06:31 PM

To <erwagner@comcast.net>, <Jim.Hartman@alexandriava.gov>

cc <jnoritake@erols.com>, <jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov>

bcc

Subject Docket #8 Pocket Parks

In my opinion, the listing of item #8 is incorrect and Very misleading to the Public and City Council.....the Task Force received the nominations for pocket parks from the general public....evaluated them according the Criteria approved by City Council...and submitted their findings to the City Manager as the task force is a product of the City Manger....Regardless of the numerical number next to a nominated site the task force did not make a priority list...at least I don't remember treating the evaluation according to the CRITERIA as choosing sites in a **priority order**.....If the word "ranking " is used, it would only reference how a site appeared when compared to the Council approved Criteria.....Were we to make recommendations, I am certain the list would be in a VERY Different order.....and perhaps a note to the City Manager added stating sites that the Task Force did not think appropriate for the Council's consideration for Pocket Parks. It appears to me that the memo for #8 has been written by some other entity than the task force.....

If City Council, at the meeting of the 20th of September, tries to publicly placate all the calls they received regarding docket item #8 they will fulfill the plan to make Council and the whole process look foolish by some folks who enjoy such an exercise.....(Sympathetic phone calls to land owners should suffice)

It might be best if City Council deferred the item or accepted the manger's memo and formed a City Council sub committee to address the Pocket Park issue including nominations from the public and the future role of a open space steering committee..... Ellen Pickering

8:9

9-20-05



<ptoulmin@post.harvard.edu>

09/20/2005 02:58 PM

Please respond to
<ptoulmin@post.harvard.edu>

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>,
<council@joycewoodson.net>, <councilmangaines@aol.com>,
<council@krupicka.com>, <macdonaldcouncil@msn.com>,

cc
bcc

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,

Subject councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

City of Alexandria Website Contact Us - EMail for Mayor,
Vice-Mayor and Council Members (alexvamayor@aol.com,
delpepper@aol.com, council@joycewoodson.net,
councilmangaines@aol.com, council@krupicka.com,
macdonaldcouncil@msn.com, paulcsmedberg@aol.com,
rose.boyd@alexandriava.gov, jackie.henderson@alexandriava.gov,
tom.raycroft@alexandriava.gov)

Time: [Tue Sep 20, 2005 14:58:15] IP Address: [69.3.159.223]

Response requested: []

First Name: Priestley
Last Name: Toulmin
Street Address: 418 Summers Drive
City: Alexandria
State: Virginia
Zip: 22301
Phone: 703-549-2375
Email Address: ptoulmin@post.harvard.edu

Statement to the Council of the City of Alexandria
Regarding the report, "Recommendations of the
Open Space Steering Committee"
20 September 2005

My name is Priestley Toulmin. My wife and I own
and live at 418 Summers Drive, which the Open
Space Committee has included on their list of
properties "Recommended for Voluntary
Conservation Easements". The basis for this
recommendation seems to be their
characterization of the property as an "oversized
lot". I have not been able to find a definition of that
term, but 418 Summers Drive is a single lot of

52

34,899 square feet, or about 4/5 of an acre, on which sit our house, a separate two-car garage, and a woodshed. The adjoining vacant lot, 422 Summers, which we also own, contains 14,727 square feet (1/3 acre); although shown on the subdivision plat as zoned R-8, we have been advised that it is not a buildable lot.

Comments:

We have two concerns. First, what are the consequences of including our home on this list? Although the text emphasizes the voluntary nature of the easements suggested, and states that public access is not presently available and "would not be required...in the future", a faint whiff of potential coercion is unavoidable. If all that is intended is conversation with conservation organizations, formal designation in an official City document seems unnecessary. It is also unclear what additional protection is provided by a conservation easement on a property that is already zoned for single-family residential use. If it is argued that zoning can be changed, surely an easement can be voided. As a professional geologist, I may take a somewhat longer view than many, but suppose that in 1850 a high-minded, public-spirited farmer had put an easement on a dairy farm covering much of what is now Rosemont or Del Ray, requiring that it never be developed to a higher density than it then had. Do you suppose that restriction would have survived to the present? Of course not. Social and economic pressures would long since have led to its being nullified. No one knows what the Alexandria of 2150 will look like, but surely it will be as different from today as today is from 1850, and well-meaning resolutions of today will have become irrelevant. That is not to say that we should not try to preserve the environment and amenities that we enjoy as long and as well as we can, but only that some more appropriate and effective means be sought.

A second concern has to do with what we see as a piecemeal, parcel-by-parcel approach. There are two other properties on the list abutting or visible from our home, larger than ours and potentially developable; should either or both of those be developed to a high density, the impact on our place would be great, and much of the environmental character that we value would be lost. Were we alone to have granted the sort of easement requested, our relative postage stamp of "open space" would have lost most of its value, and our sacrifice would be for nought.

8:9
9-20-05



"Marguerite Lang"
<margueritel@hotmail.com>
09/20/2005 05:33 PM

To <alexvamayor@aol.com>, <council@joycewoodson.net>, <council@krupicka.com>, <Councilmangaines@aol.com>, <delpepper@aol.com>, <jackie.henderson@ci.alexandria.va.us>, cc bcc
Subject Re: Open Space Steering Committee Pocket Park Nomination: 707 Russell Road

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of City Council,

I have sent and discussed the following message with Laura Durham:

"Re: Open Space Steering Committee Pocket Park Nomination: 707 Russell Road

Dear Ms Durham,

More information has come to light concerning the property at 707 Russell Road. The family of the present owner, Mrs. Helen Horwich, does not intend to sell the property but instead to retain the property that they have had for eighty-one years. I am told that a family member will continue to live in the house that adjoins the vacant lot and that there is no intention of selling 707 Russell Road. This is a welcome outcome for the Rosemont community, a family homestead and open space is preserved.

Based on this information the Rosemont Citizens Association would like to withdraw its nomination of 707 Russell Road for purchase by the City for a pocket park. We would, though, like to see the City pursue the course of purchasing the right of first refusal in the case that circumstances change and the family decides to sell the property. "

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Marguerite L Lang
President, Rosemont Citizens Association
703.684.6534

 **EPISCOPAL
HIGH SCHOOL**

8
9-20-05

September 6, 2005

TO: Ms. Judy Noritake
Mr. Eric Wagner
Co-Chairs, Open Space Steering Committee


FROM: F. Robertson Hershey for Episcopal High School and
Martha J. Horne for The Virginia Theological Seminary

RE: Open Space Steering Committee

Episcopal High School and the Virginia Theological Seminary would like to respond jointly to the June 9, 2005 recommendations of the Open Space Steering Committee. The stewardship of our properties for over 175 years provides clear indication that we value the principles of environmental quality and beauty which are the foundation of the Open Space initiative. As each of our institutions strives to carry out our mission, we will continue to respect the issues of green space, climate control, beauty and tree canopy which have guided the development of our campuses across the years. Our objectives are aligned with those of the City, and we would like to proceed with the voluntary understanding which has characterized our relationship across several centuries rather than to establish any specific conservation easement. The City can count on us to continue to make our campuses available upon request for appropriate public purposes. It is our goal to continue to be good stewards of our campus resources and responsible citizens of the City of Alexandria.

FRH/vvk

cc: ✓ The Honorable William D. Euille, Mayor
Mr. James K. Hartmann, City Manager



F. Robertson Hershey
Headmaster


1200 North Quaker Lane
Alexandria, VA 22302
frh@episcopalhighschool.org

School 703-933-3000
Fax 703-933-3017
www.episcopalhighschool.org

869
9-20-05

Esther J. Horwich, Attorney At Law

**11 Beacon Street, Suite 1210, Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: 617.523.1150 Fax: 617.275.8000**



September 16, 2005

Mayor William D. Euille
Vice Mayor Redella S. "Del" Pepper
Councilwoman Joyce Woodson
Councilman Ludwig P. Gaines
Councilman K. Rob Krupicka
Councilman Andrew H. Macdonald
Councilman Paul C. Smedberg
City Manager Jim Hartmann
Assistant City Manager Mark Jinks
Alexandria City Hall
301 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

RE: Public Hearing Scheduled for September 20, 2005
Opposition to Inclusion of 707 Russell Road on List of Pocket Parks

Dear Mayor Euille, City Councilors and City Manager Hartmann:

Please accept this letter on behalf of my elderly and ailing mother, Helen Horwich, who owns through a trust in which my sister Elaine Brand is trustee, the undeveloped land known as numbered as 707 Russell Road, in Alexandria, Virginia. This land forms most of the side yard of the house in which my mother was born and in which she raised her children.

Not until September 10, 2005, did my sister, as trustee of the above property, receive in the mail a letter from the Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities which was dated September 5, 2005. This letter stated that persons unknown had "nominated" this land to be included in the Open Space Steering Committee's review of sites to be acquired by the City of Alexandria as pocket parks. Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee had allowed itself many months to review the properties and make its recommendations, we were provided with only ten days notice of a public hearing on whether this property would be considered for "public acquisition" by the City of Alexandria. Frankly, I am astounded that the City would operate in such an inconsiderate and unfair manner - not only in failing to advise my family that City personnel had been

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 2

scouting the property with intentions of potentially acquiring it, but also in scheduling a public hearing with so little notice to our family. Regrettably, I can not attend the hearing so my letter will have to suffice to express what I believe would be my mother's feelings about this "nomination."

To place this letter in context, let me tell you a little bit about the history of the property. Approximately 93 years ago, my grandparents emigrated from Russia and became hard working citizens of the United States. Twelve years later, they invested everything that they had earned from working in Alexandria to purchase the land in the 700 block of Russell Road. This land in what was then a rural area serviced only by dirt roads, consisted of the entire block bounded by Masonic View Avenue and Chapman Street, and Russell Road and Commonwealth Avenue. My grandfather, in the heat of summer, built apartment houses on Chapman Street and bungalows on Masonic View. He sold the property abutting Commonwealth Avenue to a church and built the family house on the property abutting Russell Road. To the right of the house is a side yard. The side yard on the left near Masonic View Avenue is officially designated for legal purposes as 707 Russell Road, although it contains no structures.

My mother was born in the upstairs bedroom of the house in 1925. For all of her life, she has been committed to the preservation and maintenance of the house and its grounds. She used to enjoy the view of the garden from the kitchen window and would watch the birds that would come to eat out of the feeders. Ill health has forced her to live in a more protective environment, but she always asks about the house. She would be devastated to learn that someone had surreptitiously nominated the side yard to be separated from the ownership of the house. This is why I, rather than she, am writing this letter. I could not bear to see her distraught and overwhelmed with that knowledge. Similarly, I know that my grandparents would have been stunned and greatly disappointed if they thought that the City intended to wrest away from their family what they had worked so hard to acquire and what they considered to be their piece of the American dream. They would be similarly shocked, dismayed, and disappointed to learn that their government, which they trusted implicitly, had deliberately kept their plan to do this secret from the family until a mere ten days before a hearing on the matter.

My sister and I grew up in Alexandria and attended the public schools. My sister is an educator in the Alexandria City Public School System. Her daughter, who attends George Mason University, eventually stands to inherit the house. For her sake, I would hate to see the house separated from the land that my

grandparents always intended to be a part of the property. It is a legacy that my family deeply respects.

I understand that at least at the present time, the City is seeking voluntary participation and is not planning to proceed by eminent domain to seize property. However, should that approach change, I would like to be on record as completely and unequivocally opposing this process as it greatly and materially affects this property.

While I appreciate the need for parks in the city, I question the wisdom behind the City's interest in this particular property. Maury School provides a large open space, ball field and playground and Beach Park, which measures 1.3 acres, is located just across the street. Thus, this is not the situation where a small patch of greenery will provide a respite from urban sprawl. In addition, Russell Road is a busy street and it is of dubious wisdom to encourage children to cross the street to leave the larger pre-existing park. Another large expanse of land complete with a children's playground is part of the Church property just down the block on Commonwealth Avenue.

The amount of land in question is small and would not attract residents from anywhere but the immediate neighborhood. The neighborhood presently consists mostly of houses with yards and small gardens and trees. The addition of this small property to the park system would not fill a void in the ecological lives of the local residents. The presence of a bus stop nearby is irrelevant, because it is extremely unlikely that people would use public transportation to go to a tiny park where the city and surrounding areas have so many other parks with far superior features and amenities.

A driveway to the house presently runs over the land at 707 Russell Road and leads to the door which serves as the primary entrance and egress to the house. Inability to access that driveway would essentially eliminate the usefulness of that entrance and would significantly devalue the house.

The house would also be devalued by the potential presence of a noisy park. Presently, the school yard across the street and well as the street itself provides a certain level of noise to household residents. Placing a park immediately on the side of the house near bedrooms would remove a buffer from that noise and in fact, increase the noise from the activities in the park.

The land is not of historic significance nor are there any special ecological features to the land. Many of the trees on the property have been affected by

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 4

Dutch Elm disease and other diseases of aged trees. Sadly, their longevity is questionable.

It was only after receiving the notice from the City that we learned that the Rosemont Citizen's Association was responsible for the "nomination" of my mother's land as a pocket park. It is regrettable that the Rosemont Citizen's Association was so eager that the City acquire this property that it nominated it without even making any attempt to discuss this with anyone in my family and particularly my sister, who maintains the property due to my mother's ill health. The Rosemont Citizen's Association did not even have the courtesy to place a note regarding their intentions in the mail or slide it under the door. A great deal of time has been expended as a result of this nomination, both by the Committee in reviewing this request, and my sister and I in representing our mother's interests. If the Rosemont Citizen's Association is so interested in improving the neighborhood, perhaps they should approach owners of buildings in need of renovation and see whether they would be willing to tear down their properties to create a park where no greenery had been present, rather than go behind the back of an unsuspecting elderly landowner to seize ownership of a family homestead. That would be a much more valuable use of their time.

Out of respect for my mother's wishes, my sister, who is the trustee of the property and I will vehemently oppose any attempt to separate this land from that of the main house. We are quite prepared to utilize whatever remedies are available, whether through the legal system, a publicity campaign or the court of public opinion. In this era of limited money for essential city services, a municipal land grab that would arguably, if at all, benefit only a few local residents and which would remove privately held property from the tax base is politically unwise and fiscally irresponsible. In light of the existence of other properties whose owners might be more willing to part with them, I would respectfully request that you approach them and cease any further efforts to acquire this property. In particular, I request that you specifically amend the list of potential pocket parks to exclude this property.

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 5

Should you have any questions or require any additional information,
please contact me.

Sincerely yours,



Esther J. Horwich

EH:ai

cc: Kirk Kincannon, Director
Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
1108 Jefferson Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Laura.Durham@alexandriava.gov

Ecorr/House1A.doc

8 E 9
9-20-05

Esther J. Horwich, Attorney At Law

**11 Beacon Street, Suite 1210, Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: 617.523.1150 Fax: 617.275-8000**

September 16, 2005

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
ALEXANDRIA, VA
2005 SEP 20 A 10:34

Mayor William D. Euille
Vice Mayor Redella S. "Del" Pepper
Councilwoman Joyce Woodson
Councilman Ludwig P. Gaines
Councilman K. Rob Krupicka
Councilman Andrew H. Macdonald
Councilman Paul C. Smedberg
City Manager Jim Hartmann
Assistant City Manager Mark Jinks
Alexandria City Hall
301 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

RE: Public Hearing Scheduled for September 20, 2005
Opposition to Inclusion of 707 Russell Road on List of Pocket Parks

Dear Mayor Euille, City Councilors and City Manager Hartmann:

Please accept this letter on behalf of my elderly and ailing mother, Helen Horwich, who owns through a trust in which my sister Elaine Brand is trustee, the undeveloped land known as numbered as 707 Russell Road, in Alexandria, Virginia. This land forms most of the side yard of the house in which my mother was born and in which she raised her children.

Not until September 10, 2005, did my sister, as trustee of the above property, receive in the mail a letter from the Director of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities which was dated September 5, 2005. This letter stated that persons unknown had "nominated" this land to be included in the Open Space Steering Committee's review of sites to be acquired by the City of Alexandria as pocket parks. Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee had allowed itself many months to review the properties and make its recommendations, we were provided with only ten days notice of a public hearing on whether this property would be considered for "public acquisition" by the City of Alexandria. Frankly, I am astounded that the City would operate in such an inconsiderate and unfair manner -- not only in failing to advise my family that City personnel had been

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 2

scouting the property with intentions of potentially acquiring it, but also in scheduling a public hearing with so little notice to our family. Regrettably, I can not attend the hearing so my letter will have to suffice to express what I believe would be my mother's feelings about this "nomination."

To place this letter in context, let me tell you a little bit about the history of the property. Approximately 93 years ago, my grandparents emigrated from Russia and became hard working citizens of the United States. Twelve years later, they invested everything that they had earned from working in Alexandria to purchase the land in the 700 block of Russell Road. This land in what was then a rural area serviced only by dirt roads, consisted of the entire block bounded by Masonic View Avenue and Chapman Street, and Russell Road and Commonwealth Avenue. My grandfather, in the heat of summer, built apartment houses on Chapman Street and bungalows on Masonic View. He sold the property abutting Commonwealth Avenue to a church and built the family house on the property abutting Russell Road. To the right of the house is a side yard. The side yard on the left near Masonic View Avenue is officially designated for legal purposes as 707 Russell Road, although it contains no structures.

My mother was born in the upstairs bedroom of the house in 1925. For all of her life, she has been committed to the preservation and maintenance of the house and its grounds. She used to enjoy the view of the garden from the kitchen window and would watch the birds that would come to eat out of the feeders. Ill health has forced her to live in a more protective environment, but she always asks about the house. She would be devastated to learn that someone had surreptitiously nominated the side yard to be separated from the ownership of the house. This is why I, rather than she, am writing this letter. I could not bear to see her distraught and overwhelmed with that knowledge. Similarly, I know that my grandparents would have been stunned and greatly disappointed if they thought that the City intended to wrest away from their family what they had worked so hard to acquire and what they considered to be their piece of the American dream. They would be similarly shocked, dismayed, and disappointed to learn that their government, which they trusted implicitly, had deliberately kept their plan to do this secret from the family until a mere ten days before a hearing on the matter.

My sister and I grew up in Alexandria and attended the public schools. My sister is an educator in the Alexandria City Public School System. Her daughter, who attends George Mason University, eventually stands to inherit the house. For her sake, I would hate to see the house separated from the land that my

grandparents always intended to be a part of the property. It is a legacy that my family deeply respects.

I understand that at least at the present time, the City is seeking voluntary participation and is not planning to proceed by eminent domain to seize property. However, should that approach change, I would like to be on record as completely and unequivocally opposing this process as it greatly and materially affects this property.

While I appreciate the need for parks in the city, I question the wisdom behind the City's interest in this particular property. Maury School provides a large open space, ball field and playground and Beach Park, which measures 1.3 acres, is located just across the street. Thus, this is not the situation where a small patch of greenery will provide a respite from urban sprawl. In addition, Russell Road is a busy street and it is of dubious wisdom to encourage children to cross the street to leave the larger pre-existing park. Another large expanse of land complete with a children's playground is part of the Church property just down the block on Commonwealth Avenue.

The amount of land in question is small and would not attract residents from anywhere but the immediate neighborhood. The neighborhood presently consists mostly of houses with yards and small gardens and trees. The addition of this small property to the park system would not fill a void in the ecological lives of the local residents. The presence of a bus stop nearby is irrelevant, because it is extremely unlikely that people would use public transportation to go to a tiny park where the city and surrounding areas have so many other parks with far superior features and amenities.

A driveway to the house presently runs over the land at 707 Russell Road and leads to the door which serves as the primary entrance and egress to the house. Inability to access that driveway would essentially eliminate the usefulness of that entrance and would significantly devalue the house.

The house would also be devalued by the potential presence of a noisy park. Presently, the school yard across the street and well as the street itself provides a certain level of noise to household residents. Placing a park immediately on the side of the house near bedrooms would remove a buffer from that noise and in fact, increase the noise from the activities in the park.

The land is not of historic significance nor are there any special ecological features to the land. Many of the trees on the property have been affected by

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 4

Dutch Elm disease and other diseases of aged trees. Sadly, their longevity is questionable.

It was only after receiving the notice from the City that we learned that the Rosemont Citizen's Association was responsible for the "nomination" of my mother's land as a pocket park. It is regrettable that the Rosemont Citizen's Association was so eager that the City acquire this property that it nominated it without even making any attempt to discuss this with anyone in my family and particularly my sister, who maintains the property due to my mother's ill health. The Rosemont Citizen's Association did not even have the courtesy to place a note regarding their intentions in the mail or slide it under the door. A great deal of time has been expended as a result of this nomination, both by the Committee in reviewing this request, and my sister and I in representing our mother's interests. If the Rosemont Citizen's Association is so interested in improving the neighborhood, perhaps they should approach owners of buildings in need of renovation and see whether they would be willing to tear down their properties to create a park where no greenery had been present, rather than go behind the back of an unsuspecting elderly landowner to seize ownership of a family homestead. That would be a much more valuable use of their time.

Out of respect for my mother's wishes, my sister, who is the trustee of the property and I will vehemently oppose any attempt to separate this land from that of the main house. We are quite prepared to utilize whatever remedies are available, whether through the legal system, a publicity campaign or the court of public opinion. In this era of limited money for essential city services, a municipal land grab that would arguably, if at all, benefit only a few local residents and which would remove privately held property from the tax base is politically unwise and fiscally irresponsible. In light of the existence of other properties whose owners might be more willing to part with them, I would respectfully request that you approach them and cease any further efforts to acquire this property. In particular, I request that you specifically amend the list of potential pocket parks to exclude this property.

Mayor, City Councilors and City Manager
September 16, 2005
Page 5

Should you have any questions or require any additional information,
please contact me.

Sincerely yours,



Esther J. Horwich

EH:ai

cc: Kirk Kincannon, Director
Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
1108 Jefferson Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Laura.Durham@alexandriava.gov

Ecorr/House1A.doc

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Phone: 703.712.5000
Fax: 703.712.5050
www.mcguirewoods.com

Jonathan P. Rak
Direct: 703.712.5411

McGUIREWOODS

8 e 9
9-20-05

jrak@mcguirewoods.com
Direct Fax: 703.712.5231

September 19, 2005

RECEIVED
SEP 26 2005

Honorable William D. Euille, Mayor and
Members of City Council
City of Alexandria
City Hall, Room 2300
301 King Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Re: Docket Item #9: Open Space Steering Committee Updated list of Priorities for
Potential Acquisition or Protection

Dear Mayor Euille and Members of Council:

I am writing on behalf of Carolyn S. Alper, et al, owner of the properties located at 4109, 4115, 4121 and 4125 Mount Vernon Avenue and listed on the 2005 Open Space Priority List as "Four Mile Run/Mount Vernon Avenue Property ("the Properties") in response to the Open Space Steering Committee's decision to place these properties on the 2005 Open Space Priority List. We respectfully request that you remove these Properties from the Priorities List until the time set aside in the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan¹ for the redevelopment of this property has expired. In the alternative, we request that you move the properties to the Future Priorities List and add a notation to the list indicating that any possible acquisition of these properties will comply with the goals of the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan.

The Arlandria Neighborhood Plan and the Open Space Priority List Should be Consistent:

The Arlandria Neighborhood Plan includes the following statement as a goal under the Long Term Actions:

"If the automobile-oriented retail uses adjacent to Four Mile Run Park do not redevelop within 15 years as market conditions improve, consider acquisition of the four parcels (under one ownership) to the existing pedestrian access opposite Four Mile Road."

¹ The Arlandria Neighborhood Plan was adopted by the City Council in 2003 as an amendment to the Potomac West Small Area Plan

Placing the properties on the Current Priority List is inconsistent with this goal of the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan. The goal indicates the City's willingness to allow the owner of this property to redevelop these properties and indicates that the City will not consider acquisition until 2018 (15 years from the date of adoption of the plan). Placing the properties on the Current Priorities Lists indicates that the City plans to start the acquisition process for these properties in the near future sending a mixed signal to the property owner and the community. The property owner relied on the goals adopted in the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan and has made business decisions regarding this property based on the City Council's affirmative adoption of this plan. If the properties are now listed on the current priorities list, the property owner can no longer rely on the goal adopted by the previous plan. If the City does plan to allow the property owner to have the time set aside in the Arlandria Plan to redevelop this property, placing the properties on the Current Priority list is misleading to the property owner and the community.

The Open Space Priority List should be consistent with the small area plans adopted by the City so that the property owners and community can rely on the actions taken by the City.

The Properties Are Currently Used For Viable Businesses:

The Properties are located close to the border of Alexandria and Arlington in the neighborhood of Arlandria, facing Mount Vernon Avenue. The properties are currently used by businesses that have served this neighborhood for many years. The location has been successful in keeping commercial tenants showing that there is a demand in this area for the services that are provided on these sites. Acquisition of these properties by the City for additional park land will not only remove the services these businesses provide to the neighborhood, but it will also take away jobs that are held by residents local to this neighborhood.


The Access To The Park Can Be Obtained Without Acquiring These Properties:

As discussed in the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan, better access to the Four Mile Run Park can be obtained without acquiring these properties. The City already owns the property to the North and directly to the South of these sites and the Plan proposes that with better landscaping and signage on the City owned property, new access points to the Park can be obtained. The proposals in the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan balance the need for enhanced access and visibility to Four Mile Run Park with the need to maintain the services provided on these properties by providing short term solutions and keeping the acquisitions of the properties as a long term goal in the event the situation on these properties change and they are no longer viable locations for services.

September 19, 2005
Page 3

In conclusion, the owner of these properties understands the importance of providing open space for the community. In fact, the approximately 4 acres of property for the park behind these properties was given to the City in 1974 by the family of Carolyn S. Alper, et al showing their dedication to the open space in the City. However, the Properties now on the Priority List are not currently available for use as open space. We, therefore, request that the properties be removed from the Open Space Priority list until such time that the property owner has a chance to redevelop the properties in a manner consistent with the City's adopted Arlandria Neighborhood Plan or phase out these businesses making the properties available for open space. In the alternative, we request that you place the properties on the Future Priorities List, rather than the Current Priorities List to be more consistent with the Arlandria Neighborhood Plan and more accurate with the City's intended acquisition schedule for these properties.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jonathan P. Rak" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jonathan P. Rak

cc: Kirk Kincannon, Director, Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities
Judy Noritake, Co-Chair, Open Space Steering Committee
Eric Wagner, Co-Chair, Open Space Steering Committee
Douglas Erdman, CRC Commercial

\\REA\279535.1

16-20
1-9-07

+


Open Space Plan Implementation

Status Report on the City of
Alexandria's Open Space Activities
January 9, 2007 City Council Meeting

Open Space Preserved — 100 Acre Goal

- 48 Acres of Open Space acquired or dedicated.

- 16 Acres of Open Space under Conservation or Public Access Easements



Acquired or Dedicated

Planned Acquisition or Dedication

■ Conservation Easement


□ Balance of Ten Year Goal

Open Space Acquired



- Ivor Lane – Seminary Forest
- 2600 Business Center Drive
- Strand – Waterfront (three parcels)
- Mount Vernon Avenue - Four Mile Run
- Raleigh Avenue - Holmes Run Park

2200 Ivor Lane -- Seminary Forest




2600 Business Center Drive




Strand - Waterfront



Mount Vernon Avenue -- Four Mile Run



4630 Raleigh Avenue



Open Space Dedicated



Open space dedicated or approved for future dedication, to the City:

- Oak Grove
- 1301 Powhatten St.
- ATA – Mill Road
- Eisenhower East Parks and Public Squares

Voluntary Conservation and Public Access Easements



Open Space preserved under voluntary conservation easements:

- 1900 Russell Road
- 403 West Masonic View
- 3401 Russell Road

Development Site Open Space:

Open space preserved on nine approved development sites.

Open Space Master Plan Achievements

- Ongoing Partnerships in Open Space Preservation: NVCT and the Office of Historic Alexandria.
- Ongoing Community Outreach: Civic, Association Meetings, RP&CA program information, educational events, etc.

Revised List of Valuable Open Space Protection Sites

- Sites no longer prioritized, and all considered “valuable open space” with a goal to be preserved.
- Valuable open space to be preserved through voluntary mechanisms: acquisition, right of first refusal, conservation easements, public access easements, or other means.

Revised List of 2005 Pocket Park Sites



- Property owner outreach concluding with removal of all uninterested parties from the 2005 list.
- Review and ranking of two additional proposed properties.
- Revised list of properties to be voluntarily considered, one property for immediate consideration.

Revised Potential Voluntary Conservation Easements

+

- Property owner outreach concluding with removal on all uninterested parties from the 2005 list.
- New list created with all interested property owners to be contacted by NVCT.
- Increased efforts to build interest in voluntary conservation easements.

Recommendation of the Future OSSC Structure

+

- New group would be appointed by the City Manager and would act as an advisory body.
- Group would include representation from the current commissions and committees and two citizen representatives.