

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Present: Cupina, Hovermale, Jennings, Kennedy, Murphy, Penniman, Straits, Vanell, Walker, Weber

Absent: Cerny; Thompson ; Wilcox; Wynands; Oak

Procedural Items and announcements:

Vice Chairman Walker called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

Administrative item: Vice Chairman Walker provided commentary regarding the desire by some Committee members that we should have a County Staff Report prior to our approval of pending applications. Rob referred to the County's own guidelines that indicate that Staff Reports are typically issued 2-3 weeks prior to the Planning Commission hearing. Therefore, in Rob's opinion, it is not practical to expect the Staff Report prior to a vote by the P&Z Committee.

Agenda item 1: Approve the June meeting minutes.

This agenda item was deferred to our September meeting to provide time for the minutes to be distributed and reviewed.

Agenda item 2: General Dynamics Corporation; Application number; CDPA 86-C-054; FDPA 86-C-054-02-01; PCA 86-C-054-02

1. **Presentation:** Mark Looney of Cooley
Mark reviewed changes that have occurred to the plan since the last committee meeting. Additionally, there have been further changes to the plan after we received our packets. In summary, the loading area was moved from the north side of the building to the south side; slight modifications to parking; etc.
2. **Committee comments:**
 - Ms. Straits asked questions regarding vehicular access; coord. w/ neighbors; LEED, Park dedication and storm water management (SWM). Mark Looney said they have coordinated with the neighbors; SWM will meet the new standards and it includes provisions to cover the impact to future Sunset Hills Road widening.
 - Mr. Murphy asked question pertaining to parking and architecture which led to a larger discussion about the fact that there is not architectural review in Reston of this project.
 - Mr. Hovermale commented he likes the low key design.
 - Mr. Jennings had similar comments to Mr. Hovermale.
 - Mr. Cupina asked about the height of the building and commented the optional 6th story may be more noticeable than described.
 - Mr. Penniman commented that he appreciates the parking reduction; prefers a higher LEED standard; and asked if there was a better use for the area located outside of the fence.
 - Mr. Kennedy asked why the fence is not enclosing the entire property; questioned the term "low cost fence"; and was surprised at Mark's response to Art Murphy's comments regarding architecture. Dick also recommends permeable pavers be

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

used for parking. Mark described how the fence changes around the property and he re-stated some information regarding architecture.

- Mr. Vanell asked about why the fence does not extend to the perimeter of the property; had comments regarding the importance of the architectural review as Mr. Vanell agrees with Mr. Murphy's previous comments regarding architecture; Is there better use for the eastern portion of the property and had comments regarding trail clearing.
- Mr. Murphy added additional comments regarding the importance of the architecture.
- Mr. Walker asked if the applicant was willing to consider a compromise regarding Mr. Murphy's and Mr. Vanell's comments whereas would the applicant be willing to take advantage of the Reston DRB offer to provide a non-committal review of architectural issues at some point in the future.
- Mr. Weber commented the project should be LEED silver; suggested better solar orientation; noted that graphic scales should be provided on drawings; asked if ADA parking spaces could be closer; and suggested a channelized right turn lane should be provided to the eastern entrance. Mark responded that the extra widening for a right turn lane would be problematic.

Public Speakers

- Arlene Kreiger commented how important the architectural review is to the project.
- Jean Vasterlin asked why is there no architectural review.

Motion: Mr. Vanell moved to approve the application as presented.

Mr. Penniman seconded the motion.

After considerable comments and wordsmithing, the following motion moved forward for a vote:

The Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Committee recommends approval of this project/application from a planning and zoning perspective with the understanding that the applicant will come back to the P&Z Committee or meet with the Reston Design Review Board (DRB) with architectural plans and elevations for review and comment at a future date on or around October 2016.

Vote Outcome

AYE: Cupina, Hovermale, Jennings, Kennedy, Murphy, Vanell, Walker

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: Straits, Penniman and Weber

The motion to approves as noted was passed 7-3.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Agenda item 3: St John's Woods

Presentation: Brian Winterhalter of Cooley

Brian reviewed changes that have occurred to the plan since the last committee meeting. The Planning Commission Hearing is presently scheduled for September 24th. Brian reviewed the traffic analysis and believed the existing level of service was at a D or above. He addressed previous comments concerns regarding:

- Whether or not the Traffic Study should include Metro. Yes, they plan to revise by September.
- Queuing for Center Harbor Road.
- Exploration of a new entrance on to Reston Parkway.
- Speed/traffic and pedestrian concerns along Center Harbor Road. Brian mentioned traffic calming could be further explored. They would agree to a proffer to provide a traffic calming analysis.

Committee comments:

- Ms. Straits thanked the applicant for offering relocation assistance and making the DRB changes. She is concerned about building size; she would prefer access from Reston Parkway; asked what is the % of open space and asked if there was an off-leash dog area.
- Mr. Walker questioned whether the PC date was realistic since their revised traffic study would not be completed until mid-September and they still need to come back to P&Z.
- Mr. Murphy commended the applicant for revising the architecture based on his past comments and comments from DRB. He believes this is a valid housing project.
- Mr. Hovermale had questions regarding student/school calculations; made comments regarding traffic calming pros and cons (related to Soapstone Drive); and asked to see elevation comparisons of the existing use verses the proposed use.
- Mr. Jennings reiterated Mr. Hovermale's comments regarding the importance of building elevation comparisons and he also commented on traffic queuing.
- Mr. Cupina was concerned regarding the views along Reston Parkway and the impact of the building mass; and he noted the buffer widths along Reston Parkway have been reduced. Eric from Buzzuto responded by stating their goal is to have a similar buffer affect along Reston Parkway especially travelling north.
- Mr. Penniman asked where the applicant stands with the DRB review?; Are the pathways publically accessible?; What are the pool dimensions?; What are the green building options?; Will these units be rentals: The applicant's response; DRB is o.k. with the massing but the details need to be worked-out; The pathways will be accessible; the pool is approx.. 2000 sq. ft. and the units are rentals.
- Mr. Kennedy is concerned regarding the increased density in this neighborhood and does not believe the applicant has justified the need for the added density.
- Mr. Vanell commented that he would like to see architectural elevations on the north and east sides. He would also like to know if there is a higher Green standard than NAHB.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

- Mr. Weber commented that he does not agree with the increased density; believes traffic calming is not the answer; the development is not transit oriented; believe they need more traffic counts; and prefers a play area.

Public Comments (Note: Names were only verbally provided, therefore, there may be misspellings)

- Carlos Campbell believes the height and bulk are too great; the project doesn't fit; not great aesthetically; the original Reston Master Plan proposed underpasses; will have a negative impact to local schools and he questions what impact this development will have on support services.
- John Morney reviewed the traffic study and is concerned about the ITE trip generation numbers and had additional concerns regarding traffic.
- John Lovary had concerns regarding storm water.
- Suzanne Anderson Tosado asked that her letter be added to the public record (It was previously attached to the P&Z Committee's agenda); she has been collecting signatures from North Point Village Citizens; and she does not believe the plan adheres to the Updated Reston Master Plan.
- Katie Burtleson is a renter in St. John's Woods; She believes it is falling apart and is in need of redevelopment; and she advocates for affordable options in Reston.
- Darlene Blaggra believes lighting is an issue; is concerned about noise and pet problems.
- Mark Hynman believes the size is massive.
- Steve Page is concerned regarding the visibility along Reston Parkway; and he is concerned about this development increasing school population.
- Steve Rank (Hampton Point) is concerned about construction.
- Gary Vogel (?) wanted to make us aware that the speed limit is only 10 mph along North Point Village Road.
- Elaine Reinhard (Timberview) complained that there has been no communication with near-by homeowners. She did acknowledge that their home owners association had been notified but failed to notify their homeowners.
- James Burrelson believes North Point Village is a problem.
- Jack Clausa is worried this development will set a bad precedent.
- Tamera Catonia is worried about the rentals.

No Vote was required. The applicant plans to return to the P&Z at a later meeting.

Agenda item 4: Lincoln at Commerce Center

Presentation: Mark Looney of Cooley

Mark reviewed changes that have occurred to the plan since the last committee meeting. He mentioned the PC Hearing is scheduled for September. A Parking reduction request has delayed the application.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Committee comments:

- Mr. Weber asked who owns the land?; Why is it not being re-developed with the other development?; Has concerns regarding private roads and entrances; He is concerned about the Level of service at the Wiehle and Sunrise Valley Drive intersection; Why is a front yard waiver being requested? Why so many waivers? And he believes he has asked for TDM data and has never seen it.
- Mr. Vanell asked several architectural questions. He likes the South and East sides but does not see enough change along the Association Drive side. He believes it appears too flat.
- Mr. Kennedy commented that a lot of good work has been done by the applicant. He believes the Association Drive elevation looks huge but defers to other colleagues. He likes the affordable/workforce housing.
- Mr. Penniman has questions regarding property ownership; Has concerns regarding the 400 foot Association Drive building face; asked about the status of RA membership; stated he plans to vote no due to the lack of retail. (The applicant responded that they are in discussions with RA but have made no commitments at this time).
- Mr. Cupina asked about pedestrian access and asked why no retail?
- Mr. Jennings questioned the formula used for athletic field contributions and schools; he also stated he appreciates the drawings.
- Mr. Hovermale had questions regarding the timing of the traffic light. He also stated he loves the park details.
- Mr. Murphy commented that architecture is an improvement; the 400 ft elevation along Association Drive is still a concern; requests the applicant agree to having the architecture reviewed at a later date (citing the RA Board language)
- Ms. Straits agreed with Mr. Murphy regarding his architecture comments:asked which green building program they propose. She also had questions regarding storm water. (The applicant responded by saying they are considering LEED as their green building method).

Motion: Mr. Vanell made the following motion and it was seconded by several. The motion below reflects comments made during discussion agreed to by Mr. Vanell.

The Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Committee recommends approval of the project/application from a planning and zoning perspective with the understanding that the applicant will come back to a joint meeting between the P&Z and the Reston Design Review Board (DRB) with architectural plans and elevations for review and comment at a future date before the end of 2016.

Vote Outcome

AYE: Cupina, Hovermale, Jennings, Murphy, Vanell, Walker

NAY: Weber and Penniman

ABSTAIN: Straits and Kennedy

The motion passed 6-2 (with 2 abstentions)

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
July 25th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Close of meeting

A motion was made by several to adjourn the meeting. Several members seconded.

Vote Outcome

AYE: Unanimous.

The motion passed

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:23 am.(July 26th)

Next scheduled P&Z meeting: September 12th, 2016 at RA's conference room

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Walker, Reston P&Z Member and Committee Vice Chairman