

[EXTERNAL]New buildings planned at the intersection of Beauregard and West Braddock

ellen I harmon <elharmon3787@gmail.com>

Sat 1/30/2021 5:21 PM

To: PlanComm <PlanComm@alexandriava.gov>

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to voice my objection to the plan being considered to abolish parts of Newport Village and replace them with higher density, larger structures.

1. As a resident of Stonegate Foundation, I was never given notice nor consulted. I only just learned of this plan quite by accident yesterday on Facebook and then again today from a Board member here at Stonegate.

It is stated that nearby residents were notified and consulted. NOT TRUE.

2. There is not enough street parking in this immediate area now; this project will create even more of a problem.

3. In recent years we have seen built more than our share of large residential buildings: the new housing on Beauregard in front of The Goodwin House, new housing on Fillmore - both projects replaced churches - ; then there is the ongoing conversion on Ford Avenue of two large office buildings into apartments, the development of the old Jefferson Hospital property on the corner of King and West Braddock, and lastly the development of more housing on the corner of Seminary Rd. and Beauregard. I won't even get into what is being planned for King Street near Fairlington nor 31st Road going down to Shirlington.

I don't know why the current City Council thinks we should reclassify many things in Alexandria as "urban", requiring higher density. If I wanted to live in Clarendon, Ballston, Old Town, DC or NYC I would've bought a home there when I was in the market seven years ago. Alexandria is a close-in suburb and should be regarded as such. Filling it up with high density buildings is ill-advised and unwanted.

Thank you for your attention.

Ellen Harmon
4691 Kirkpatrick Lane
Alexandria, VA. 22311

DISCLAIMER: This message was sent from outside the City of Alexandria email system.
DO NOT CLICK any links or download attachments unless the contents are from a trusted source.

[EXTERNAL]Proposed project at Beauregard and W. Braddock

Sally Reinholdt <sreinholdt1991@comcast.net>

Sun 1/31/2021 6:13 PM

To: PlanComm <PlanComm@alexandriava.gov>

To whom it may concern:

My husband and I heard yesterday from a neighbor about the proposed project at Beauregard and W. Braddock. We are residents of Stonegate Foundation and, despite the fact that this would be a massive project that effects our community, we have had no notification about this project from the City of Alexandria.

We strongly object to additional high density housing in this area. Since moving to Stonegate in 1996 we have seen the construction of low and high rise housing on N. Hampton and on King Street immediately behind the Liberty Gas Station. What we believe was formerly a government building on Ford St. was converted into lofts and high rise office buildings in the in the same block are currently being converted to residential use. There is also the recently completed project at West Alex in addition to more house being built along Beauregard, on Fillmore St. as well as the big development at Beauregard and Seminary Rds.

The building documents state that "Staff finds that both the site layout and the building design are reasonable and appropriate for this site. With regard to site layout, staff worked with the applicant to achieve a design relating well to both adjacent streets-in a more urban style than the current suburban layout at Newport Village". We find that laughable. The proposed structure would stick out like a sore thumb and is totally inappropriate for the surrounding area. Additionally, it is apparent from the planning documents I read that the parking that is proposed is woefully inadequate for the number of units/occupants. Parking in this area is currently difficult at best and a new high density building would only add to the problem.

It seems that the City of Alexandria is bent on building high rise/high density housing in any and all available space. It also seems the developers ideas are adopted without input or consideration of the surrounding communities, e.g. Stonegate. Our pleasant suburban area is being turned into a high density urban area and ruining the character of our beloved neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matthew Minor
Sally Reinholdt
4654 Kell Lane
Alexandria, VA 22311

**DISCLAIMER: This message was sent from outside the City of Alexandria email system.
DO NOT CLICK any links or download attachments unless the contents are from a trusted source.**

[EXTERNAL]Objection to Proposed Building at Beauregard and West Braddock

Margaret Welsh <mawelsh@comcast.net>

Mon 2/1/2021 11:09 AM

To: PlanComm <PlanComm@alexandriava.gov>

Dear Alexandria Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to object to the proposed building at the corner of Beauregard and West Braddock to replace parts of Newport Village with a larger, higher density multi-use building. As a homeowner in the neighborhood of Stonegate Foundation, I object to this proposal as the density in this neighborhood is already very high, resulting in increased traffic and criminal activity.

Furthermore, the staff report noted that nearby residents were notified and consulted. We were provided neither a notice or opportunity to consult on the viability of this project. Only one homeowner received notice less than a week prior to the upcoming Planning Commission meeting to be held tomorrow, February 2.

Parking issues in this neighborhood continue to escalate and should this new building be approved, it will exacerbate the issue even further since the building proposes less than adequate parking. Workers and others who do not live in this neighborhood continually park their cars for long periods of time eliminating the opportunity for those who do live in the neighborhood to use the limited parking spaces available.

Over development of the West End needs to be curtailed as the streets cannot accommodate the increase in density as proposed, given that new large structures have already been built nearby or are under construction. The new building at the corner of King and West Braddock, the building being constructed in front of the Goodwin House and many other already approved conversations and new builds in the neighborhood are more than enough to negatively impact the daily lives of residents in this neighborhood.

I strongly object to this proposal and urge the members of the Planning Commission to NOT APPROVE this proposal.

Margaret Welsh
4693 Kirkpatrick Lane
Alexandria, Virginia 22311

**DISCLAIMER: This message was sent from outside the City of Alexandria email system.
DO NOT CLICK any links or download attachments unless the contents are from a trusted source.**



Kenneth W. Wire
kwire@wiregill.com
703-677-3129

February 1, 2021

VIA EMAIL TO karl.moritz@alexandriava.gov

Nate Macek, Chair and Members of the Planning Commission
301 King Street, Suite 2100
Alexandria, VA 22314

RE: February 2nd Planning Commission Hearing
Docket Item #8, Newport Village

Dear Mr. Macek and Members of the Planning Commission:

On behalf of my client, the UDR Newport Village LLC (the "Applicant"), I am requesting the following revisions to the staff recommendation conditions of approval for DSUP 2020-10016.

Condition 86

Mitigate any impacts on water quality of the development by encroachment into and/or destruction of an existing resource protection areas (RPAs) and mapped wetland area by the following methods to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation and Environmental Services and in compliance with the approved exception request:

- a. Design and construct a stream restoration for the entire perennial stream section located in the median of North Beauregard Street between Fillmore Ave and Braddock Road that provides no less than 24.5 pounds of phosphorous removal utilizing the BANCS Assessment criteria and natural channel design. A revegetation plan will be required that uses only locally native plantings. The stream restoration plan must be approved prior to the release of the final site plan. Completion of the stream restoration is required prior to release of the first certificate of occupancy.
- b. Reforest .40 contiguous acres on the site that are currently managed turf. This area requires a protective easement and maintenance plan.
- c. Remove both slip lanes at the intersection of North Beauregard Street and Braddock Road and replace them with vegetated cover.
- d. Create and implement a pet waste program that is approved by the Stormwater Division of Transportation and Environmental Services.
- e. All sidewalks and pathways in the RPA must be permeable pavement.
- f. The entire building rooftop, with the exception of required setbacks, in the RPA must be vegetated.
- g. ~~In total, the mitigation must reduce phosphorous based upon the existing load from the site by no less than 10 times the state requirement.~~ **In total, mitigation measures must reduce phosphorus by no less than 27.54 lbs.**

Condition 105

No major construction staging shall be allowed within the public right-of-way **without permit or as approved by T&ES with the Construction Management Plan**. The applicant shall meet with T&ES to discuss construction staging activities prior to release of any permits for ground disturbing activities. (T&ES) **

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to discussing this request with you at tomorrow's Planning Commission hearing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. W. Wire", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kenneth W. Wire

February 1, 2021

(as attachment to *E mail*) PlanComm@Alexandriava.gov;

To: Alexandria Planning Commission and City Council
Karl Moritz, Director, Planning and Zoning, City of Alexandria

From: Stonegate Foundation, Inc. (a VA Homeowner's Association)
(by Dina Biblin, Secretary-Treasurer)

Re: Agenda Item #8, Planning Commission Docket (2-1-2021):
OPPOSITION to the Development Plan for Newport Village

The Board of Directors of Stonegate Foundation, Inc., ("SFI"), a VA homeowner's association, hereby registers its opposition to planning proposals submitted by Newport Village ("Newport") for consideration on February 2, 2021.

We are an association of 76 townhomes immediately adjacent to the Newport property, at the Northeast Corner of W. Braddock Road and N. Hampton Drive. The block on W. Braddock from N Hampton to Beauregard, where the Newport plan for increased density is located, is already highly developed with multi-family apartments and townhomes. Along this block there are five Homeowner Associations, with hundreds of individual townhomes and apartments, plus the entire Newport Village property, and one Section 8 townhome development. They are all low-rise buildings.

1. Failure to provide proper notice.

We have significant concerns about overdevelopment of this area and are impacted by Newport's proposals. We knew nothing of the upcoming Proposal until we happened to see it on the Planning Commission agenda for tomorrow night. Proper notice of the upcoming request for exception should have been given to our entire community, among the 4 other HOAs along Braddock Road, but it was not. Mr. Wire apparently sent a single letter to one homeowner at Stonegate and failed to notify our management company or the Registered Agent. We previously registered our failure to have received Notice concerning another aspect of this proposal before the Planning Commission on February 4, 2020. The absence of proper Notice appears more intentional than negligent at this point.

Remarkably, Newport claims they gave notice to their tenants at Newport Village. However, they ignored those who need the notice, particularly the neighboring townhome communities along Braddock Road and N. Hampton Drive.

2. The City Staff Report Ignored the interests of homeowners directly next door.

The City Staff Report seems to have ignored the interests of these homeowners directly next door to this proposal. Particularly given the fact that Newport states that it plans to tear down other of their garden apartments adjacent to our townhomes, and build more high-density high rise residential buildings, this is a fairly important omission.

No mention nor consideration was made concerning the hundreds of homeowners who purchased low rise, colonial style properties on **quiet, residential streets** adjacent to the monolith

being proposed. We are not Beauregard or King Street, where other high rise, high density developments have been built. We are a quiet neighborhood behind two urban streets that intersect at Beauregard and King Streets. Our concerns must be considered by the City Planning Commission and the City Council.

No mention was made of the fact that along this strip of Braddock Road are only low rise apartments and townhomes that will be adversely affected by a high density development. Not only will access to our quiet community be affected at the intersection of Beauregard and W. Braddock for years, but the resulting traffic from more vehicles looking to avoid that corner and instead, traverse to King Street and I-395 via N. Hampton Drive is a major problem for our homeowners.

For the Planning Staff to assume that it is desirable to convert a quiet, residential community into an urban one is simply wrong. These homes were purchased, and these developments were built over 25 years ago and the purchasers and homeowners knew that the area was designated as low-density multifamily housing. It should stay that way. Most of the residents along W. Braddock and N. Hampton Drives are not young urbanites who rent bicycles at kiosks. Take a good look at the profile of the taxpaying Alexandria residents who are adversely affected by this overblown project.

The Staff report concludes that: *"Staff does not find that the new land-use designation would be out of character for the neighborhood."* Staff report at p.10. They obviously forgot to turn around and look down the street. Your staff discussed only what was on Beauregard. Going from 24 homes to 393 homes on one corner with a massive, modern building structure that is out of place with a colonial style adjacent to it is unwarranted. It does not "fit in" with the existing neighborhood.

Even the staff acknowledges *"the increase in the number of units at the site from 24 to 383 would redevelop an existing use at a greater density/intensity and is not consistent with Objective #1."* This should not have been recommended in that case. Certainly, the developer and the City can come up with an attractive improvement on a much smaller scale.

We suggest the Commission take a good look at the neighborhoods along W. Braddock and you will conclude, as we do, that a building of this size and design does not belong here. It will diminish the tranquility and charm of these smaller neighborhoods -- something for which Alexandria prides itself.

3. Effect on Traffic and Parking.

There is already too much traffic speeding along W. Braddock Road. The impact of this high-density project on a relatively quiet neighborhood is enormous and adverse. The congestion caused by the size of this project during construction and after completion at the intersection of W. Braddock and Beauregard will be the subject of complaints from many Alexandrians for years.

In addition, there is not enough street parking in this immediate area now; this project will create even more of a problem. Again, this is a suburban neighborhood where vehicles are required to get groceries, go to the drugstore, and shop westward on King Street. This is not a walkable metro area and should not be. Middle aged and seniors do not take busses to get their groceries and prescriptions. (*See also, Parking Reduction, #4.*)

As it is now, Newport Village residents do not have sufficient parking on their property, so many of them drop their cars off on N. Hampton Drive, which eliminates visitor parking for the townhome and condo communities along N. Hampton. There is no street parking on Beauregard and parking on N. Hampton is purposely limited.

Not only the Newport Village residents, but those at the high-rise condos on N. Hampton and King Street, and the recently converted office buildings along Ford Avenue also park their excess vehicles on N. Hampton Drive. So do the residents of the garden condos on N. Hampton Drive, where the City saw fit to permit the developers more parking reductions.

The City kept granting parking reductions to those higher density developments, against the protests of the Stonegate HOAs along N. Hampton. Our own development of 76 townhomes was approved with only eight (8) visitor parking spaces back in the early 1990's. The result was that the City created a parking congestion problem as there is insufficient parking for the residents of these neighborhoods. They are forced to find parking for their visitors and contractors on the public street. Please do not make the same mistake with the Newport Village proposal.

4. The City Planning Staff applied faulty Analysis to the decision on the request for a parking reduction.

As you can see when we described the current congestion considerations above, it should be apparent that the City Planning Staff applied faulty analysis to their support of a parking reduction, let alone other aspects of this project.

- Staff claims they looked at the parking levels for Newport Village but did not realize that Newport Village did not provide enough parking for their own tenants.
- Staff claims they looked at the parking for The Alexander and Northhampton Place developments but obviously was not made aware that the parking levels for those Residential Buildings are insufficient for the residents and guests of those buildings. The City granted both developments parking reductions that resulted in too many residents with multiple cars and no indoor parking. The developers at Northhampton Place even gave extra parking spaces to buyers in order to sell condos, which spaces had been required by the City for visitor parking. The result is that residents there complain they don't have off street parking for their visitors and the City's requirements were not complied with by the developer.
- Staff ignored the fact that many younger people who rent apartments tend to cram multiple adults, each with their own vehicle, into 2 bedroom or 3 bedroom apartments. That would dictate a minimum of 1 parking space per bedroom, let alone creating sufficient spaces for visitors to the building.
- The parking calculations are misleading. They did not just reduce by 48 spaces; they are planning to reduce the parking by 72 spaces (from a permit max of 487 down to 415 spaces). That is insufficient parking for the residents, let alone for the visitors to the building. 30% of 393 is 118 visitor parking spaces. Even at a 20% level of visitor parking, that would mandate 79 visitor parking spots. This proposed parking reduction wipes them out and none of your staff seems to have noticed.
- The Staff also bases its calculations for a reduction on a rapid transitway to be built on Beauregard. That is years away. In the meantime, people are going to be using cars and reducing parking requirements inside that new structure is a mistake. Approving this project will create a traffic mess along Beauregard and down W. Braddock to N. Hampton Drive.

- The recommendation for only 0.8 parking spaces per bedroom is dramatically insufficient. This area is not directly accessible to a metro stop, and many of our suburban residents do not commute to shopping or jobs via bus or on foot and there is no metro nearby. Grocery stores are a minimum of 1-2 miles away. With 415 spaces for 393 units, you don't even have 22 spaces for visitors to this massive, high-density building, and that is assuming only 1 space per unit.

* * *

We encourage the City to look for less overpowering alternatives to the Newport project which might better blend with the existing community. A village-like project with some commercial ready space might be a better goal for this location and would create benefits for the existing residents. By contrast, the proposal to switch from low density multi-family to a high-rise of immense proportions at the corner of Beauregard and W. Braddock is an insult to the current residents along W. Braddock.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns, which would likely have been echoed by hundreds of homeowners at Stonegate Mews, Stonegate Manors, Stonegate Highpointe, and Stonegate Hamptons, had they received proper Notice.

STONEGATE FOUNDATION, INC. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

By Greg Niessen, President, and Dina_L. Biblin, Esq., Secretary-Treasurer
and Registered Agent. DBStonegate@comcast.net

[EXTERNAL]Questions on Proposed Newport Village Apt. Project on West Braddock Rd. & Beauregard

Len Horning <haspresident@yahoo.com>

Tue 2/2/2021 3:41 PM

To: Patrick Silva <Patrick.Silva@alexandriava.gov>

Thanks for the contact information. Here are questions one of our residents compiled. She forwarded them to the planning committee.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Janice Corbett <janice.corbett77@gmail.com>

To: "plancomm@alexandria.gov" <plancomm@alexandria.gov>; Maya Contreras <maya.contreras@alexandriava.gov>

Cc: Len Horning <haspresident@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021, 11:50:35 AM EST

Subject: Questions on Proposed Newport Village Apt. Project on West Braddock Rd. & Beauregard

1. Is there a way to get the project back to its original configuration (number of units & parking spaces)?
2. If the project is to continue, the developers MUST provide more parking for the tenants. How can you enforce that?
3. If the project is to continue, what provisions have been made for street parking?
4. If the project is to continue, what are the plans to redesign the corner of King St. & Beauregard to accommodate the increased traffic volume?
5. What are the plans to increase public transportation? You approved the Array with the condition that there would be a bus transit center at the Array. This did NOT happen. How can we depend on the City Council to approve this project with increased public transportation options and road redesign?

This area has eight apartment complexes within a one-mile radius. If you allow the addition of a ninth with inadequate parking, you are causing unnecessary stress on the population.

**DISCLAIMER: This message was sent from outside the City of Alexandria email system.
DO NOT CLICK any links or download attachments unless the contents are from a trusted source.**

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: FEBRUARY 2, 2021

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: KARL MORITZ, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ZONING

SUBJECT: DOCKET ITEM #8 – NEWPORT VILLAGE - DSUP #2020-10026
STAFF RESPONSE TO RECENT LETTERS

In the last two days, staff has forwarded to Planning Commission a total of six letters or emails regarding the Newport Village project (Docket Item #8). One of these letters is from the applicant, another is from the Stonegate Association, and the remaining four letters appear to have been submitted by individual residents of the Stonegate residential community to the south of the project site. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide to the Planning Commission staff's response to the matters raised by all parties.

1. Applicant Letter

In his letter dated yesterday (February 1st), Ken Wire, the attorney for the applicant has asked the Planning Commission to consider revisions to two recommended conditions of approval. The first condition is related to the amount of phosphorous that must be removed from stormwater runoff at the site. The second condition is related to whether the applicant may place construction staging equipment within the public right-of-way.

a) Phosphorous Removal (Condition #86g)

The applicant has requested the following specific change to Condition #86g in the staff report:

~~*In total, the mitigation must reduce phosphorous based upon the existing load from the site by no less than 10 times the state requirement.*~~ *In total, mitigation measures must reduce phosphorus by no less than 27.54 lbs.*

Staff does not support this requested change. The difference between the fixed amount of 27.54 lbs. and 10 times the state requirement is about 1.3 pounds of phosphorous. If the condition change were approved, more pollution would be allowed to be contained within stormwater that leaves the project site, enters the City's storm sewers, and ultimately reaches Chesapeake Bay. In addition, staff's original inclusion of the condition that phosphorous must be reduced by 10 times the state requirement was taken directly from the RPA Mitigation Presentation to Planning Commission and the EPC in March 2020 that resulted in the approval of the RPA exception request. If the change were approved, the project would not be consistent with the request as presented to the Environmental Policy Commission or the Planning Commission.

b) Construction Staging in Public Right-of-Way (Condition #105)

The applicant has requested the following specific change to Condition #105 in the staff report:

No major construction staging shall be allowed within the public right-of-way without permit or as approved by T&ES with the Construction Management Plan. The applicant shall meet with T&ES to discuss construction staging activities prior to release of any permits for ground disturbing activities.

Staff instead supports a modified version of the applicant's proposal to revise Condition #105 that would read as follows:

No ~~major~~ construction staging shall be allowed within the public right-of-way without a T&ES permit. The applicant shall meet with T&ES to discuss construction staging activities prior to release of any permits for ground disturbing activities.

Staff understands that the applicant's concern with the original condition language is that its wording would preclude the option of obtaining approval of a T&ES permit to allow construction staging in the public right-of-way. Historically, staff has not read the condition in question, which is a "standard" condition, as precluding any applicant from availing itself of such an option as may be allowed with T&ES permit approval, under certain circumstances, throughout the City. Nonetheless, staff recommends its revision of this condition to remove the ambiguity that the applicant has raised, but without the option of potentially approving such construction staging as part of the Construction Management Plan (which is a part of the Final Site Plan.) T&ES does not approve construction staging in the public right-of-way as part of Construction Management Plans for any applicants in the City and does not believe such special permission should be granted in this case.

2. Resident Concerns (Stonegate Community)

Staff has also received five letters/emails, one from the Stonegate Association, and four from confirmed or presumed individuals living in the Stonegate community. The letters express concerns about the Newport Village project that may be generally divided into the following categories: a) the lack of proper noticing to the community; b) concerns about the increase in density; c) traffic concerns; and d) concerns about insufficient parking and the requested parking reduction. Staff would like to provide responses to the Planning Commission regarding each of these matters.

a) Noticing to the Community

Summary of Concern:

Certain letters have stated that the Stonegate community has not been informed of the project in a timely manner.

Staff Response:

The applicant fulfilled requirements listed in the Zoning Ordinance to post placards at the site and to provide written notice to properties immediately abutting the property at 4898 West Braddock Road within specified timeframes, which were November 2020 and mid/late January

2021, respectively. According to the information it provided to the City, the applicant included written notice to both the Stonegate Foundation and the Stonegate Mews Owners Association. In addition, the applicant hosted virtual meetings with the greater community - and sent letters or emailed nearby associations in advance of those meetings - which occurred in both March 2020 and July 2020. According to the applicant's records, several nearby communities were notified of these meetings, including the Stonegate community.

b) Increased Density

Summary of Concern: The density being sought in connection with this project is too great of an increase in this area, particularly one that includes residential townhouses.

Staff Response: Staff recognizes that the Master Plan Amendments and the rezoning would allow for an increase in density at this site. It also acknowledges that existing densities are lower further to the south along West Braddock Road near the Stonegate community. However, the project site for the current request is not the entirety of the 4898 West Braddock Road property but a smaller portion near the intersection of North Beauregard and West Braddock Road, one of the points of Newport Village farthest from the lower densities found to the south. Staff believes that an increase in density here is appropriate given existing transit options, the urban planning principle of concentrating density near existing and future transit, and the presence of other larger-scale residential and institutional buildings nearby, particularly to the northeast and southwest along North Beauregard Street.

c) Potential for Increased Traffic

Summary of Concern: The project would have a large and negative impact on traffic in the vicinity of North Beauregard Street and West Braddock Road.

Staff Response: As noted in the staff report, staff has reviewed the traffic study commissioned by the applicant through its private traffic consultant. The study revealed that adequate levels of service would be maintained in the area studied, which included six intersections in the vicinity. The closure of the slip lanes at North Beauregard Street and West Braddock Road may result in slightly longer queuing times at that intersection's traffic signal; however, staff believes that this is an acceptable trade-off for the increased pedestrian safety that would result from the closure.

d) Parking Concerns

Summary of Concern: The amount of parking provided with the project is insufficient given the requested parking reduction and would negatively affect the surrounding area.

Staff Response: The City established parking requirements for multifamily buildings in 2016 through an in-depth community process and based on data collection of parking in Alexandria and peer jurisdictions. These requirements allow reductions for certain site characteristics like being near transit or in a walkable area. This development is eligible for a 5% reduction in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance for being within a quarter mile of at least 4 bus routes, and they are applying this reduction. The development requested to have an additional 10%

reduction as is consistent with developments near Metro stops and existing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stops. As design for the West End Transitway BRT will begin this year, and a BRT station is planned on the development's site frontage, staff believes that this additional reduction, which presently requires Special Use Permit (SUP) approval, would be appropriate for this project. Staff believes that the amount of parking provided with the development is appropriate given the multimodal network that is anticipated in this area which is supported by the BRT project, local buses, the planned bicycle/pedestrian trail along N. Beauregard Street, the planned bikeshare station, and an overall expansion of bikeshare in the West End of the City.